



**ARCHAEOLOGICAL
DESK BASED
ASSESSMENT**

**44 Eagle Street
London
WC1R**

August 2017

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

**Site centred at:
TQ30691 81670**

**Author:
Richard von Kalinowski-Meager
BA MA PG Cert FSA MIfA**

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

**Report Status:
Planning issue**

**Issue Date:
August 2017**

**CgMs Ref:
RM/23635**

© CgMs Limited

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

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

© Ordnance Survey maps reproduced with the
sanction of the controller of HM Stationery Office.
Licence No: AL 100014723

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

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

Sources Consulted

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Fig. 1 Site location
- Fig. 2 Summary of cultural heritage designations (data from GLHER)
- Fig. 3 1562 Ralph Agas map
- Fig. 4 1572 Braun & Hogenberg map
- Fig. 5 1682 Morgan map
- Fig. 6 1745 John Rocque
- Fig. 7 1799-1819 Richard Horwood
- Fig. 8 1827 Greenwood map of London
- Fig. 9 1872 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 10 1888 GOAD Insurance plan
- Fig. 11 1894 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 12 1914 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 13 1923 GOAD Insurance plan
- Fig. 14 1936 GOAD Insurance plan
- Fig. 15 1939 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 16 1946 World War Two bomb damage map
- Fig. 17 1952 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 18 1960 GOAD Insurance plan
- Fig. 19 1966 Ordnance Survey

- Fig. 20 site as existing: basement
Fig. 21 site as existing: ground floor
Fig. 22 Redevelopment proposals: basement
Fig. 23 Redevelopment proposals: ground floor

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1 2017 the Eagle Street site frontage

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The site of 44 Eagle Street, London WC1R, has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.

In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Wreck or Historic Battlefield sites are present within the site or its immediate vicinity.

In terms of relevant local designations, the site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the London Borough of Camden.

The site can be considered likely to have a moderate archaeological potential for the Palaeolithic and Roman periods, and a generally low archaeological potential for all other periods of past human activity.

Past post depositional impacts are considered likely to have been severe as a result of several phases of redevelopment, including World War Two bomb damage.

Redevelopment proposals include the refurbishment of the existing building, including elements of new build requiring new foundations.

On the basis of the available information, further mitigation in the form of archaeological monitoring during relevant construction groundworks is proposed, to be secured by an appropriate condition to the granting of planning consent.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

- 1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by Edward Hawkins and Jazmin Sexton, and prepared by Richard Meager, of CgMs Consulting on behalf of AFT Properties Ltd.
- 1.2 The subject of this Assessment comprises the site, also referred to as the study site, of 44 Eagle Street, London WC1R. The site is centred at TQ30691 81670 within the London Borough of Camden (see Figs. 1-2, 20-21, and Plate 1).
- 1.3 In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites have been identified within the study site or its immediate vicinity.
- 1.4 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area, as defined by the London Borough of Camden.
- 1.5 AFT Properties Ltd have therefore commissioned CgMs Consulting to establish the archaeological potential of the study site, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.
- 1.6 In accordance with relevant government policy and guidance on archaeology and **planning, and in accordance with the 'Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments'** (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists August 2014), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site.
- 1.7 The assessment comprises an examination of evidence on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) and other sources, including Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre. The report also includes the results of a comprehensive map regression exercise.
- 1.8 The Assessment thus enables relevant parties to understand the archaeological potential of various parts of the study site, and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and archaeological solutions to the archaeological potential identified.

