



6 New Bridge Street  
London EC4V 6AB

T: 020 7489 0213

F: 020 7248 4743

E: [info@dwdllp.com](mailto:info@dwdllp.com)

W: [dwdllp.com](http://dwdllp.com)

# Archaeology Assessment

**Ref:** 12698

**Date:** July 2021

- 
1. A Desk Based Archaeology Assessment was prepared by CGMS to accompany approved planning permission reference 2013/1014/P dated May 2014 at the Tybalds Estate:

*“Mixed use development to provide 93 mixed tenure residential units (Class C3), alterations to existing dwellings and entrances, 249 sqm of new/replacement community facilities (Class D1) an energy centre, refuse, cycle and caretakers facilities and associated landscape and public realm improvement works. The provision of a new internal access road and the reorganisation of car parking within the site and the surrounding area.”*

2. This development was never implemented. The current application, which seeks planning permission for a revised scheme at the Tybalds Estate, is required to be accompanied by an Archaeology Assessment.
3. It has been confirmed with planning officers that the report prepared to accompany the 2014 planning permission can be submitted with the revised planning application. CGMS’s report is therefore appended to this document and forms part of the planning application submission.



---

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK  
BASED ASSESSMENT**

---

**TYBALDS CLOSE ESTATE  
CAMDEN  
LONDON**

**March 2012  
Revised February 2013**

**Planning • Heritage**

Specialist & Independent Advisors to the Property Industry

**Planning Authority:  
London Borough of Camden**

**Site centred at:  
531160E, 181890N**

**Author:  
Michelle Collings BA MA AIFA**

**Approved by:  
Paul Chadwick BA FSA MIFA**

**Report Status:  
FINAL**

**Issue Date:  
February 2013**

**CgMs Ref:  
MC/13803(T)**

© CgMs Limited

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

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

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

## **CONTENTS**

- Executive Summary
- 1.0 Introduction and Scope of Study
- 2.0 Planning Background and Development Plan Framework
- 3.0 Geology and Topography
- 4.0 Archaeological and Historical Background, including Assessment of Significance
- 5.0 Site Conditions, the Proposed Development and Impact on Heritage Assets
- 6.0 Summary and Conclusions

Sources Consulted

**Appendix 1:** Table detailing GLHER References within a 250m radius

**Appendix 2:** Preliminary Site Investigation Logs (Harrison Group 2012)

## **LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS**

- Fig. 1 Site location plan
- Fig. 2 HER Plot
- Fig. 3 1572 Braun and Hogenberg
- Fig. 4 1682 Morgan
- Fig. 5 1720 Stow
- Fig. 6 1746 Rocque
- Fig. 7 1799-1819 Horwood
- Fig. 8 1851 Town Plan
- Fig. 9 1874-1875 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 10 1877-1878 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 11 1895-1896 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 12 1916 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 13 1938 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 14 1946 Bomb Damage map
- Fig. 15 1953-1954 Ordnance Survey
- Fig. 16 1965-1968 Ordnance Survey

- Fig. 17 1982-1990 Ordnance Survey  
Fig. 18 1991 Ordnance Survey  
Fig. 19 2011 Ordnance Survey  
Fig. 20 The Proposed Development

### **LIST OF PLATES**

- Plate 1 View along northern boundary showing Babington Court  
Plate 2 View from Orde Hall Street looking west showing Chancellors Court, Babington Court and Devonshire Court  
Plate 3 View from Dombey Street/ Orde Hall Street looking west showing, Blemundsbury, Windmill and Springwater  
Plate 4 View from Harpur Street showing Windmill, Springwater and Richbell  
Plate 5 View from Orde Hall Street showing Chancellor's Court and Play Area  
Plate 6 View within site showing courtyard area and Blemundsbury  
Plate 7 Slope alongside Blemundsbury  
Plate 8 View within site showing courtyard, Chancellor's Court and Blemundsbury and Orde Hall Street beyond

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Land at Tybalds Close Estate, Camden, London is to be the subject of a planning application. Nine residential buildings, ranging from five to fourteen storeys currently occupy the site.

The site can be shown to have a generally low/limited archaeological potential for all periods.

