



**CHANNING JUNIOR SCHOOL**  
**Highgate**  
**London N6**

London Borough of Camden

Historic environment assessment

November 2017



**Channing Junior School  
Highgate High Street  
London N6 5JR**

**Historic environment assessment**

NGR 528658 187277

Sign-off history

issue no.	issue date	prepared by	reviewed by	approved by	notes
1	03/11/2017	Emily Dennis (Archaeology) Judith Peresztegi (Graphics)	Rupert Featherby Lead Consultant Archaeology	Christina Holloway Contract Manager	Issue to client

MOLA code: P1263



[www.mola.org.uk](http://www.mola.org.uk)

© MOLA

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

tel 0207 410 2200 email: [business@mola.org.uk](mailto:business@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

Executive summary	1	
<u>1</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>2</u>
1.1	Origin and scope of the report	2
1.2	Designated heritage assets	2
1.3	Aims and objectives	3
<u>2</u>	<u>Methodology and sources consulted</u>	<u>4</u>
2.1	Sources	4
2.2	Methodology	4
2.3	Assumptions and limitations	5
<u>3</u>	<u>The site: topography, geology and modern impacts</u>	<u>6</u>
3.1	Site location	6
3.2	Topography	6
3.3	Geology	6
<u>4</u>	<u>Archaeological and historical background</u>	<u>8</u>
4.1	Overview of past investigations	8
4.2	Chronological summary	8
<u>5</u>	<u>Statement of significance</u>	<u>13</u>
5.1	Introduction	13
5.2	Factors affecting archaeological survival	13
5.3	Archaeological potential and significance	13
<u>6</u>	<u>Impact of proposals</u>	<u>15</u>
6.1	Proposals	15
6.2	Implications	15
<u>7</u>	<u>Conclusion and recommendations</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>Gazetteer of known historic environment assets</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>Planning framework</u>	<u>23</u>
9.1	Statutory protection	23
9.2	National Planning Policy Framework	23
9.3	Greater London regional policy	25
9.4	Local planning policy	26
<u>10</u>	<u>Determining significance</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>Non-archaeological constraints</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>12</u>	<u>Glossary</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>13</u>	<u>Bibliography</u>	<u>32</u>
13.1	Published and documentary sources	32
13.2	Other Sources	32
13.3	Cartographic sources	33
13.4	Available site survey information checklist	33

# Figures

Cover: North facing view of Fairseat (MOLA photograph, 12/10/2017)

*Fig 1 Site location*

*Fig 2 Historic environment features map*

*Fig 3 Geology map (British Geological Survey online digital data)*

*Fig 4 Rocque's map of 1766*

*Fig 5 Stanford's map of 1862*

*Fig 6 Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1870*

*Fig 7 Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25":mile map of 1914*

*Fig 8 Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1967*

*Fig 9 Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1992*

*Fig 10 Existing Plans (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL01, rev. A, January 2017)*

*Fig 11 Proposed Plans Lower Ground and Tennis Court Level (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL06, rev. A, December 2016 and dwg. 343..40/PL02 P, rev. A, January 2017)*

*Fig 12 Existing Elevations (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL02, rev. A, January 2017)*

*Fig 13 Proposed Elevations Preliminary (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL07, rev. A, December 2016)*

*Fig 14 Pavilion Proposed Plans Ground Level (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343..40/PL01 P, rev. A, January 2017)*

*Fig 15 Pavilion Proposed Elevations (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343..40/PL03 P, rev. A, June 2017)*

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

# Executive summary

*Rolfe Judd on behalf of Channing School has commissioned MOLA to carry out a historic environment assessment in advance of proposed development at Channing Junior School, Highgate High Street in the London Borough of Camden. Provisionally, the scheme proposes ground floor extensions to the south and east of the existing building, the latter underneath the existing first floor terrace to create additional teaching space and enlarged toilets. Additionally, subterranean works are proposed in the steep grass bank beneath the existing playground to create a changing area/pavilion at the level of the existing tennis courts, access to which would be via a lift and stairs from garden level and an entrance at the lower level, set within the grass bank. The method used for the construction of the pavilion would be cut and cover.*

*This desk-based study assesses the impact of the scheme 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:*

- ***Remains of a 16th century house and outbuildings.*** *The first known occupier of the site was Sir Roger Cholmeley in the 16th century, and it included one of the many large manors that were being erected by wealthy businessmen in Highgate at the time. It is uncertain to what extent the previous house was demolished or remodelled in the following centuries; according to some sources it was pulled down and completely rebuilt, while others suggest that just alterations were made. It is possible that remains of the 16th century structure survive below ground, but are likely to have been severely truncated and fragmented by later building, and would therefore be of low heritage significance.*
- ***Post-medieval horticultural remains.*** *Throughout the post-medieval period, the majority of the site to the south remained as open land or gardens belonging to the associated property. The site has the potential to contain later post-medieval garden features such as planting pits, pathways or drains. Such remains would be of low heritage significance.*

*There is a low potential for prehistoric, Roman and Saxon remains on the site due to the lack of evidence for activity from these periods in the study area. Evidence of activity dating to these periods that has been recorded within the study area is a considerable distance from the site. There is documentary evidence for the development of a small settlement around Pond Square, 315m to the north-west of the site, from the 14th century onwards. However, limited archaeological investigation within the area has resulted in evidence being sparse on the archaeological record. Within the site, any medieval remains would be concentrated in the north-western corner of the site, and will have been severely truncated or removed entirely by the construction of the current and previous house and outbuildings. Much of the impact of the scheme would be outside this area.*

*In the south of the site, in the area of the existing tennis court, survival potential of archaeological remains is low, as it is likely that remains will have been severely truncated if not removed entirely by the ground levelling that has taken place in the last century, although this is not in the area of the proposed development.*

*The main impacts from the proposed development would be the breaking out of the existing tarmac, the new foundations for the southern and eastern extensions and the excavation for the subterranean pavilion.*

*The northernmost corner of the site falls within an Archaeological Priority Area, as defined by the LPA. In view of this, along with the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is probable that the local authority would request further archaeological investigation, in order to clarify the likely impacts of the development. The archaeological monitoring of geotechnical pits would help to determine the depth of natural deposits and the likely degree and extent of truncation. The results would enable an informed decision to be made in respect of an appropriate mitigation strategy. A watching brief during groundworks would ensure that any archaeological remains are not removed without record, or no further work may be required. Any archaeological work would need to be undertaken in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and could be carried out under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition set out with the granting of planning consent.*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Origin and scope of the report

---

- 1.1.1 Rolfe Judd on behalf of Channing School has commissioned MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology) to carry out a historic environment assessment in advance of proposed development at Channing Junior School, Highgate High Street N6; National Grid Reference (NGR) 528658, 187277: Fig 1. Details of the scheme are yet to be finalised. Provisionally, extensions are proposed to the south and east of the existing building, the former at lower ground level by excavating partly into the sloping ground to the south-west of the building, and the latter being created by excavating the ground underneath the existing raised terrace to the east. Additionally, subterranean works are proposed north of the tennis court to create a new changing area set within the grass bank, at the level of the existing tennis courts. Access would be via by a lift and stairs down from the higher garden level and an entrance at the tennis court level. The method used for the construction of the changing rooms would be cut and cover.
- 1.1.2 This desk-based study assesses the impact of the scheme on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). It forms an initial stage of investigation of the area of proposed development (hereafter referred to as 'the site') 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 on 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.
- 1.1.3 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 (i.e., 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 assets arising from the development proposals are noted. The report does not assess issues in relation to the setting of above ground assets (e.g., visible changes to historic character and views).
- 1.1.4 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, HE 2015), and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS 2015). Under the 'Copyright, Designs and Patents Act' 1988 MOLA retains the copyright to this document.
- 1.1.5 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. The statue of Sir Sydney Waterlow, the former owner of Fairseat House (the existing building on site) is located just outside the southern border of the site and is Grade II listed (National Heritage List ref: 1379135).
- 1.2.2 The site is within Highgate Conservation Area, in the sub-area of Highgate Village, as defined by the Local Planning Authority in 1978. This sub-area has the most intense development within the Conservation Area, rich in form and detail. The grand houses reflect the fact that Highgate has been a desirable residential area since the late 17th century. There are a series of strong edges that define the village core around which the rest of Highgate has developed

(Camden Council, 2007).

1.2.3 The northernmost corner of the site, where the existing buildings are located, falls within Highgate Archaeological Priority Area (APA) as defined by the LPA, owing to the early settlement of Highgate Village.

1.2.4 GLAAS is currently re-assessing APAs throughout the London boroughs in line with new guidelines to link archaeological sensitivity tiers to specific thresholds for triggering archaeological advice and assessment (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/greater-london-archaeological-priority-areas/>). Camden is due to be reviewed in 2018.

## 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 Sources

- 2.1.1 For the purposes of this report, documentary and cartographic sources including results from any archaeological investigations in the site and the 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 an 800m-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 (GLHER) and the Museum of London Archaeological Archive (MoL Archaeological Archive). The GLHER is managed by Historic England and includes information from past investigations, local knowledge, find spots, and documentary and cartographic sources. The MoL Archaeological Archive 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, where appropriate, e.g., where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.
- 2.1.3 In addition, the following sources were consulted:
- MOLA – in-house Geographical Information System (GIS) with statutory designations GIS data, the locations of all ‘key indicators’ of known prehistoric and Roman activity across Greater London, past investigation locations, projected Roman roads; burial grounds from the Holmes burial ground survey of 1896; georeferenced published historic maps; Defence of Britain survey data, 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;
  - Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre – historic maps and published histories;
  - Groundsure– historic Ordnance Survey maps from the first edition (1860–70s) to the present day
  - British Geological Survey (BGS) – solid and drift geology digital map; online BGS geological borehole record data;
  - Geotechnical & Environmental Associates – Geotechnical data from Channing Senior School, 2011
  - Rolfe Judd – architectural drawings (Prime Meridian, 2016-2017), existing site survey (Prime Meridian, 2016);
  - Internet – web-published material including the LPA local plan, and information on conservation areas and locally listed buildings.
  - Consultation with John Bater of Prime Meridian regarding construction methods.
- 2.1.4 The assessment included a site visit carried out on the 12th October 2017 in order to determine the topography, existing land use 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.