2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 Legislation regarding below ground archaeology, including Scheduled Monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002.
- 2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was published online 6th March 2014 and updated 10 April 2014 (<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>). In addition the NPPF and NPPG are supported by three Good Practice Advice (GPA) documents published by Historic England in March 2015: GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans; GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment, and GPA 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.
- 2.3 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development;
 - Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;
 - Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and;
 - Recognition of the contribution that heritage assets make to our understanding of the past.
- 2.4 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be *no more than sufficient* to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 2.5 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined

in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

- 2.6 Annex 2 also defines **Archaeological Interest** as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
- 2.7 A **Designated Heritage Asset** comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.
- 2.8 **Significance** is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, **artistic or historic**. **Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.**
- 2.9 In short, government policy provides a framework which:
- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets;
 - Protects the settings of such designations;
 - In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions;
 - Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.
- 2.10 The NPPG reiterates that the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. Furthermore, it highlights that neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Importantly, the guidance states that if complete, or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim should then be to capture and record the evidence of **the asset's significance, and make the interpretation** publically available. Key elements of the guidance relate to assessing harm. An important consideration should be whether **the proposed works adversely affect a key element of the heritage asset's special architectural or historic interest**. Additionally, it is the degree of harm, rather than the **scale of development, that is to be assessed**. The level of 'substantial harm' is

considered to be a high bar that may not arise in many cases. Essentially, whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the NPPF. Importantly, harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. Setting is defined as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may be more extensive than the curtilage. A thorough assessment of the impact of proposals upon setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

- 2.11 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.
- 2.13 The relevant Strategic Development Plan framework is provided by the London Plan Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. The Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) were adopted 10 March 2015. This document includes the revised early minor alterations to the London Plan were published in October 2013. There are no changes to Policy 7.8; slight amendments have been made to the wording of Policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites, cross referencing this policy with the Supplementary Planning Guidance document for the setting of World Heritage Sites prepared in 2012. Recent Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP) published 14 March 2016, concern housing standards and parking, with no alteration to heritage policies.
- 2.14 Policy in the Consolidated London Plan relevant to archaeology at the study site includes the following:

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

2.15 From the Camden Local Plan, adopted July 2017, relevant parts of Policy D2, Heritage, are reproduced below:

Policy D2 Heritage

The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance 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 and locally listed heritage assets.

Designated heritage assets

Designed heritage assets include conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve

substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;**
- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;**
- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and**
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.**

The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm.

Archaeology

The Council will protect remains of archaeological importance by ensuring acceptable measures are taken proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset to preserve them and their setting, including physical preservation, where appropriate. Other heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including non-designated heritage assets (including those on and off the local list), Registered Parks and Gardens and London Squares. The effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

- 2.16 In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites have been identified on the study site or within its immediate vicinity.
- 2.17 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the London Borough of Camden.
- 2.18 In line with relevant planning policy and guidance, this desk based assessment seeks to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site, and the need or otherwise for further mitigation measures.

3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

3.1 Geology

3.1.1 The solid geology of the study site is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences (IGS 1979) as London Clay deposits forming the London Basin. Overlying the London Clay is a series of gravel terraces deposited during periods of glacial and inter-glacial conditions (Bridgland 1996).

3.1.2 Further detail is provided by British Geological Survey Sheet 256 (North London: 1994) which shows that the study site is underlain by deposits of Lynch Hill Gravels (defined as 'Post-diversionary Thames River Terrace deposits: gravel, sandy and clayey in part').

3.1.3 No site-specific geotechnical data is currently available.

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 The ground level of the study site is level at c.25m AOD.

3.2.2 No watercourses or naturally occurring bodies of water are known within the immediate vicinity of the study site.

4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

(Including Historic Map Regression exercise)

4.1 Timescales used in this report:

Prehistoric

Palaeolithic	450,000	-	12,000	BC
Mesolithic	12,000	-	4,000	BC
Neolithic	4,000	-	1,800	BC
Bronze Age	1,800	-	600	BC
Iron Age	600	-	AD 43	

Historic

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

4.2 **Introduction**

4.2.1 What follows comprises a review of archaeological findspots within a 350m radius of the study site, also referred to as the study area, held on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER), together with a historic map regression exercise charting the development of the study area from the eighteenth century onwards until the present day.

4.2.2 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites have been identified within the study site or its immediate vicinity.

4.2.3 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area (APA) as defined by the London Borough of Camden (GLHER ref DLO35589, TQ3059 8163 – London Suburbs). This APA covers a large extent of central London, and has been designated due to the presence of Roman, Saxon and

Medieval activity and occupation, the seventeenth century Civil War defences, and the suburban growth of Post Medieval London.