The site has been extensively developed since the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Additionally there was some development pre-dating this and a building is shown on the site in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Apart from the Post-Medieval and 20<sup>th</sup> century development of the site, there is no evidence for archaeological evidence within the site.

The site was subject to severe bomb damage during World War II and buildings to the south and west of the site were largely damaged beyond repair.

Past destruction of any archaeological evidence within the site is considered severe as a result of multiple phases of development. In particular the extensive development in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and subsequent redevelopment in the 20<sup>th</sup> century are likely to have had a significant widespread impact.

It is proposed to re-develop parts of the site for residential purposes, incorporating community and ancillary use along with associated social facilities. Development proposals are unlikely to have any significant archaeological impact due to the low/limited potential for archaeological remains.

It is concluded that no further archaeological mitigation measures will be required in this particular instance.

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

- 1.1 This archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched and prepared by Michelle Collings of CgMs Consulting, on behalf of Campbell Reith Hill LLP (CambellReith) and their client the London Borough of Camden.
- 1.2 The subject of this assessment is land, approximately 1.88 hectares in extent, at Tybalds Close Estate, Camden, London (also referred to as the study site). The site lies in the London Borough of Camden within the Holborn and Covent Garden Ward and is centred at 531160E, 181890N (Fig.1). Tybalds Estate lies to the immediate east of Southampton Row, to the north of Theobald's Road, to the west of Lambs Conduit Street and to the south of Great Ormond Street.
- 1.3 In accordance with government policy (National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, historic, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the site.
- 1.4 Additionally, in accordance with the 'Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments' (Institute for Archaeologists 1999, revised 2011), the assessment includes the results of a site inspection, an examination of published and unpublished material and charts historic land-use through a map regression exercise. A site visit was undertaken during March 2012.
- 1.5 As a result, the assessment enables relevant parties to assess the significance of archaeological assets on and close to the site, assesses the potential for hitherto undiscovered archaeological assets and thus enable potential impacts on assets to be identified along with the need for design, civil engineering or archaeological solutions.

## **2.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK**

2.1 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which replaces national policy relating to heritage and archaeology (Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment).

2.1.1 Section 12 of the NPPF, entitled *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment* provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 12 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

- Delivery of sustainable development
- Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment
- Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and
- Recognition that heritage makes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.

2.1.2 Section 12 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 128 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset, and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be *no more than sufficient* to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

2.1.3 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.

2.1.4 Annex 2 also defines *Archaeological Interest* as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.

2.1.5 A *Designated Heritage Asset* comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.



2.1.6 *Significance* is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

2.1.7 In short, government policy provides a framework which:

- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets (which include World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields or Conservation Areas)
- Protects the settings of such designations
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions
- Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.

2.2 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.

2.3 The Localism Act, which came into being 15 November 2011, contains provisions which will result in the abolition of regional strategies. However, their abolition will require secondary legislation and until such time as this is introduced they will remain part of the development plan.

2.4 The relevant Strategic Development Plan framework is provided by the London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (July 2011), Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (Feb 2008). It includes the following policies relating to the heritage assets within London:

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

### **Strategic**

A London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the

desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.

B Development should incorporate measures that identify record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.

### **Planning Decisions**

C Development should identify value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.

D Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

E New development should make provision for the protection of archaeological resources, landscapes and significant memorials. The physical assets should, where possible, be made available to the public on-site. Where the archaeological asset or memorial cannot be preserved or managed on-site, provision must be made for the investigation, understanding, recording, dissemination and archiving of that asset.

### **LDF Preparation**

F Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London's environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London's ability to accommodate change and regeneration. Boroughs, in consultation with English Heritage, Natural England and other relevant statutory organisations, should include appropriate policies in their LDFs for identifying, protecting, enhancing and improving access to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings where appropriate, and to archaeological assets, memorials and historic and natural landscape character within their area.

## **POLICY 7.9 HERITAGE-LED REGENERATION**

### **Strategic**

A Regeneration schemes should identify and make use of heritage assets and reinforce the qualities that make them significant so they can help stimulate environmental,

economic and community regeneration. This includes buildings, landscape features, views, Blue Ribbon Network and public realm.