### 2.2 Methodology

- 2.2.1 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 (i.e. within 100m) are included, unless their inclusion is considered relevant to the study. Conservation areas and archaeological priority areas are not shown. All distances quoted in the text are approximate (within 5m).

- 2.2.2 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 (i.e. present and previous land use), as well as possible significance.
- 2.2.3 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.

## 2.3 Assumptions and limitations

---

- 2.3.1 The borehole data used for the purpose of this assessment measured the levels of deposits using an arbitrary datum, and levels in metres above Ordnance Datum (m OD) were not given. These therefore have been calculated to m OD using the spot heights of the surrounding roads. However, the given that the topography of the area is uneven and the ground is not level, the levels in m OD are likely to be imprecise which will affect the accuracy of the predicted levels of natural geology on site.

## 3 The site: topography, geology and modern impacts

### 3.1 Site location

---

- 3.1.1 The site is located at Channing Junior School, Highgate High Street, Highgate, N6 5JR (NGR 528658, 187277: Fig 1). The site area is 1.0ha and is bounded by Highgate High Street to the north and north-east, and Waterlow Park to the south-east, south and west. The site falls within the historic parish of St Pancras, and was within the county of Middlesex prior to being absorbed into the administration of the Greater London Borough of Camden.
- 3.1.2 The easternmost head of the now culverted River Fleet is mapped just 150m to the south-west of site, in Waterlow Park, which joins up with the westernmost fork of the eastern branch of the river 1km to the south of the site, before meeting the western branch of the river in Camden Town, 3km south of the site and flowing south towards its confluence with the River Thames at Blackfriars, 7.1km south-east of the site (Barton & Myers, 2016).
- 3.1.3 The nearest surface water features are the Waterlow Park Ponds, 150m to the west and south of site, fed by the natural springs of the River Fleet.

### 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 Highgate Village, 400m to the north-west of the site is located at the top of Highgate Hill, from which the ground slopes down towards the south. This gradient is reflected in the ground levels on the site; in the north of the site the ground level is at 118.1m OD, falling to 110.5m OD in the south of the site. From the sloping grassed garden area a steep grass bank is present across the centre of the site, as a result of terracing to create the level tennis court in the south of the 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 British Geological Survey map of the area (BGS online digital data) indicates that Highgate Hill is capped with the Bagshot Formation (sand), upon which the north of the site is located. This overlies the Claygate Member (sandy clay) which covers the rest of the site, which is in turn above the London Clay Formation (Fig 3).
- 3.3.3 The superficial sandy deposits are likely to have been either heavily truncated or removed entirely in the south of the site by the terracing that has taken place.
- 3.3.4 No geotechnical investigations have been carried out within the site but an investigation was undertaken within the grounds of the Channing Senior School in 2011 on the north side of Highgate High Street, 190m to the north-east of the site (Geotechnical & Environmental Associates, 2011, Fig 3). The results of that investigation are shown in Table 1. When the survey was undertaken, there was a considerable amount of ground variation across the site as a result of the naturally uneven topography of the area and the subsequent terracing that had taken place. Consequently, the levels of natural geology vary across the site and it is likely truncated in some places. Fig 3 shows the spot heights of the bordering roads and the ground levels within the site, in order to illustrate the ground variation in the area.
- 3.3.5 An archaeological watching brief (**HEA 1**) was carried out following the survey in the area that contained boreholes 3, 4 and 6, which was considered to have the most potential for untruncated natural geology (Fig 3). It recorded ground level at 114.6m OD and the natural sand at 113.8m OD.
- 3.3.6 The ground level in the area of the site where development is proposed varies between 114.0m OD and 115.5mOD, which is similar height to the ground level recorded in **HEA 1**.

Therefore, it is probable that natural deposits would be at a similar depth, i.e. 0.8m below ground level (mbgl), which would be 113.2m–114.7m OD.

3.3.7 Table 1 differentiates between modern made ground (i.e. containing identifiably modern inclusions such as concrete and plastic) and undated made ground, which may potentially contain deposits of archaeological interest.

*Table 1: summary of geotechnical data (ref Geotechnical & Environmental Associates, 2011)  
Levels are in metres above Ordnance Datum (m OD)*

<b>BH ref.</b>	<b>Ground Level</b>	<b>Modern made ground</b>	<b>Top of undated made ground</b>	<b>Top of natural sand</b>	<b>Top of natural clay</b>
BH1	107.0	>105.2	105.2	101.4 (5.6mbgl)	-
BH2	112.0	-	>109.9	109.9 (2.1mbgl)	105.2
BH3	114.4	-	>114.0	114.0 (0.4mbgl)	-
BH4	114.4	>114.3	-	114.3 (0.1mbgl)	107.6
BH5	105.6	-	>103.1	-	103.1
BH6	114.3	-	>113.9	113.9 (0.4mbgl)	-
HEA1	114.6	>113.8		113.8 (0.8mbgl)	-

## 4 Archaeological and historical background

### 4.1 Overview of past investigations

- 4.1.1 There have been twelve investigations within the study area in total, comprising six watching briefs, three evaluations and three excavations. The majority of these have been centred on Pond Square (315m to the north-west of the site), the earliest known area of settlement in Highgate. The earliest written record of Highgate dates to the 13th century, and there has been considerable documentary evidence since; however, archaeological evidence for such settlement has been sparse within the study area. The limited number of archaeological investigations within 800m of the site, particularly full excavations, could account for this; such little evidence limits our understanding of the area.
- 4.1.2 Evidence of medieval activity has only been recorded on two occasions within the study area, and only in the form of ploughsoil and made ground. Other than this, the investigations have primarily recorded post-medieval activity, particularly that of a horticultural nature.
- 4.1.3 The closest investigation to the site, a watching brief at Channing Senior School in 2013, 100m to the north-east of site, only recorded structures that were late 19th century in date (**HEA 1**).
- 4.1.4 The results of these investigations, along with other known sites and finds within the study area, are discussed by period, below. The date ranges below 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 Britain first saw continuous occupation. Erosion has removed much of the Palaeolithic land surfaces and finds are typically residual. There are no known finds dated to this period within the study area.
- 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 dependable 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 There has been significant Mesolithic activity recorded outside the study area, however, approximately 3km to the south-west of the site. Excavations in the 1970s–80s on West Heath in Hampstead recovered a flintwork assemblage comprising over 60,000 artefacts, as well as environmental evidence from a nearby bog (Grieg, 1989). Additionally, a MoLAS (now MOLA) watching brief along the British Gas Pipeline on Hampstead Heath recorded a concentration of Mesolithic flints c 1.4km to the north-west of the site (MoLAS, 1992). This suggests continued Mesolithic occupation to the east into the area of Hampstead Heath and Highgate, which would have been a valuable vantage point (MOLA Prehistoric Key Indicators).
- 4.2.4 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. There are no known finds dating to this period within the study area.
- 4.2.5 Beyond the study area, Ordnance Survey maps indicate that a ‘tumulus’ (an earth mound also known as a barrow) is located on Hampstead Heath 980m south-west of the site. During the Bronze Age barrows were erected over important burials. There is no indication of the date of this mound, which may be of prehistoric or more recent construction. Local legend refers to the

mound as the final resting place of Boudicca after her failed revolt against the Romans in AD 60, but there has been no archaeological evidence for this (MOLA Prehistoric Key Indicators).

- 4.2.6 During this period, it is likely that the area was heavily wooded; even though the site was near a water source, the uneven land and poor soil quality would have been difficult to cultivate and thus not ideal for settlement in this period. However, it should be noted that our understanding is hindered by the limited investigations within the study area.

#### *Roman period (AD 43–410)*

- 4.2.7 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, 7km to the south-east of the site. It quickly rose to prominence, becoming a major commercial centre and the hub of the Roman road system in Britain. Small settlements, typically located along the major roads, supplied produce to the urban population, and were markets for *Londinium's* traded and manufactured goods (MoLAS, 2000, 150).
- 4.2.8 The site is located 6km east of Watling Street, the Roman Road from the west side of London to St Albans (*Verulamium*); and 5km west of Ermine Street, the Roman road from London to Lincoln (Margary 1967, 171; 189)
- 4.2.9 As *Londinium* grew in size, the area around it became increasingly involved in the provision of foodstuffs for the expanding urban population. This area was known as the *territorium* of *Londinium*, which may have maintained more direct control over it to ensure the regularity of supply (Lakin *et al.* 2002, 2). Investigations in east London have shown that the *territorium* was most probably composed of a managed agricultural landscape of settlement and scattered farms close to a network of roads which allowed produce to be brought into the city (MoLAS 2000a, 150).
- 4.2.10 A Roman floor was found by chance at Holly Lodge Gardens in the late 1940s, 520m southwest of the site (**HEA 19**), comprising bricks laid in a herringbone pattern. This feature suggests that a Roman building was located in the area, and may have been a farm involved in supplying the capital.
- 4.2.11 A complete ring-necked flagon and the base of another was found when an extension was dug in 1971, 525m north of the site. Excavation found further small red potsherds, tile, burnt clay, fragment of sandstone and possible pit. It was suggested that this was either a burial or kiln of a probable Roman date but there is no further evidence to confirm this (**HEA 21**).
- 4.2.12 It is probable that the site continued to be located in a heavily wooded area during this period and was an undesirable location for settlement, and the considerable distance from the Roman road network would have made the site an inconvenient location for supplying *Londinium* with produce. However, our understanding is hampered by limited archaeological investigation within the study area.