- 4.2.4 The GLHER findspots within the study area principally comprise finds of Palaeolithic, Roman and Medieval date (the latter including documentary references). Several recent archaeological interventions have however revealed Post Medieval and Modern remains only (see Section 4.8 below).
- 4.2.5 The map regression demonstrates that the study site has been developed since the eighteenth century and has been redeveloped during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; the rear part of the study site was heavily impacted by World War Two bomb damage.
- 4.2.6 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the study site conditions as understood through this review of potential archaeological assets, and whether the theoretical potential identified is likely to survive the impact of previous and existing development.

4.3 **Prehistoric - Palaeolithic and Mesolithic**

- 4.3.1 The Lynch Hill Gravels sequence has proved to be one of the richest sources of Palaeolithic material in the country (BGS 1996: 130; MoLAS/English Heritage 2000: 31, 34-6; Wymer 1999: 63). Wymer records a scatter of Palaeolithic handaxes identified from the Lynch Hill and Hackney Gravels across an area reaching from the eastern end of Hyde Park, through Bloomsbury and on to Hackney (Wymer 1999: Vol. 1 63; Vol. 2 Map 9).
- 4.3.2 A Palaeolithic flint axe was discovered in 1906 'on a heap of gravel in front of Wallis Store'; the grid reference places this find immediately south of the study site (MLO17694, TQ3070 8165; Juby 2011). Monitoring at Aviation House on the Kingsway to the west revealed a residual Palaeolithic waste flint flake in a later context (ELO3788, MLO75124, TQ3045 8145). At least five handaxes were found 1908-1917 by builders near the junction of Great Queen Street and Kingsway to the southwest of the study site (MLO16891, TQ3055 8138), and an assemblage of lithics were found 1898-9 at High Holborn also to the southwest (MLO17693, TQ3050 8150).
- 4.3.3 The presence of early prehistoric material within a study site can be notoriously difficult to predict, from desk based research alone, and is typically dependant upon

an appropriate underlying geology sequence, i.e. river terrace gravels, which survive below the study site, together with topographical features including watersources, which are not known to lie adjacent to the study site. Given the presence of Palaeolithic material within the study area search radius, however, including the find close to the southern boundary, a moderate archaeological potential can be identified for the Palaeolithic period at the study site, with small quantities of flintwork artefacts most likely to be represented in the archaeological record.

4.3.4 No finds of Mesolithic date have been identified within the study area search radius. A generally low potential can therefore be identified for this period at the study site itself.

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

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

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

4.4.3 A watching brief at Aviation House to the west of the study site revealed traces of a prehistoric stream bed (MLO73557, TQ3045 8145).

4.4.4 An Iron Age figurine was found in 1904 at Lincolns Inn Fields to the south of the study site (MLO23579, TQ3090 8150).

4.4.5 In view of the paucity of evidence from the study area search radius, a low archaeological potential can be identified for the later prehistoric periods at the study site itself.

4.5 **Roman**

- 4.5.1 To the north of the study site, the line of Theobalds Road/New Oxford Street follows a possible alignment of the Silchester to Colchester Roman Road (ELO5713, TQ3063 8181; MLO17773, TQ3069 8154; Margary 1955).
- 4.5.2 Typical archaeological features associated with Roman roads can include evidence for settlement and occupation, roadside ditches and associated land division, together with quarry pits, burials and chance losses.
- 4.5.3 Work at Aviation House on the Kingsway to the west of the study site revealed ditches and gullies, together with a compacted surface, dated to the Roman period (ELO 3788, MLO75121-2, TQ3045 8145). At 311-318 High Holborn to the east, features interpreted as quarry pits containing Roman pottery were identified (ELO6017, ELO7649, MLO78226 TQ31000 81595).
- 4.5.4 A Roman cremation urn was found during the construction of Holborn Station in 1909, to the southwest of the study site (ELO5694, MLO69168, TQ3055 8150), and another was identified at Southampton Row, northwest of the study site (MLO18065, TQ3040 8175).
- 4.5.5 Along the Kingsway, to the southwest of the study site, finds have included the bronze foot of a statue (ELO5696, MLO6175, TQ3058 8136), and a brooch (ELO5698, MLO11190, TQ3055 8140). Part of a tombstone was identified in the modern backfill of a sewer at Barter Street to the west of the study site (MLO17778, MLO162, TQ3035 8153). A hoard of copper coins has been identified at Lincolns Inn Fields to the south (MLO17776, TQ3080 8140).
- 4.5.6 **In view of the above, the study site's archaeological potential for the Roman period can be identified as moderate.**