### **Planning Decisions**

B The significance of heritage assets should be assessed when development is proposed and schemes designed so that the heritage significance is recognised both in their own right and as catalysts for regeneration. Wherever possible heritage assets (including buildings at risk) should be repaired, restored and put to a suitable and viable use that is consistent with their conservation and the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality.

### **LDF Preparation**

C Boroughs should support the principles of heritage-led regeneration in LDF policies.

- 2.5 The relevant Development Plan Framework is provided by the Local Development Framework (LDF) which, along with Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025, replaced the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in November 2010. Camden Core Strategy Policy CS14 Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage refer to Policy DP25 in the LDF. The LDF contains the following policy which provides a framework for the consideration of development proposals affecting archaeological and heritage features:

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

***DP25 ARCHAEOLOGY-THE COUNCIL WILL PROTECT REMAINS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE BY ENSURING ACCEPTABLE MEASURES ARE TAKEN TO PRESERVE THEM AND THEIR SETTING, INCLUDING PHYSICAL PRESERVATION, WHERE APPROPRIATE.***

***25.21-IF IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS ARE FOUND, THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO RESIST DEVELOPMENT WHICH ADVERSELY AFFECTS REMAINS AND TO MINIMISE THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES BY REQUIRING EITHER IN SITU PRESERVATION OR A PROGRAMME OF EXCAVATION, RECORDING, PUBLICATION AND ARCHIVING OF REMAINS. THERE WILL USUALLY BE A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF IN SITU PRESERVATION OF REMAINS AND, IF IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS ARE FOUND, MEASURES SHOULD BE ADOPTED TO ALLOW THE REMAINS TO BE PERMANENTLY PRESERVED IN SITU. WHERE IN SITU PRESERVATION IS NOT FEASIBLE, NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE UNTIL SATISFACTORY EXCAVATION AND RECORDING OF THE REMAINS HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT ON SITE, AND SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS, PUBLICATION AND ARCHIVING UNDERTAKEN BY AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ORGANISATION APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL.***

- 2.6 Camden has 13 Archaeological Priority Areas and 39 Conservation Areas. The study site is bordered by the Bloomsbury Conservation Area to the north and east, and part of the Conservation Area boundary extends into the western part of the site. No Scheduled

Ancient Monuments lie on or close to the site. This assessment therefore seeks to establish whether Policy DP25 applies to the study site and whether any archaeological evaluation or investigation will be required in this instance.

### **3.0 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY**

#### **3.1 Geology**

- 3.1.1 The solid geology of the study site is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences (IGS 1979) as London Clay forming the London basin.
- 3.1.2 British Geological Survey Sheet 256 (North London: 1994) shows the underlying geology of the study site to comprise Lynch Hill Gravel, defined as a 'Post-diversionary Thames River Terrace deposit: gravel, sandy and clayey in part.'
- 3.1.3 A Geoenvironmental Desktop Study has been undertaken for the study site detailing the site specific geological background (CampbellReith 2012).
- 3.1.4 A geotechnical site survey was undertaken in March 2012 (Harrison Group 2012) revealing sand and gravel and sand, gravel and clay deposits between 1.15m below ground level (bgl) (FPT3) and 3.20m bgl (BHT4), frequently occurring beneath 2.00m of Made Ground as detailed in Appendix 2.

#### **3.2 Topography**

- 3.2.1 Much of the natural topography of London has been lost or masked by generations of development. The site is situated at approximately 31m AOD. However, there are significant changes in topography across the site as it has been terraced to allow for development. The site slopes downwards to the north and east and it has been terraced in these areas to accommodate changes in level (as shown by Plates 7 and 8).
- 3.2.2 The site slopes from 27m AOD at Tottenham Court Road to 20m AOD at Grays Inn Road. Spotheights of 22m AOD are recorded to the north and southeast of the site.
- 3.2.3 No modern watercourses or naturally occurring bodies of water are known within the vicinity of the study site. The River Fleet lies approximately 50m to the east of the site.