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

- 4.2.13 Following the withdrawal of the Roman army from England in the early 5th century AD the Roman city was abandoned. The main Saxon trading settlement of *Lundenwic* flourished in the 7th to 9th centuries in the area which is now Covent Garden and the Strand, 6.5km to the south-east of the site (AGL 2000, 182). In some areas, large landed estates (manors) can be identified from the 7th century onwards; some, as Christianity was widely adopted, with a main 'minster' church and other subsidiary churches or chapels.
- 4.2.14 The site lay at the northern border of the extensive manor (estate) of St Pancras. St Pancras Old Church lies beside the River Fleet (now underground) at the northern end of Pancras Road, 4km to the south-east of the site. The church was believed to have been founded on land given by King Ethelbert to St Paul's Cathedral in AD 604 (VCH *Middlesex* i, 122).
- 4.2.15 In the 9th century, *Londinium* was reoccupied as *Lundenburh*, and its walls repaired as part of the defensive system established by King Alfred against the Danes. Around the 9th and 10th century, the local parochial system began to replace the earlier Saxon Minster system, with formal areas of land centred on settlements served by a parish church.
- 4.2.16 The main St Pancras manor was eventually broken up into smaller estates. The site fell within the Canteloves manor (estate) in the north-east. The location of any main settlement is unknown, although in the northern part of the manor of Canteloves the HER records that an

early medieval settlement was located at Pond Square, Highgate 315m to the north-west of the site, although there is no evidence of it in the archaeological record. It is possible that this settlement extended west of Pond Square and undated features recorded in 1986 in investigations at South Grove (**HEA 11**), 350m to the west of the site may relate to that settlement.

- 4.2.17 It is speculated that the River Fleet derives its name from the Saxon word ‘*flēot*’, meaning either estuary or flood, which would confirm the existence of the river during this period (Barton & Myers, 2016). The fresh water provided by the spring of the river, 150m to the south-west of site, would have made the area an attractive location for Saxon populations to settle.
- 4.2.18 However, there have been no finds within the study area that assuredly date to this period. The heavy clay topped with sand, combined with the uneven terrain would have made the land hard to cultivate and therefore not ideal for settlement. That said, our understanding of this period is restricted due to the limited archaeological investigation within the area.

#### *Later medieval period (AD 1066–1485)*

- 4.2.19 At the time of the Domesday Survey 1086 the manor of Cantelowes was held by the Canons of St Paul’s. The entry states that “the manor contains plenty of timber in the hedge rows, good pasture for cattle, and a running brook” (Walford 1878, 324–340). Towards the end of this period a large area of Cantelowes later became Camden Town, c 3.3km to the south of the site (Richardson 1997, 14).
- 4.2.20 In the 14th century, the Bishop of London built a road across Highgate Hill immediately east of the site (Highgate High Street), to replace the now impassable old road around the Hill (Weinreb and Hibbert 1995, 389). To pay for the upkeep of the road the Bishop erected a tollgate, which was called the High Gate (Willey, 2006, 241). The existing hamlet adopted this name and rapidly developed as a resting place on the road, where travellers could rest before or after attempting the route up or down Highgate Hill (Richardson 2004, 6). The toll gate was built 400m to the north-west of the site and comprised an arch with two rooms above and a staircase in a buttress. Inscriptions suggest the gate could date as early as 1386 (**HEA 16**). The toll gate and upkeep of the road were in the charge of a Hermit who lived in a nearby Hermitage established by the Bishop of London. The Hermitage, which was later converted to a chapel, had been built by c 1364 (**HEA 15**). By the 15th century the chapel was dedicated to St Michael and as the settlement grew, it was used as a chapel of ease, allowing the inhabitants of the village to avoid a long walk to the parish churches of Hornsey or St Pancras. During the 15th century the Hermit quarried gravel to repair the road down Highgate Hill. These quarries became ponds in Pond Square 315m north-west of the site, which were backfilled in the 19th century (**HEA 15**).
- 4.2.21 In 1473, a Leper Hospital was founded 800m south-east of the site (**HEA 28**). Leper hospitals were typically founded beside the main roads out of the city, which indicates the importance of the road over Highgate Hill only c 150 years after its foundation (VCH *Middlesex* i, 153). This road acted as the eastern border of the historic Parish boundary (**HEA 18**).
- 4.2.22 A number of the other roads that still exist in Highgate today are also believed to be of medieval origin. Swain’s lane, 215m to the west of the site, was a medieval track, mentioned in 1492 as ‘Swaynes Lane’; it is one of the earlier routes up Highgate hill. It was used to provide access to the adjacent farm lands on either side. The only dwellings along it were at the upper end of the road (**HEA 17**). Merton Lane, 680m to the south-west of the site, is thought to have been a medieval footpath leading across the fields from Highgate to Hampstead. In Rocque’s map, drawn in the mid 17th century, the path is shown leading from the hills just west of Highgate hamlet (**HEA 20**). Hampstead Lane, 460m to the north-east of the site, was part of the turnpike managed by the Turnpike Trust in 1710. It is likely that the road is also of medieval origin (**HEA 41**).
- 4.2.23 Later medieval remains have only been recorded on two occasions in the study area, despite the extensive documentary evidence of activity. This could be due to the limited archaeological investigation that has taken place. An evaluation in 2011, 420m north-west of the site (**HEA 7**), recorded deep 15th century made ground deposits, which were interpreted to possibly be the infilling of the eastern boundary ditch of the land belonging to the Bishop of London. Additionally, an investigation at Salisbury House, 195m to the north-west of the site, recorded ploughsoil containing possible medieval material (**HEA 5**).

4.2.24 It is probable that the site was undeveloped during this period and lay in open land on the periphery of the developing settlement, bordering the Parish boundary road.

*Post-medieval period (AD 1485–present)*

- 4.2.25 Highgate developed as a settlement throughout the post-medieval period. As London grew, wealthy merchants and aristocrats built properties in the countryside, where they could escape the overcrowding. The commanding view of London and the open land attracted a number of wealthy property owners to Highgate, and the village expanded to provide the necessary services (Weinreb and Hibbert 1995, 389).
- 4.2.26 In 1576, the nearby chapel / former hermitage around which Highgate developed, was acquired by Sir Roger Cholmeley, who built a grammar school there. The chapel remained in use as the chapel of ease serving the village of Highgate (Willey 2006, 241). Excavations at the school in 2011 recorded a 17th century pit or ditch feature, as well as a series of burnt deposits including burnt bricks, interpreted to be a 16th century brick clamp. This, in combination with the 15th century made ground that was also recorded, suggests continuous activity in the area during the late medieval and early post-medieval periods (**HEA 7**).
- 4.2.27 Sir Roger Cholmeley was the son of Richard Cholmeley, lieutenant of the Tower of London. The house in which he lived is thought to be in the location of the site, according to John Norden, English antiquary (c. 1547 – 1625), thus being the site's first known occupant. The establishment, having been described as "a house of 15 hearths", would have been of considerable size (Saunders, 1978).
- 4.2.28 Throughout the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries, this house, which was located in the north of the site, fell under ownership of various different families of wealth. The building can be seen on Rocque's map of 1766 (Fig 4), which illustrates its position on the steep slopes of Highgate Hill.
- 4.2.29 Tompson's map of 1801 (not reproduced) illustrates the property within the site as a complex of buildings in the north of the site comprising one main building in the east of the complex and five smaller buildings to the south and west of it. Davies's map of 1834 (not reproduced) depicts the same main building but the surrounding buildings have varied slightly. The rest of the site to the south remains undeveloped. Similarly to Rocque, Davies illustrates the position of the site on the slopes of Highgate Hill.
- 4.2.30 The last family to own the house before it was bought by Sir Sydney Waterlow, Liberal politician and well known philanthropist, was the Bloxams, from whom Sir Sydney rented the property from 1855 to 1865. Stanford's map of 1862 (Fig 5) illustrates the house with new property boundaries which become the site outline. By this point, as is evident on the map, the house was known as Fairseat. According to the map, Fairseat comprises 6 buildings, with a private driveway intersecting them along the western side of the site.
- 4.2.31 Excavation 100m to the south of site, in what is now Waterlow Park, recorded a number of 19th century garden features such as planting pits, garden paths, a brick drain and an ornamental pond (**HEA 3**). During this period, these would have been in a similar expanse of horticultural land as the south of the site, so it is possible that such features may have also been present on the site.
- 4.2.32 In 1865, Fairseat was purchased by Sir Sydney Waterlow after buying the three neighbouring properties the year before. Documentary evidence regarding the changes that Sir Sydney made to the property vary; a diary entry from an adjacent neighbour of Fairseat claims that Mr Waterlow had bought the land, intended to pull down the original house and rebuild a new house as it is known today. A reference from 1895 describes the house as "a comfortable old country residence of the last century", possibly implying that it was a product of the 18th century and therefore had been rebuilt since it was occupied by Sir Roger Cholmeley. Additionally, several authors have made reference to the 'considerable alterations' made by Sir Sydney. However, during works that took place on the house in the 1970s, ancient beams, probably dating from the 17th–18th centuries, were uncovered, indicative of only alterations to the house and not a total rebuild. One of the alterations that Sir Sydney made is the addition of a glass domed entrance that was accessed by a flight of stone steps to the south of the house, making the front side of the house be that which faced onto the garden; both the glass dome and the stone steps are still present on the house today (Saunders, 1978).
- 4.2.33 The Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1870 (Fig 6) is relatively consistent with

Stanford; the site is occupied by Fairseat in the north, although the shape of the house has undergone noticeable change. A linear shaped greenhouse has been constructed extending out from the eastern side of the house along the alignment of the High Street. Furthermore, Sir Sydney's addition of the stone steps leading to the new entrance at the south of the house can be seen on this map. The rest of the site comprises the formal gardens of the house with their associated paths and vistas. The map also shows the two additional buildings in the north-western corner of the site. The Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25":mile map of 1896 (not reproduced), shows that by this time these two buildings merge and become one long linear building in the north of site. Other than this, the site undergoes no change. Additionally, this map shows that the adjacent property to the north-west, Hertford House, has been demolished, which helps to establish the site boundary.