4.6 **Anglo Saxon & Medieval**

- 4.6.1 The sole find of Anglo-Saxon date within the study area search radius includes a sherd of Saxon pottery identified on the Kingsway to the southwest of the study site (ELO5054, MLO22221, TQ3060 8150).

- 4.6.2 The potential of the study site for the Saxon period can be identified as generally low. Evidence of agricultural activity and land division could conceivably be present.
- 4.6.3 **Gray's Inn to the east of the site was established in the fourteenth century** (MLO21218, TQ3093 8178; MLO59307, TQ30936 81839). Lincolns Inn to the southeast also has a Medieval foundation (MLO8572, TQ3090 8150). Chancery Lane to the southwest of the study site is known to have Medieval antecedents (MLO17819, TQ3104 8135). A wooden water conduit was found in 1905 opposite 26 Theobalds Road to the northeast of the study site (MLO696, TQ3087 8193).
- 4.6.4 A fifteenth century sword was found at the site of Holborn underground station, southwest of the study site (MLO69171, TQ3055 8150). Medieval peg tile was identified at 311-318 High Holborn to the east of the study site, in a cut feature (MLO78229, TQ3100 8158). Residual pottery and cultivation soil was also identified at Aviation House to the southwest (ELO9135, TQ30450 81450; MLO75123, TQ3045 8145); residual pottery and a knife were identified at Lincolns Inn Fields to the south (MLO64073, MLO71765, TQ3080 8140).
- 4.6.5 Early map evidence (see 4.7.1 below) suggests that the study site lay in undeveloped land at the end of the Medieval period. A generally low archaeological potential can therefore be identified at the site, for this period, save for the possibility of agricultural activity and land division.
- 4.7 **Post Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise)**
- 4.7.1 Theobalds Road to the north of the study site was laid out for James I (1566-1625) as a route to his house at Theobalds in Hertfordshire (Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay 2008: 916). In the sixteenth century, the study site remained in open land to the north of Holborn, south of Theobalds Road (Fig 3: 1562 Ralph Agas; Fig 4: 1572 Braun & Hogenberg).
- 4.7.2 The Morgan map of 1682 (Fig 5) shows the development of the study area, and the layout of Red Lion Fields (named after the adjacent public house) within which the study site lay.
- 4.7.3 **John Rocque's Survey of London (Fig 6: 1745) shows the creation of Red Lion Square and the development of the study site with buildings. Richard Horwood's survey of**

1799-1819 (Fig 7) shows the study site occupied by a courtyard leading from the southern boundary, with buildings on the street frontage.