#### **4.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, INCLUDING ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Timescales used in this report:

##### **Prehistoric**

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

##### **Historic**

Roman	AD 43 - 410
Anglo Saxon/Early Medieval	AD 410 - 1066
Medieval	AD 1066 - 1485
Post Medieval	AD 1486 - 1900
Modern	AD 1900 - Present

#### **4.1 Introduction**

- 4.1.1 This assessment is based on a consideration of evidence in the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) for the study site and a 250m radius, also referred to as the study area (Fig.2 and Appendix 1). The historic maps for this area have also been examined in compiling the following assessment.
- 4.1.2 There are no designated heritage assets on the site. Undesignated assets (i.e. archaeological finds/features) within the site and its surroundings are reviewed below and are illustrated on Figure 2 (and listed in Appendix 1).
- 4.1.3 This chapter reviews existing archaeological evidence for the site and the archaeological/historical background of the general area and, in accordance with NPPF, considers the potential for as yet undiscovered archaeological evidence on the site.
- 4.1.4 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the site conditions and whether the theoretical potential identified in this chapter is likely to survive.

## 4.2 **Prehistoric**

- 4.2.1 There is little evidence for any prehistoric activity of any period (Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age or Iron Age) within the study area.
- 4.2.2 The Lynch Hill Gravels are traditionally a major source of Lower Palaeolithic material in London (MoLAS/English Heritage 2000: 31, 34-6). Wymer records a scatter of handaxes identified from the Lynch Hill and Hackney Gravels across an area from Hyde Park, through Bloomsbury to Hackney (Wymer 1999: Vol.1 63; Vol.2 Map 9).
- 4.2.3 Whilst a number of early prehistoric findspots are recorded within the wider area (within a 1km of the site) there is no such evidence within the study area. Accordingly, although the Lynch Hill Gravels have the potential to produce Palaeolithic artefacts, the likelihood of them occurring at depth beneath the site is unknown.
- 4.2.4 There is limited evidence for any prehistoric activity from the Mesolithic period to the Iron Age within the surrounding area and overall the archaeological potential for prehistoric evidence must be defined as low.

## 4.3 **Roman**

- 4.3.1 There is limited evidence for any Roman activity within the study area; it lay outside the main area of occupation, which lay to the east of the River Fleet.
- 4.3.2 Only two Roman find spots are recorded within the study area, comprising a cremation found to the southwest of the site on Southampton Row (HER MLO18085 and ELO5712) and a Roman tombstone discovered to the southeast of the site on Lambs Conduit Street in 1911 (HER MLO16263). However, it is likely that the latter find was not in-situ.
- 4.3.3 A Roman Road is recorded beyond the study area, to the south and the dispersed findspots are typical of remains found in the proximity of roads indicating a presence in the area but not sustained activity. Theobald's Road (continuing eastward to Clerkenwell Road) is recorded as a Roman Road (HER MLO24965). It formed part of the Silchester to Colchester route (Margary 1955).
- 4.3.4 It is likely that the site lay within outlying agricultural land during the Roman period, accordingly a low/limited potential is ascribed for remains of this date. If any remains are present they are likely to be agricultural in nature.

#### 4.4 **Anglo Saxon and Medieval**

4.4.1 There is no evidence for any Anglo-Saxon activity within the study area. The Domesday Book of 1086 records that the study area comprised vineyards and woodland. In 1201 William de Blemond acquired land within the study area and surrounds and it became known as Blemondisberi (the Manor of Blemond); accordingly a low potential is ascribed.

4.4.2 There is very limited evidence for any Medieval activity within the study area. A Medieval water conduit is recorded at 20 Queens Square to the north of the site, built to supply Greyfriars Monastery (ML023432). Greyfriars Monastery was built to the east of the study area near Newgate. The Franciscan Friars settled there in 1225 and the monastery flourished throughout the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries until it was dissolved in 1538. At the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century Edward III acquired the Manor of Blemond and gave it to the Carthusian Monks of London Charterhouse, under whose ownership the area remained rural. Accordingly, there is a low/limited potential for Medieval remains. If present any evidence likely to be agricultural in nature.