- 4.2.34 In 1883, Sir Sydney decided to put Fairseat on the market, and the house remained unoccupied for some time. By 1889, he decided to give his parkland to the south of the site for public recreation. Having worked in the city for 53 years, he wanted to provide a "garden for the gardenless", and so Waterlow Park (**HEA 29**) was created and a statue erected in his honour (**HEA 36**) (Saunders, 1978).
- 4.2.35 Fairseat was still empty in 1891; the Parks and Open Spaces committee who were given responsibility of Waterlow Park would not allow the building to be used for anything other than a private residence. After brief ownership by John Sheppard Edmonds between 1891 and 1906, the house became vacant again until 1910. In 1909, its existence was threatened by the construction of a new tramway up to Highgate Village. In order to accommodate a double electric line, some of the house backing onto the main road, including the large greenhouse, was demolished, meaning that the original mansion was considerably larger than what exists on site today (Saunders, 1978). This decrease in size is evident in the Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25":mile map of 1914 (Fig 7), as is the new tramway.
- 4.2.36 In 1911, Fairseat was purchased by the Goodwin family who built two new greenhouses in the north and east of the site to replace those demolished in 1909; these can also be seen in Fig 7.
- 4.2.37 The Goodwins vacated Fairseat in 1925 and in October of that year, Channing School began negotiations to acquire the lease. A lot of work was needed to convert it from a family house into a school, and this was completed in May 1926. The school was evacuated during the Second World War; in 1940, some damage was inflicted upon the building by a landmine that fell near the school. The school was reinstated in 1945, having been briefly occupied by Admiralty and a British restaurant during the war-time period (Saunders, 1978).
- 4.2.38 The bomb damage is not evident in historic mapping, neither is the building's transition into a school; the site remains much the same until the 1960s. The Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1967 (Fig 8) shows Fairseat and its peripheral buildings in the north of site, and that a new tennis court has been constructed to the south of site. It is assumed that it is at this point that the some terracing on site took place, in order to accommodate a level tennis court on an otherwise steep slope.
- 4.2.39 The Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1992 (Fig 9) shows the only change that has occurred on the site in the last 50 years; the tennis court in the south of site has doubled in area to the size it is today. This will have likely been subsequent to further landscaping in order to adapt to the natural slope of the site. The site is still in use and remains home to Channing Junior School.



## 5 Statement of significance

### 5.1 Introduction

---

- 5.1.1 The following section discusses historic impacts on the site which may have compromised archaeological survival from earlier periods, identified primarily from historic maps, and information on the likely depth of deposits.
- 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 There is no geotechnical data for the site. Based on BGS boreholes and the information from archaeological investigations in the vicinity, the predicted level of natural geology within the site is as follows:
- Current ground level is at 118.1m–110.5m OD, sloping down towards the south. Much landscaping has taken place on the site; there is a steep slope across the middle of the site where the ground level drops 2.8m in order to create flat ground in the south of the site. In the other areas of the site, the slope is gradual. The ground level of the area of proposed development is at 114.0m–115.5m OD.
  - Based on the three boreholes and watching brief at Channing Senior School in 2011, untruncated sand is expected to be at 0.1-0.8mbgl.
- 5.2.2 Between the top of the natural and the current ground level is made ground; in all likelihood, this is likely to comprise redeposited natural sands and soils from episodes of landscaping and possible undated made ground in the vicinity of the house derived from building works.

#### *Historic impacts*

- 5.2.3 Although it is not certain exactly to what extent Fairseat was remodelled during the 19th century by Sir Sidney Waterlow, the demolition of previous buildings and/ or extensions to them will have truncated, if not removed completely, any earlier buried remains. Nonetheless, any reconstruction that the building underwent in the 19th century is still of historic interest.
- 5.2.4 The substantial landscaping that has taken place in the last century on the site in order to level out the slope of Highgate Hill to create and expand tennis courts will likely have severely truncated if not removed all archaeological remains with the footprint of the courts; however, this is outside the area of proposed development. It is not known if any of the spoil from the levelling was dumped to the north of the courts.

#### *Likely depth/thickness of archaeological remains*

- 5.2.5 Based on the data from the geotechnical boreholes and archaeological carried out opposite to the north of the site, at Channing Senior School, natural deposits would not be far below ground level, and there is likely to be between 0.1 and 0.8m of made ground. Therefore, it is possible that any archaeological remains would be found directly below the tarmac of the current playground, within the made ground and cutting into the underlying natural gravel.

### 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.* Highgate Hill would have been a favourable vantage point for prehistoric communities, and Mesolithic activity has been

recorded c 1.4km from site. However, no prehistoric remains have been found within the study area; although this could be because the result of the limited level of archaeological investigation within the study area.

- 5.3.3 *The site has a low potential to contain Roman remains.* Roman activity has been recorded on two occasions within the study area, both by chance. This is indicative of Roman activity in the area, although it is likely that these findspots represent solitary farmsteads that supplied *Londinium*, and are not evidence of Roman settlement in the area. The site was likely undeveloped open land or densely wooded during this period.
- 5.3.4 *The site has a low potential to contain early medieval remains.* Although documentary evidence suggests that Highgate began developing as a settlement in the early medieval period, there have been no finds that assuredly date to this period within the study area. The site was likely located on open and undeveloped land.
- 5.3.5 *The site has a low potential to contain later medieval remains.* There is documentary evidence of a later medieval settlement centred on Pond Square, and a number of roads in Highgate are of later medieval origin. Particularly significant of which is Highgate High Street, which borders the site to the east. This road's junction with North Road, 400m north-west of site, housed a tollgate for those wishing to travel on the road. The establishment of a Leper hospital in 1473 and a possible wayside cross along this road, 800m to the south-east of site, is further indication of the prominence of this road during the later medieval period. However, the only finds dating to this period that has been recorded within the study area are ploughsoil containing possible medieval material and made-ground, possibly backfilling a boundary ditch of the Bishop's land. It is known from documentary evidence that there was later medieval settlement in Highgate; however, our understanding is limited due to the lack of archaeological investigation. Within the site, the construction of the post-medieval Fairseat and associated outbuildings is likely to have severely truncated or removed entirely any medieval remains within the APA.
- 5.3.6 *The site has a moderate to high potential to contain post-medieval remains.* The site has seen continuous occupation since the 16th century. Although the current buildings on the site date to the 19th century, there was a substantial establishment in the same location dating from the 16th century, localised remains of which may still be *in-situ* below the current ground level. However, their survival is likely to have been compromised by the construction of the existing building on site in the 19th century and would be of **low** significance. The rest of the site, to the south and the east, was, as it is now, used as open land and gardens. Similarly to excavations 100m south of the site, it is likely that post-medieval garden features such as planting pits, garden paths and drains would have been present on the site and may still remain *in-situ*. However, such remains are likely to have been severely truncated or removed entirely in the area of the tennis courts, due to recent ground levelling. Any such remains would be of **low** heritage significance in their evidential value for providing evidence of past activity.

## 6 Impact of proposals

### 6.1 Proposals

---

- 6.1.1 Details of the scheme are yet to be finalised but, provisionally, a ground floor extension is proposed to the south and east of the existing building, the latter underneath the existing first floor terrace to create additional teaching space and enlarged toilets. (Fig 11, Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL06, rev. A, December 2016). Additionally, subterranean works are proposed in the steep grass bank beneath the existing playground to create a changing area/pavilion at the level of the existing tennis courts, access to which will be by a lift and stairs from garden level and an entrance at the lower level, set within the grass bank (Fig 15, Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.40/PL03 P, rev. A, June 2017). The method used for the construction of the pavilion would be cut and cover.
- 6.1.2 No engineering details are available yet regarding foundation type and layout for the proposed extension.

### 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.
- 6.2.3 The site has a low potential to contain medieval or earlier remains and a moderate to high potential to contain post-medieval remains, of low significance.

#### *Breaking out of tarmac*

- 6.2.4 It is assumed for the purposes of this assessment that the entire extent of the tarmac of the existing playground on site will be removed as part of the preliminary site works. The breaking out and removal of the tarmac would impact any potential remains that are located immediately below. Potential remains that are not directly affected by the impact of the breaking out could be exposed to further impact from the movement of vehicles and plant involved in construction activities, for example through rutting and compaction.