- 4.7.4 No change is shown within the study site on the 1827 Greenwood map (Fig 8) however the First Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 9: 1872) shows the study site occupied with three buildings fronting Eagle Street, with access to a large building occupying the bulk of the remainder of the study site.
- 4.7.5 The 1888 GOAD Insurance plan (Fig 10) shows the buildings fronting Eagle Street to be 3.5-4 storeys, with basement, with a two storey building to the rear, labelled as a Moulding Factory. No significant changes are shown within the study site on the Second Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 11: 1894); alterations are shown within the study site on the Third Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig 12: 1914).
- 4.7.6 The 1923 GOAD Insurance Plan (Fig 13) shows the study site occupied by a four storey engravers and varnishers fronting Eagle Street, with part of a sponge warehouse to the rear. Minor changes are shown within the study site on the 1936 GOAD Insurance Plan (Fig 14), with no significant changes shown on the LCC Revised Ordnance Survey (Fig 15: 1939).
- 4.7.7 The World War Two Bomb damage Map (Fig 16: 1946) shows that the rear half of the study site was destroyed by bomb damage.
- 4.7.8 The 1952 Ordnance Survey (Fig 17) shows the buildings fronting Eagle Street remaining with the rear of the study site cleared of all buildings.
- 4.7.9 The 1960 GOAD Insurance Plan (Fig 18) shows the rear of the study site comprising a builders yard, with the buildings fronting Eagle Street occupied by a fitters and joiners, and a builders.
- 4.7.10 The 1966 Ordnance Survey (Fig 19) shows new build within the northeastern corner of the study site.
- 4.7.11 The current site survey at basement and ground floor level is reproduced at Figures 20-21.

4.7.12 The potential of the study site for the Post Medieval and Modern periods can be identified as generally low.

4.8 **Negative/Neutral Evidence**

4.8.1 Monitoring at 278-282 High Holborn to the southeast revealed Post Medieval remains (ELO11349, MLO103542, TQ30821 81553). To the east, monitoring at **Gray's** Inn Road revealed modern truncation, as did monitoring at 125 High Holborn to the west (ELO7226, TQ30457 81556).

4.8.2 To the southwest, monitoring at 60 Parker Street to the southwest revealed Post Medieval remains (ELO231, MLO75731, MLO76553, MLO76555-6, TQ3054 8140); monitoring at 77-97 Kingsway revealed Modern truncation (ELO3797, TQ3055 8135), as did monitoring at 8-18 Great Queen Street (ELO7468, TQ30500 81375). Monitoring at 27-28 Lincolns Inn Fields revealed Modern remains (ELO3888, MLO714, MLO71968-9, TQ3082 8151). Monitoring at Lincolns Inn (north gardens) revealed seventeenth century and later material (ELO3891, TQ3080 8140; ELO6452, TQ30729 81353).

4.8.3 **Evaluation at 64 Lincoln's Inn Fields to the south revealed seventeenth and nineteenth century evidence** (ELO15254, ELO17137, TQ3062 8137). To the west, evaluation at 14 Barter Street revealed truncation of natural deposits (ELO2737, TQ3037 8153). Evaluation at 88-93 High Holborn c.60m south of the study site revealed modern truncation (ELO3542, TQ3070 8160). To the north, evaluations at 84 and 98 Theobalds Road revealed sixteenth century and later evidence (ELO4692, TQ3065 8185).

4.9 **Assessment of Significance**

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

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

4.9.3 Overall it would appear that whilst there is a moderate potential for archaeological remains, of Palaeolithic and Roman date, to be present within the study site boundary, the balance of probability is that these will be of local significance only.

5.0 SITE CONDITIONS AND THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

(Review of potential impact upon Heritage Assets)

5.1 Site Conditions

- 5.1.1 The Eagle Street study site frontage is currently occupied by a range of buildings of four storey with basement, dating to the 1920s, with a two storey range of later buildings (dating to c.1962) extending into the northeastern corner, and open space to the northwest, accessed through the Eagle Street frontage (see Figures 20-21 and Plate 1).
- 5.1.2 The construction of the existing buildings can be considered likely to have a significant negative archaeological impact through the cutting of foundations and services, together with the basement below the buildings fronting Eagle Street.
- 5.1.3 The construction and subsequent demolition of the buildings previously occupying the study site can be considered likely to have had a cumulative negative archaeological impact, through the cutting of basements/cellars, foundations and services, together with their subsequent grubbing out.
- 5.1.4 Agricultural/horticultural use of the study site prior to development can be considered likely to have had a moderate, widespread negative archaeological impact.

5.2 The Proposed Development

- 5.2.1 Redevelopment proposals currently comprise the refurbishment of the existing building, including the construction of a garden room. The maximum proposed foundation depth is c.2.5m below the existing ground level (see Figures 22-23).