#### 4.5 **Post-Medieval**

4.5.1 Theobald's Road, to the south of the site was formerly laid out for James I (1566-1625) as a route to his house in Hertfordshire (Weinreb, Hibbert and Keay 2008) and there is varying historical evidence for the development of the study area throughout this period. In particular the Bloomsbury area was expanded between 1660 and 1840. Following the Dissolution of the monasteries in 1538, Henry VIII gave land at Bloomsbury to Thomas Wriothesley, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Southampton. In the early 1660's he constructed what later became known as Bloomsbury Square. Following which the area was largely laid out during the 18<sup>th</sup> century under the ownership of the Russell family. In 1800 Francis Russell (the 5<sup>th</sup> Duke of Bedford) demolished the former Earl's house on Southampton Row (HER MLO18060) to allow for the construction of Russell Square to the northwest of the study area.

4.5.2 In general the Bloomsbury area was laid out with planned streets and squares from the 17<sup>th</sup> century onwards. There are four Squares within the study area: Bloomsbury Square (HER MLO5922), Queens Square (HER MLO102717), Red Lion Square (MLO102720) and Red Lion Square/Conway Hall (MLO102692). Bloomsbury Square (Grade II Registered Park and Garden DLO32948) lies to the southwest of the site. It was built in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, forming part of the Bedford Estate. The garden was later redesigned in the early 19<sup>th</sup> to late 20<sup>th</sup> century (ML059220).



- 4.5.3 The majority of the HER references for the study area detail historic buildings of Post-Medieval to Modern date. The listed buildings are not considered here in any detail as this is outside the scope of this report; mention is merely made to demonstrate growth within the study area at this time.
- 4.5.4 There are two HER references detailing below ground remains. A Post-Medieval conduit lay to the north of the site (HER MLO18057 and ELO5699); in use by 1577, it was rebuilt by Sir Christopher Wren in 1677 and was demolished in 1746. Evidence for Post-Medieval activity was recorded during an evaluation at Lacon House and Adastal House to the east of the site (HER ELO4692). A Post-Medieval gravel pit was recorded which had been backfilled with late 17<sup>th</sup> century material (HER MLO72240). 18<sup>th</sup> century pits were recorded (HER MLO72441) along with 18<sup>th</sup> century brick drains (HER MLO72242) and shallow 18<sup>th</sup> century brick foundations (HER MLO72243).
- 4.5.5 Early mapping showing the site indicates that development first took place on the site in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century (Fig.4). The 1572 Braun and Hogenberg map (Fig.3) shows the site within open fields and was surrounded by open land on all sides. However, there had already been extensive development further to the east and the south of the site by this date (Fig.3).
- 4.5.6 The 1682 Morgan map (Fig. 4) indicates a single building within the site. The area to the immediate west of the site had been developed by this time and a road network was in place including the Kings Way. A row of terrace properties are marked to the west of the site. There had been extensive development in the area further to the south and Red Lion Fields is shown to the south of The Kings Way. Buildings lined High Holborn further to the south. Land to the immediate north and east of the site remained undeveloped as does the vast majority of the site.
- 4.5.7 The 1720 Stow map (Fig. 5) shows that the site and surrounding area to the north and east had been developed by this time. Great Ormond Street is named to the north of the site and a parallel road within the site is marked East Street. Additionally, there had been further development to the south in the vicinity of Red Lion Fields, now identified as Red Lion Square. The Kings Way is identified as Theobalds Row.
- 4.5.8 Rocque's map of 1746 (Fig. 6) shows little change to the overall layout of the site. Theobalds Row to the south is now identified as Theobald's Row and Ormond Street to the north is now marked as Great Ormond Street. Southampton Row is named as such to the west of the site and Bloomsbury Square is shown further to the southwest.