#### *Southern and eastern extensions*

- 6.2.5 Foundation type and design for the proposed scheme are yet to be finalised. For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that either strip or pad foundations will be used, or a raft. The excavation of standard strip and pad foundations to a typical depth of 1.0–1.5mbgl would remove any archaeological remains within their footprint. A raft foundation would have a shallow impact, but over a wider area. If ground-raising is necessary to level the area of the southern extension, any archaeological remains may be buried (and protected) beneath the made ground.
- 6.2.6 The proposed extension may impact any remains of post-medieval structures that predate the current 19th century building on the site, as can be seen in in Stanford's map of 1862 (Fig 5).

#### *Subterranean works*

- 6.2.7 The cut and cover method intended for the construction of the underground pavilion would involve a 3.4m deep excavation at the level of the current playground (114.5m OD) down to the level of the current tennis court (111.1m OD), possibly with an additional formation level. This would remove entirely any archaeological remains within its footprint, and extend deep

into the natural geology.

### *Services*

- 6.2.8 The scheme proposes installing additional toilets in the eastern wing; the excavation of new service trenches and drains would extend to a depth of 1.0–1.5mbgl as assumed for the purposes of this assessment. This would entirely remove any archaeological remains within the trench footprint. This might include post-medieval remains predating the current 19th century building on the site, similarly to the new foundations required for the eastern extension.

## 7 Conclusion and recommendations

- 7.1.1 The site lies with Highgate Village Conservation Area, as defined by the LPA. The northernmost corner of the site, where the extant buildings are located, falls within Highgate APA as defined by the LPA.
- 7.1.2 The site has a moderate to high potential to contain post-medieval remains, and a low potential for earlier remains. The main potential of the site is for post-medieval garden features.
- 7.1.3 The main impacts to buried heritage assets would be the preliminary breaking out of tarmac, the groundworks involved with the proposed southern and eastern extensions and the proposed subterranean works beneath the existing playground.
- 7.1.4 Table 2 summarises the known or likely buried assets within the site, their significance, and the impact of the proposed scheme on asset significance.

*Table 2: Impact upon heritage assets (prior to mitigation)*

Asset	Asset Significance	Impact of proposed scheme
Possible localised remains of structures dating to the 16th century onward (moderate potential)	<b>low</b>	Preliminary breaking out of tarmac, extension to southern wing, alterations (including foundation replacement) to eastern wing, construction of subterranean pavilion.  Significance of asset reduced to negligible
Remains of 19th century horticultural activity (high potential)	<b>low</b>	

- 7.1.5 The APA boundary is drawn around the existing buildings, and therefore much of the impact of the scheme would fall outside this, away from the likely location of any early-post-medieval structural remains. However, the local authority may request further archaeological investigation, in order to clarify the likely impacts of the development.
- 7.1.6 Although the precise details would need to be agreed with the local authority's archaeological advisor, it is suggested that the most appropriate investigation strategy would be the preliminary archaeological monitoring of any geotechnical pits dug for engineering purposes. This would help to determine the depth of natural deposits and the likely degree and extent of truncation of any archaeological remains in the areas of proposed impact.
- 7.1.7 The results would enable an informed decision to be made in respect of an appropriate mitigation strategy, if necessary. A watching brief during ground works of the development would ensure that any archaeological remains are not removed without record, although it is possible that no further work will be required.
- 7.1.8 Any archaeological work would need to be undertaken in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and could be carried out under the terms of a standard archaeological planning condition set out with the granting of planning consent.

## 8 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets

- 8.1.1 The gazetteer lists known historic environment sites and finds within the 800m-radius study area around the site. The gazetteer should be read in conjunction with Fig 2.
- 8.1.2 The GLHER data contained within this gazetteer was obtained on 16/10/2017 and is the copyright of Historic England 2017.
- 8.1.3 Historic England statutory designations data © Historic England 2017. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. The Historic England GIS Data contained in this material was obtained in April 2017. The most publicly available up to date Historic England GIS Data can be obtained from <http://www.historicengland.org.uk>.

### Abbreviations

CA – *Compass Archaeology*

DGLA – *Department of Greater London Archaeology (Museum of London)*

ELO - *Greater London Historic Environment Record unique Event reference*

HADAS – *Hendon and District Archaeological Society*

GLHER – *Greater London Historic Environment Record*

MLO - *Greater London Historic Environment Record unique Monument reference*

MoLAS – *Museum of London Archaeology Service (now MOLA)*

NHL – *National Heritage List for England (Historic England)*

RCHM – *Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England*

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER/NHL No.
1	<b>Channing School, the Bank, Highgate, N6</b> Groundworks associated with the construction of a new Performing Arts Building were monitored. No archaeological deposits or features were found during the watching brief. The only structures recorded were late 19th century in date. Natural ground was observed at 113.8m OD.	CHN13
2	<b>Duke's Head Yard, Highgate, N6</b> A watching brief took place at between February and April 1995 by MoLAS. The areas that were monitored revealed no archaeological deposits, features or finds.	HEX95 ELO3571
3	<b>Lower Terrace Gardens, Waterlow Park, Highgate, N6</b> Five areas were excavated around a feature known as the mound. The mound appeared to be the remains of a light-weight garden building dating to the eighteenth century. Four trenches were also excavated on the Lower Terrace. Nine 'planting pits' were found in these trenches, suggesting garden features. Garden paths seem to have been put in between 1857 and 1863. A Victorian drainage system was also uncovered. The remains of an ornamental pond were also encountered, associated with a large brick drain. This is similar to eighteenth century ponds elsewhere. Cobbled surfaces found between the gravel paths suggest that the later path plan followed that of an earlier, possibly dating back to the sixteenth century. No features earlier than the sixteenth century were encountered.  A garden survey was undertaken by garden historian Belinda Jupp. She recommended retaining certain plants during the redevelopment. A geophysical survey was undertaken by MoLAS. Two major regions of activity were detected: possible linear features aligned East-West and North-South and a feature in the central area.	ELO235  ELO234
4	<b>Dartmouth Park Hill (Waterlow Park Centre), Highgate, N6</b> Watching brief by MoLAS in 2003. No significant archaeological features or finds were discovered.	WLP03 ELO1465
5	<b>Salisbury House, 49 Highgate High Street, N6</b> Salisbury House, erected in c. 1975 and added to in c 1890, is a Grade II Listed Building. The watching brief by CA took place during alterations to the access of the cellar and recorded a ploughsoil, containing possible medieval material, above the natural gravel.	HGG02

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER/NHL No.
6	<p><b>Witanhurst House, Highgate, N6</b> MOLA produced three schematic transects across site, in order to better understand the archaeological potential of the site. It was concluded that the site lies on the sloping valley side above the headwaters of the River Fleet. The house platform appeared to have been levelled and better preservation of past land surfaces and/or cut features was expected to more likely exist to the west of the house.</p> <p>An evaluation was carried out by MOLA in 2009. The evaluation found that the earlier ground surface had been significantly lowered and all archaeological layers had been removed as a consequence. A brick lined well of uncertain date and two pits which may be traces of garden features were also found.</p> <p>A watching brief was undertaken at the site by MOLA on the 2nd-8th September, the 25th November and the 7th December 2010. The watching brief monitored the ground reduction for a basement during the re-development of the house. No archaeological deposits were recorded.</p> <p>Witanhurst was built in 1913-20 for Sir Arthur Crosfield, designed by George Hubbard on the site of an earlier 18th century house called Parkfield.</p>	<p>HWT09 ELO14976</p> <p>ELO10333 MLO102537</p> <p>ELO11854</p> <p>MLO104344</p>
7	<p><b>Highgate School, 26 North Road, Highgate, N6</b> An archaeological evaluation carried out by CA in 2011. Three trial trenches were excavated, all of which contained significant archaeological remains. Possible 15th century 'made-ground' deposits were observed in all three trenches, which is thought to be associated with landscaping or the infilling of the eastern boundary ditch of the 15th century Bishop of London's Hunting Park. A 17th – early 18th century pit or ditch feature was observed in trench 1. A series of burnt deposits, including burnt bricks, were observed in trench 2. These are probably evidence for a brick clamp - dating from the 16th century.</p> <p>In 1565, Sir Roger Cholmeley, former Lord Chief Justice, obtained charter for a grammar school and the land of hermitage and chapel (<b>HEA 15</b>). Built c 1576. Rebuilt 1819 and 1865-1868 to designs of F. C. Cockerell, and further buildings added in 19th century. East school chapel, which also served as a chapel of ease for Highgate, was rebuilt in 1720. This was separated from the school c 1825, and the chapel was demolished.</p> <p>The Old Chapel at Highgate School was built on the site of an earlier chapel at ease with an adjacent burial ground, which was used for Anglican burials before St Michael's Church was built in South Grove in 1832. A World War I war memorial stands nearby.</p>	<p>NOR11 ELO12056 MLO4510</p> <p>MLO12275</p> <p>MLO108605</p>
8	<p><b>17 South Grove, Highgate, N6</b> Watching brief by PCA from December 2009- February 2010. Natural sand and gravels were sealed by modern made ground.</p>	<p>SGQ09</p>
9	<p><b>62 &amp; 62A Highgate High Street, N6</b> Standing structure recording and watching brief by BEAMS in August 2000. The present brick building was constructed in 1833 as a butcher's shop with associated slaughterhouse, stables, cart shed and other structures, the remains of which have been recorded in the rear yard. It succeeded the <i>White Lion</i> inn, demolition rubble from which lay above the natural sands. At the extreme rear of the yard the corner remains of a brick structure were also recorded; they may relate to an earlier, documented house. The shop front was altered and many of the rear yard buildings demolished when it became an ironmongers' in c 1915; late 19th century and early 20th century material found throughout the site is presumably related. This use continued until quite recently.</p>	<p>HHI00</p>
10	<p><b>82 Highgate High Street, N6</b> Watching brief by PCA in 1999. Natural sand was observed to slope down considerably from north-west to south-east. Post-medieval "made ground" was recorded in 6 boreholes and 2 small test pits. They were presumably to level the area and contained fragments of yellow stock brick suggesting a Victorian or later date.</p>	<p>HGE99 MLO74229</p>
11	<p><b>South Grove, Highgate, N6</b> Excavation in 1986 by DGLA revealed a linear feature containing fragments of decorated wall plaster. To the north of this, post-holes in circular formation were located, though no direct association was established. Segments of a brick feature, possibly a path or similar, were recorded in the north-east corner of the site.</p>	<p>SOG86 MLO63104 MLO63105 MLO63106 MLO63107</p>