5.3 Review of potential development impacts upon Heritage Assets

- 5.3.1 In view of the study site's archaeological potential, combined with the potential for past depositional impacts, the redevelopment proposals are considered unlikely to have a significant negative archaeological impact.
- 5.3.2 However, in view of the study site's location within the Camden APA, and the identified archaeological potential for the Palaeolithic and Roman periods, it is anticipated that the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) officer for the London Borough

of Camden will require additional mitigation measures associated with the redevelopment.

6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The site of 44 Eagle Street, London WC1R, has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.
- 6.2 In accordance with relevant government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study area.
- 6.3 In terms of relevant nationally significant designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Study sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Wreck or Historic Battlefield study sites have been identified within the study site, or the vicinity of the study site.
- 6.4 In terms of relevant local designations, the site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area, as defined by the London Borough of Camden.
- 6.5 The study site can be considered likely to have a moderate archaeological potential for the Palaeolithic and Roman periods, and a generally low archaeological potential for all other periods of past human activity.
- 6.6 Past-post depositional impacts within the study site are considered likely to have had a severe negative archaeological impact.
- 6.7 Proposals include the refurbishment and enhancement of the buildings present at the study site, including elements of new build requiring new foundations.
- 6.8 On the basis of the available information we anticipate further archaeological mitigation measures in the form of archaeological monitoring during relevant redevelopment groundworks (principally demolition below ground level, together with relevant construction).
- 6.9 Such works can necessarily follow the granting of planning permission, secured by a standard archaeological planning condition.

SOURCES CONSULTED

1. **General**

British Library
Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre
Greater London Historic Environment Record
London & Metropolitan Archives

2. **Internet**

<http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk>
<http://www.britainfromabove.org.uk/>
<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>
<https://finds.org.uk/database/>
<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list>
<https://opendomesday.org.uk>
<http://www.pastscape.org.uk>
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>

3. **Bibliographic**

Bridgland Quaternary River terrace deposits as a framework for the Lower Palaeolithic record in Gamble & Lawson (eds.) The *English Palaeolithic Reviewed* 1996

British Geological Survey British Regional Geology *London and the Thames Valley* Fourth Edition 1996

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists *Standard & Guidance for historic environment desk based assessment* August 2014 unpublished document

Cherry & Pevsner *Buildings of England London 4: North* 1999

Department of Communities and Local Government *National Planning Policy Framework* 2012

Gibbard *The Pleistocene History of the Lower Thames Valley* 1994

Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service *Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London* April 2015 unpublished document

Historic England (formerly English Heritage) *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* 2008

Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 1 The Historic Environment in Local Plans* July 2015 unpublished document

Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment* July 2015 unpublished document

Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets* July 2015 unpublished document

Juby *London Before London Reconstructing a Palaeolithic Landscape* 2011

London County Council *Names and Streets and Places in the Administrative County of London* 1955

London Topographical Society/London & Metropolitan Archives *The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps 1939-1945*, 2005

Margary *Roman Roads in Britain* 1955

MoLAS/English Heritage *The Archaeology of Greater London: An Assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area now covered by Greater London* 2000

Museum of London *A research framework for London archaeology* 2002

Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay (eds.) *The London Encyclopaedia* 2008

Wymer *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain* 2 volumes 1999

3. **Cartographic**

1562 Ralph Agas map

1572 Braun & Hogenberg map of London

1682 Morgan map of London

1720 Blome Map of London

1745 John Rocque map of London

1799-1819 Richard Horwood map of London

1827 Greenwood map

1872 Ordnance Survey

1888 GOAD Insurance Plan

1894 Ordnance Survey

1914 Ordnance Survey

1923 GOAD Insurance Plan

1936 GOAD Insurance Plan

1939 Ordnance Survey

1952 Ordnance Survey

1960 GOAD Insurance Plan

1966 Ordnance Survey

1979 Ordnance Survey

1994 British Geological Survey Sheet 256 (North London)