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER/NHL No.
12	<p><b>Athlone House, Hampstead Lane, Highgate, N6</b> An archaeological evaluation was conducted by MoLAS in 2005. Three trenches were located to the west of the estate in the footprint of the proposed development. An east west orientated brick foundation of probable 18th century date was recorded in trench 1, along with buried topsoils relating to landscaping of the garden. In trench two, modern features were recorded. A subterranean brick built structure, conical and sealed by a heavy circular stone capping with central iron ring and of unknown purpose was found in trench 3. This may have been connected with water supply and was not thought to be earlier than 18th century in date. The contractors concluded that the archaeological potential of the site was low.</p>	HPH05 ELO6714 MLO98170
13	<p><b>64 Highgate High Street, N6</b> Archaeological excavations by HADAS in 1978 at the rear of the house revealed remains of the former mineral water works and laboratory attached to the pharmacy situated on the premises since the 1830s. The works operated until c 1888. The pharmacy continues in the front part of the building. The rear became a builder's yard c 1894, and was redeveloped for offices after the excavation in 1978. A brick cistern from the mineral water works was preserved in the new development.</p>	MLO60635
14	<p><b>South Grove, Highgate, N6</b> Beneath St Michael's church are some foundations which probably belonged to Toashurst House.</p>	MLO16721
15	<p><b>Pond Square, Highgate Village Centre, N6</b> A small hamlet was based on Pond Square, Highgate. It was never a parish, but had a small chapel of ease.</p> <p>There are 14th century references to a hermitage connected with collection of tolls for road improvement &amp; Highgate chapel (<b>HEA 16</b>). The hermitage was converted into a chapel of ease. Last hermit received grant of house in 1531 for life. In 1577 it was granted by Queen Elizabeth to John Farneham. In the late 16th century obtained by Sir Roger Cholmeley for a grammar school (<b>HEA 7</b>).</p> <p>Medieval ponds existed on the site of Pond Square, as a result of the hermit's quarrying to maintain the road. One account says that a "hermit caused gravel to be digged on the top of Highgate hill &amp; therewith made a causeway to Islington providing water on the hill &amp; cleanness in the vale". These two ponds were backfilled in the 1880s.</p> <p>Today, Pond Square is a triangular shaded square, the central area now resurfaced with bonded gravel with stone pathways following receipt of a grant from English Heritage. The square is the highest point in Camden and was laid out to create a public park in 1886.</p>	MLO3221  MLO10683 MLO20012  MLO209 MLO23319  MLO103807
16	<p><b>North Road, Highgate, N6</b> Gate to aid in collection of toll for road through Bishop's land, built in 1386 according to inscription, although possibly 16th century. Called high gate on hill and settlement named after it. Comprised an arch with two rooms above and a staircase in the east buttress. Demolished to widen/heighten road.</p>	MLO217
17	<p><b>Swain's Lane, Highgate, N6</b> This was a medieval track, mentioned in 1492 as 'Swaynes Lane'; it is one of the earlier routes up Highgate hill. It was used to provide access to the adjacent farm lands on either side. The only dwellings along it were at the upper end of the road.</p>	MLO17871
18	<p><b>Highgate Hill, N6</b> Road from Highgate to Crouch End that served as part of the historic Parish boundary.</p>	MLO361
19	<p><b>8 Holly Lodge Gardens, Highgate, N6</b> An alleged Roman paving found c 1947-9, reported to RCHM June 1981. It was made of bricks laid in a herring bone pattern and was found where stables formerly stood.</p>	MLO17833
20	<p><b>Merton Lane, Highgate, N6</b> A medieval footpath leading across the fields from Highgate to Hampstead. In Rocque, the path is shown leading from hills just west of Highgate hamlet. A fragment remains as Merton Lane.</p>	MLO17830
21	<p><b>37 Southwood Lawn Road, Highgate, N6</b> A complete ring-necked flagon and base of another found when extension was dug in 1971. Excavation found further small red potsherds, tile, burnt clay, fragment of sandstone and possible pit. Suggested either burial or kiln. Probable Roman date.</p>	MLO1651



HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER/NHL No.
22	<b>Highgate (exact location unknown), N6</b> A rumour is reported that a 4th century hoard was found, but no part of it was seen.	MLO17774
23	<b>15 North Road, Highgate, N6</b> During excavation work for a rear extension, the groundwork contractors revealed a bell topped well of c. 1700 date to the south-west of the present house. The interior of the well is approximately 1100mm in diameter and the brick wall c. 225mm wide. Depth unknown but exceeds 4m. The well is situated on the boundary between nos. 15 and 13, and the later garden wall between the two properties is carried over the well on an arch. The well has been capped with ply and concrete, and is preserved in-situ on the edge of the new extension.	MLO106821
24	<b>The Grove/ Hampstead Lane, Highgate, N6</b> Possibly medieval path/road across from church to Hampstead lane; not shown clearly as a road in Rocque.	MLO17897
25	<b>Highgate Road, N6</b> This road ran from old Mother Redcap Inn in Camden Town, through Kentish Town (on the present Kentish Town High Street) up Green Street (Highgate Road) and up Highgate Hill. The Inn was one that was favoured by Oliver Cromwell.	MLO17862
26	<b>Highgate West Hill, N6</b> Milestone situated along Highgate West Hill, opposite Holly Lodge Gardens, less than 400m from the milestone at South Grove.	MLO77845
27	<b>Highgate Hill, outside Anthony's Leper Hospital, N19</b> Site of stone recording Whittington's mayoralties in 1397, 1406 and 1419. Replaced in 1795 & 1821, when the present structure was erected. Original may have been a wayside cross associated with St Anthony's leper hospital.	MLO22989
28	<b>St Anthony's Leper Hospital, Highgate Hill, N19</b> St Anthony's Leper Hospital was founded by William Pole in 1473, himself a leper. Open from 1150 until its closure in 1650 it seems to have been a poor house rather than a leper hospital. It consisted of a chapel, hall, eight small rooms, an orchard & gardens.	MLO151 MLO281
29	<b>Waterlow Park, Highgate, N6</b> 19th century public park laid out 1889-91 on the site of 17th to 19th century private grounds, further developed during the 20th century. This garden or other land is registered under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 within the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens by English Heritage for its special historic interest.	MLO59294
30	<b>Highgate Cemetery, Highgate, N6</b> Cemetery laid out by the London Cemetery Company and opened in 1839. The 17.5 acre site purchased by the London Cemetery Company included part of the grounds of Ashurst Manor, which had belonged to Sir William Ashurst, Lord Mayor of London in 1693. Among the people buried or commemorated in the cemetery are George Elliot, Marguerite Radclyffe-Hall, Christina Rossetti, Karl Marx, Jacob Bronowski and Tom Sayers.	MLO14884
31	<b>Dartmouth Park Hill, Highgate, N6</b> The Whittington Estate was built in the 1970s as part of post-war social housing by Camden Council. Built north of Raydon Street, and overlooking Highgate Cemetery, the estate comprises six terraces with strong horizontal lines of balconies and cornices and vertical cross walls. Between each terrace is a pedestrian walkway of a different character, with planting of trees and shrubs to soften the architecture. This landscaping together with other green spaces provided for residents is an integral part of the design.	MLO107482
32	<b>The Grove / Highgate West Hill (Highgate Reservoir), N6</b> The land here was formerly part of Highgate Green, purchased in 1844 the New River Company who built Highgate Service Reservoir here in 1846. Today the reservoir is covered and the site is largely grassland, but still has the small circular conduit house. Species of birch have been planted on the reservoir roof by Thames Water, who continue to be responsible for the site	MLO107457
33	<b>South Grove Square and The Grove Enclosures, Highgate, N6</b> Between The Grove and West Hill Highgate are a number of areas of open space, originally part of the old village green, which were preserved as public open space through the London Squares Preservation Act of 1931	MLO104342

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER/NHL No.
34	<b>Southwood Lane, Highgate, N6</b> Former grounds of Southwood Hospital (1951-91) now redeveloped as private housing. Hospital grounds comprised lawn, belts of mature trees and remains of garden of early Nineteenth Century villa. Site redeveloped by 2004 as Southwood Court - terrace of 6 private houses with gardens - and Linear House built in former grounds.	MLO108628
35	<b>Archway Campus, Archway, N19</b> Hospital first established on Archway Road as Holborn Union Infirmary in 1879. Further building works and changes of name occurred during the first half of the 20th century. Became part of the National Health Service in 1948 and functioned as the Archway Wing until it was sold to two universities in 1998.	MLO108116
36	<b>Statue of Sir Sydney Waterlow</b> Grade II Listed Building	1379135
37	<b>Slingley West View</b> Grade II Listed Building	1294537
38	<b>Retaining wall along Highgate Hill between street pavement and higher paved walk leading to numbers 104 to 110 (even) and the cottage, and houses farther west</b> Grade II Listed Building	1079237
39	<b>Ivy House and Northgate House</b> Grade II* Listed Building	1358831
40	<b>K6 Telephone Kiosk to the east of No. 3, Highgate High Street</b> Grade II Listed Building	1378936
41	<b>Hampstead Lane, Highgate, N6</b> Hampstead Lane was part of the turnpike managed by the Turnpike Trust in 1710. It is likely that the road is of medieval origin.	MLO24770
42	<b>Highgate Hill, N6</b> A walled garden to the north of 128-130 Highgate Hill. The garden dates to the 17th-18th centuries and was partially replaced in the 20th century.	MLO107813

# 9 Planning framework

## 9.1 Statutory protection

### *Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas*

- 9.1.1 The *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* sets out the legal requirements for the control of development and alterations which affect buildings, including those which are listed or in conservation areas. Buildings which are listed or which lie within a conservation area are protected by law. Grade I are buildings of exceptional interest. Grade II\* are particularly significant buildings of more than special interest. Grade II are buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them.

## 9.2 National Planning Policy Framework

- 9.2.1 The Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 (DCLG 2012) and supporting Planning Practice Guidance in 2014 (DCLG 2014). One of the 12 core principles that underpin both plan-making and decision-taking within the framework is to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations' (DCLG 2012 para 17). It recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource (para 126), and requires the significance of heritage assets to be considered in the planning process, whether designated or not. The contribution of setting to asset significance needs to be taken into account (para 128). The NPPF encourages early engagement (i.e. pre-application) as this has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of a planning application and can lead to better outcomes for the local community (para 188).

- 9.2.2 NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, is produced in full below:

**Para 126.** Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

**Para 127.** When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.

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

**Para 129.** Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary

expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

**Para 130.** Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

**Para 131.** In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

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

**Para 133.** Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, 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:

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

**Para 134.** Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

**Para 135.** The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

**Para 136.** Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

**Para 137.** Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

**Para 138.** Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

**Para 139.** Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

**Para 140.** Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would

secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

**Para 141.** Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

## 9.3 Greater London regional policy

---

### *The London Plan*

9.3.1 The overarching strategies and policies for the whole of the Greater London area are contained within the London Plan of the Greater London Authority (GLA March 2016). Policy 7.8 relates to Heritage Assets and Archaeology:

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.

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.

F. Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London's environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London's ability to accommodate change and regeneration.

G. Boroughs, in consultation with English Heritage [now named Historic England], 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.

9.3.2 Para. 7.31A supporting Policy 7.8 notes that 'Substantial harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset should be exceptional, with substantial harm to or loss of those assets designated of the highest significance being wholly exceptional. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use. Enabling development that would otherwise not comply with planning policies, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset should be assessed to see if the benefits of departing from those policies outweigh the disbenefits.'

9.3.3 It further adds (para. 7.31B) 'Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of and/or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of that asset should not be taken into account when making a decision on a development proposal'.

9.3.4 Para. 7.32 recognises the value of London's heritage: '...where new development uncovers an archaeological site or memorial, these should be preserved and managed on-site. Where this is not possible provision should be made for the investigation, understanding, dissemination and archiving of that asset'.

## 9.4 Local planning policy

---

9.4.1 Following the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Planning Authorities have replaced their Unitary Development Plans, Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance with a new system of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). UDP policies have been either 'saved' or 'deleted'. In most cases archaeology policies are likely to be 'saved' because there have been no significant changes in legislation or advice at a national level.

9.4.2 The Local Plan was adopted by Camden Council on 3 July 2017 and has replaced the Core Strategy and Camden Development Policies documents as the basis for planning decisions and future development in the borough.

### 9.4.3 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**

Designated 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.

#### **Conservation areas**

Conservation areas are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed 'designated heritage assets'. In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing applications within conservation areas.

The Council will:

- e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;
- f. resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area;
- g. resist development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character or appearance of that conservation area; and
- h. preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area or which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

#### **Listed Buildings**

Listed buildings are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed 'designated heritage assets'. To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

- i. resist the total or substantial demolition of a listed building;
- j. resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building; and
- k. resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.

**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.

## 10 Determining significance

10.1.1 'Significance' lies in the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Archaeological interest includes an interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity, and may apply to standing buildings or structures as well as buried remains. Known and potential heritage assets within the site and its vicinity have been identified from national and local designations, HER data and expert opinion. The determination of the significance of these assets is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against four values (EH 2008):

- *Evidential value*: the potential of the physical remains to yield evidence of past human activity. This might take into account date; rarity; state of preservation; diversity/complexity; contribution to published priorities; supporting documentation; collective value and comparative potential.
- *Aesthetic value*: this derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from the heritage asset, taking into account what other people have said or written;
- *Historical value*: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through heritage asset to the present, such a connection often being illustrative or associative;
- *Communal value*: this derives from the meanings of a heritage asset for the people who know about it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory; communal values are closely bound up with historical, particularly associative, and aesthetic values, along with and educational, social or economic values.

10.1.2 Table 3 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

*Table 3: Significance of heritage assets*

<b>Heritage asset description</b>	<b>Significance</b>
World heritage sites Scheduled monuments Grade I and II* listed buildings Historic England Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens Protected Wrecks Heritage assets of national importance	Very high (International/ national)
Historic England Grade II registered parks and gardens Conservation areas Designated historic battlefields Grade II listed buildings Burial grounds Protected heritage landscapes (e.g. ancient woodland or historic hedgerows) Heritage assets of regional or county importance	High (national/ regional/ county)
Heritage assets with a district value or interest for education or cultural appreciation Locally listed buildings	Medium (District)
Heritage assets with a local (i.e. parish) value or interest for education or cultural appreciation	Low (Local)
Historic environment resource with no significant value or interest	Negligible
Heritage assets that have a clear potential, but for which current knowledge is insufficient to allow significance to be determined	Uncertain

10.1.3 Unless the nature and exact extent of buried archaeological remains within any given area has been determined through prior investigation, significance is often uncertain.



# 11 Non-archaeological constraints

- 11.1.1 It is anticipated that live services will be present on the site, the locations of which have not been identified by this archaeological report. Other than this, no other non-archaeological constraints to any archaeological fieldwork have been identified within the site.
- 11.1.2 Note: the purpose of this section is to highlight to decision makers any relevant non-archaeological constraints identified during the study, that might affect future archaeological field investigation on the site (should this be recommended). The information has been assembled using only those sources as identified in section 2 and section 13.4, in order to assist forward planning for the project designs, working schemes of investigation and risk assessments that would be needed prior to any such field work. MOLA has used its best endeavours to ensure that the sources used are appropriate for this task but has not independently verified any details. Under the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974 and subsequent regulations, all organisations are required to protect their employees as far as is reasonably practicable by addressing health and safety risks. The contents of this section are intended only to support organisations operating on this site in fulfilling this obligation and do not comprise a comprehensive risk assessment.

## 12 Glossary

<i>Alluvium</i>	Sediment laid down by a river. Can range from sands and gravels deposited by fast flowing water and clays that settle out of suspension during overbank flooding. Other deposits found on a valley floor are usually included in the term alluvium (e.g. peat).
<i>Archaeological Priority Area/Zone</i>	Areas of archaeological priority, significance, potential or other title, often designated by the local authority.
<i>Brickearth</i>	A fine-grained silt believed to have accumulated by a mixture of processes (e.g. wind, slope and freeze-thaw) mostly since the Last Glacial Maximum around 17,000BP.
<i>B.P.</i>	Before Present, conventionally taken to be 1950
<i>Bronze Age</i>	2,000–600 BC
<i>Building recording</i>	Recording of historic buildings (by a competent archaeological organisation) is undertaken <i>'to document buildings, or parts of buildings, which may be lost as a result of demolition, alteration or neglect'</i> , amongst other reasons. Four levels of recording are defined by Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and Historic England. Level 1 (basic visual record); Level 2 (descriptive record), Level 3 (analytical record), and Level 4 (comprehensive analytical record)
<i>Built heritage</i>	Upstanding structure of historic interest.
<i>Colluvium</i>	A natural deposit accumulated through the action of rainwash or gravity at the base of a slope.
<i>Conservation area</i>	An area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Designation by the local authority often includes controls over the demolition of buildings; strengthened controls over minor development; and special provision for the protection of trees.
<i>Cropmarks</i>	Marks visible from the air in growing crops, caused by moisture variation due to subsurface features of possible archaeological origin (i.e. ditches or buried walls).
<i>Cut-and-cover [trench]</i>	Method of construction in which a trench is excavated down from existing ground level and which is subsequently covered over and/or backfilled.
<i>Cut feature</i>	Archaeological feature such as a pit, ditch or well, which has been cut into the then-existing ground surface.
<i>Devensian</i>	The most recent cold stage (glacial) of the Pleistocene. Spanning the period from c 70,000 years ago until the start of the Holocene (10,000 years ago). Climate fluctuated within the Devensian, as it did in other glacials and interglacials. It is associated with the demise of the Neanderthals and the expansion of modern humans.
<i>Early medieval</i>	AD 410–1066. Also referred to as the Saxon period.
<i>Evaluation (archaeological)</i>	A limited programme of non-intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area.
<i>Excavation (archaeological)</i>	A programme of controlled, intrusive fieldwork with defined research objectives which examines, records and interprets archaeological remains, retrieves artefacts, ecofacts and other remains within a specified area. The records made and objects gathered are studied and the results published in detail appropriate to the project design.
<i>Findspot</i>	Chance find/antiquarian discovery of artefact. The artefact has no known context, is either residual or indicates an area of archaeological activity.
<i>Geotechnical</i>	Ground investigation, typically in the form of boreholes and/or trial/test pits, carried out for engineering purposes to determine the nature of the subsurface deposits.
<i>Head</i>	Weathered/soliflucted periglacial deposit (i.e. moved downslope through natural processes).
<i>Heritage asset</i>	A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
<i>Historic environment assessment</i>	A written document whose purpose is to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature of the historic environment resource/heritage assets within a specified area.
<i>Historic Environment Record (HER)</i>	Archaeological and built heritage database held and maintained by the County authority. Previously known as the Sites and Monuments Record
<i>Holocene</i>	The most recent epoch (part) of the Quaternary, covering the past 10,000 years during which time a warm interglacial climate has existed. Also referred to as the 'Postglacial' and (in Britain) as the 'Flandrian'.
<i>Iron Age</i>	600 BC–AD 43

<i>Later medieval</i>	AD 1066 – 1500
<i>Last Glacial Maximum</i>	Characterised by the expansion of the last ice sheet to affect the British Isles (around 18,000 years ago), which at its maximum extent covered over two-thirds of the present land area of the country.
<i>Locally listed building</i>	A structure of local architectural and/or historical interest. These are structures that are not included in the Secretary of State's Listing but are considered by the local authority to have architectural and/or historical merit
<i>Listed building</i>	A structure of architectural and/or historical interest. These are included on the Secretary of State's list, which affords statutory protection. These are subdivided into Grades I, II* and II (in descending importance).
<i>Made Ground</i>	Artificial deposit. An archaeologist would differentiate between modern made ground, containing identifiably modern inclusion such as concrete (but not brick or tile), and undated made ground, which may potentially contain deposits of archaeological interest.
<i>Mesolithic</i>	12,000 – 4,000 BC
<i>National Record for the Historic Environment (NRHE)</i>	National database of archaeological sites, finds and events as maintained by Historic England in Swindon. Generally not as comprehensive as the country HER.
<i>Neolithic</i>	4,000 – 2,000 BC
<i>Ordnance Datum (OD)</i>	A vertical datum used by Ordnance Survey as the basis for deriving altitudes on maps.
<i>Palaeo-environmental</i>	Related to past environments, i.e. during the prehistoric and later periods. Such remains can be of archaeological interest, and often consist of organic remains such as pollen and plant macro fossils which can be used to reconstruct the past environment.
<i>Palaeolithic</i>	700,000–12,000 BC
<i>Palaeochannel</i>	A former/ancient watercourse
<i>Peat</i>	A build-up of organic material in waterlogged areas, producing marshes, fens, mires, blanket and raised bogs. Accumulation is due to inhibited decay in anaerobic conditions.
<i>Pleistocene</i>	Geological period pre-dating the Holocene.
<i>Post-medieval</i>	AD 1500–present
<i>Preservation by record</i>	Archaeological mitigation strategy where archaeological remains are fully excavated and recorded archaeologically and the results published. For remains of lesser significance, preservation by record might comprise an archaeological watching brief.
<i>Preservation in situ</i>	Archaeological mitigation strategy where nationally important (whether Scheduled or not) archaeological remains are preserved <i>in situ</i> for future generations, typically through modifications to design proposals to avoid damage or destruction of such remains.
<i>Registered Historic Parks and Gardens</i>	A site may lie within or contain a registered historic park or garden. The register of these in England is compiled and maintained by Historic England.
<i>Residual</i>	When used to describe archaeological artefacts, this means not <i>in situ</i> , i.e. Found outside the context in which it was originally deposited.
<i>Roman</i>	AD 43–410
<i>Scheduled Monument</i>	An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and protected under the Ancient Monuments Act.
<i>Site</i>	The area of proposed development
<i>Site codes</i>	Unique identifying codes allocated to archaeological fieldwork sites, e.g. evaluation, excavation, or watching brief sites.
<i>Study area</i>	Defined area surrounding the proposed development in which archaeological data is collected and analysed in order to set the site into its archaeological and historical context.
<i>Solifluction, Soliflucted</i>	Creeping of soil down a slope during periods of freeze and thaw in periglacial environments. Such material can seal and protect earlier landsurfaces and archaeological deposits which might otherwise not survive later erosion.
<i>Stratigraphy</i>	A term used to define a sequence of visually distinct horizontal layers (strata), one above another, which form the material remains of past cultures.
<i>Truncate</i>	Partially or wholly remove. In archaeological terms remains may have been truncated by previous construction activity.
<i>Watching brief (archaeological)</i>	A formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons.

# 13 Bibliography

## 13.1 Published and documentary sources

- AGL, 2000 MoLAS, *The archaeology of Greater London: an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area covered by modern Greater London*, London
- Barton N and Myers S, 2016 *Lost Rivers of London*. Whitstable, Kent: Historical Publications Ltd
- ClfA [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists] Dec 2014a, *Standards and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*, Reading.
- ClfA [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists] Dec 2014b, *Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*, Reading
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2014 *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment: Planning Practice Guide*
- Domesday Book, A Complete Translation*, eds Williams, A. and Martin, G.H. 1992, 2002. London: Penguin Books
- EH [English Heritage], 2008 *Conservation principles, policies and guidance*. Swindon
- Greig, J. A. 1989. 'From lime forest to Heathland – five thousand years of change at West Heath Spa, Hampstead, as shown by the plant remains.' In D. Collins, and D. Lorimer, (eds.) *Excavations at the Mesolithic site on West Heath, Hampstead 1976–1981*. BAR Brit Ser 217.
- HE [Historic England] 2015a, *The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3*. Historic England in collaboration with the Historic Environment Forum, second edition, Historic England July 2015.
- HE [Historic England] 2015b *Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2*. Historic England in collaboration with the Historic Environment Forum, second edition, Historic England July 2015.
- Humphery-Smith C, 1984 *The Phillimore Atlas and Index of Parish Registers*.
- Lakin, D. Seeley, F. Bird, J. Reilly, K. Ainsley, C. 2002. *The Roman Tower at Shadwell, London: A reappraisal*. MoLAS and English Heritage.
- Margary, I. D. 1967. *Roman Roads in Britain* London: John Baker
- MoLAS, 1992 *British Gas Pipeline: Hampstead Heath to Gospel Oak, London Borough of Camden. An Archaeological Investigation*. Unpublished report.
- MoLAS [Museum of London Archaeology Service], 2000 *The archaeology of Greater London: an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area covered by modern Greater London*. London
- Richardson J, 1997 *Kentish Town Past*. Historical Publications, London.
- Richardson, J. 2004. *Highgate Past*. Historical Publications, London
- Saunders, E. M., 1978 *Fairseat: The story of a house and its occupants over the last 400 years* Brighton
- Wiley, R. 2006. *London Gazetteer*.
- VCH *Middlesex vi*. Victoria County History *Middlesex vi*. 'Hornsey including Highgate'
- Walford, E, 1878 'St Pancras', in *Old and New London: Volume 5*. London.
- Weinreb B Hibbert C, Keay J, Keay J (eds), 2008 *The London Encyclopaedia*. London: Macmillan

## 13.2 Other Sources

- British Geological Survey online historic geology borehole data and digital drift and solid geology data
- British History Online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol5/pp324-340>
- Greater London Historic Environment Record
- Historic England designation data
- Groundsure historic Ordnance Survey mapping
- Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre
- Geotechnical & Environmental Associates, Channing School Geotechnical Survey, 2011, Job no.

J11240

Internet – web-published sources:

Camden Council, 2007, *Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy*

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/content/environment/planning-and-built-environment/two/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents/conservation-area-appraisal-and-management-strategies/highgate/> Accessed: 12/10/17

Cooper, C. *Friends of Waterlow Park: History*

<http://www.waterlowpark.org.uk/pages/about-the-park/history.php> Accessed: 13/10/17

### 13.3 Cartographic sources

---

Davies, B R, 1834 *Topographical map of the Borough of St Marylebone, as incorporated and defined by Act of Parliament 1832*. Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre, ref 85.244

Rocque, 1766 'Exact Survey of the City of London Westminster and Southwark and the Country 10 Miles Round', reproduced in Margary, H, 1971 '*Exact Survey of the City of London Westminster and Southwark and the Country 10 Miles Round*' by John Rocque, 1766, Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Stanford, 1862 'Stanford's Library Map of London', reproduced in Margary, H, 1980, '*Stanford's Library Map of London*' 1862, Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Tompson, 1801 *Plan of the Parish of St Pancras situate in the county of Middlesex*. Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre, ref 85.244

#### *Ordnance Survey maps*

Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25" map (1870)

Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25" map (1914)

Ordnance Survey 1:2500 scale maps (1967, 1992)

#### *Engineering/Architects drawings*

Proposed Plans Lower Ground (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL06, rev. A, December 2016)

Proposed Elevations Preliminary (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.36/PL07, rev. A, December 2016)

Proposed Plans Ground Level (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.40/PL01 P, rev. A, January 2017)

Pavilion Proposed Elevations (Prime Meridian, dwg. 343.40/PL03 P, rev. A, June 2017)

### 13.4 Available site survey information checklist

---

Information from client	Available	Format	Obtained
Plan of existing site services (overhead/buried)	not known	-	N
Levelled site survey as existing (ground and buildings)	Y	pdf	Y
Contamination survey data ground and buildings (inc. asbestos)	not known	-	N
Geotechnical report	not known	-	N
Envirocheck report	not known	-	N
Information obtained from non-client source	Carried out	Internal inspection of buildings	
Site inspection	Y	N	