- 4.5.9 The 1799-1819 Horwood map (Fig. 7) shows the extension of the road parallel to the west of New North Street extending into the site. There had been additional development along this street. The area to the east of New North Street had been altered. Two former parallel roads, Theobalds Court and Bedford Court, had been demolished to allow for the construction of Harpur Street running parallel to New North Street at the eastern edge of the site. Theobalds Road to the south of the site is now marked as such and Red Lyon Street to the east is identified as Lamb Conduit Street. There had been further development in the wider surrounding area, in particular to the north of the study area. The general layout of the site had little changed by 1851 (Fig. 8) however Ormond Mews is identified as Great Ormond Yard to the north of the site and Ormond Yard is shown as Little Ormond Yard.
- 4.5.10 The 1874-1875 map (Fig. 9) identifies Bedford Court to the west of New North Street. The site was predominantly occupied by terrace properties at this time and aside from garden plots there was little remaining open space. The surrounding area largely comprised of similar terrace properties. A Hospital for Sick Children is identified to the north of Great Ormond Street, beyond which a timber yard is shown. The 1877-1878 map (Fig. 10) shows little change to the layout of the site and the immediate surrounding area.
- 4.5.11 The 1895-1896 map (Fig. 11) shows little change to the overall layout of the site. However, Little Ormond Yard to the immediate east of the site had been demolished and Orde Hall Street had been constructed in its place. Great Ormond Yard to the north of the site is now identified as Ormond Yard. A Fire Engine Station is shown to the south of the site, to the northwest of Red Lion Square.

#### 4.6 **Modern**

- 4.6.1 Varied change within the site is evident by 1916 (Fig. 12) and demolition, presumably slum clearance, of a number of buildings appears to have taken place. Properties to the west of Devonshire Street, to the west of New North Street and in the vicinity of Ormond Yard had been demolished. Two Public Houses are shown within the site, one to the south of Boswell Court and another at the junction of Old Gloucester Street and Cage Street. St. John's Church had been constructed to the south of the site. The 1938 map (Fig. 13) shows little further change to the layout of the site and the immediate surrounding area.
- 4.6.2 The 1946 Bomb Damage map (Fig. 14) shows that there was significant bomb damage to the site. In particular, the southern part of the site suffered 'severe damage' to 'damage beyond repair' and 'total destruction' (red, purple and black). Buildings to the

south of East Street and to the west of New North Street largely suffered severe damage to total destruction (red, purple and black) whilst buildings to the north of the site in the vicinity of Ormond Close (previously Ormond Yard) were in the main little impacted (green). However, several buildings are still marked as severely damaged (red). Many properties immediately bordering the site to the south were also destroyed (Fig.14).

4.6.3 Following World War II, significant redevelopment of the site had taken place by 1952 (Fig. 15). Although ruins remained to the northwest of the site and to the immediate south of the site, six buildings had been constructed on the site: identified as Windmill, Blemundsbury, Richbell, Boswell House, Springwater and Falcon. Ramps are marked to the north of Blemundsbury (as illustrated on Plate. 7) and Windmill and to the south of Richbell and Springwater, indicating terracing to allow for development. A playground is shown to the western edge of the site along Old Golucester Street (to the northwest of Falcon) in the location of former terraced properties. Devonshire Street is identified as Boswell Street and an electricity sub-station is marked. East Street is no longer shown running from the east of the site to Lambs Conduit Street. In its place Dombey Street had been constructed to the south of Orde Hall Street adjoining Harpur Street and Lamb Conduits Street. New buildings are shown to the immediate south of the site, to the south of Dombey Street identified as Lacon House (Board of Trade) and Ariel House (Ministry of Civil Aviation). Ruins and empty plots are shown to the west of the site to the west of New North Street to the immediate south of the site boundary.

4.6.4 The 1958-1966 map (not reproduced) shows a car park to the southeast corner of the site, to the south of Windmill. However, this is not identified on the 1965-1968 map (Fig. 16). Babington Court had been constructed in the area of Ormond Close to the north of the site. The electricity sub-station is no longer shown to the west of the site. Ariel House is now identified as Adastral House to the south of the site and there had been further development to the immediate south of the site. Mercurary House and Rochdale House had been built in the location of former ruins.

4.6.5 The 1965-1968 map (Fig. 16) shows that the site had been further redeveloped by this time. Ormond Close had been demolished within the site allowing for continued development alongside Babington Court. However two access roads to the north and west are marked as Ormond Close. Chancellors Court had been built to the north of the site and a courtyard had been constructed between this and the existing Babington Court. Devonshire Court had been built at the western edge of the site. There had been further redevelopment elsewhere in the surrounding area, in particular to the north of the site.

4.6.6 There has been little further change to the site or the immediate surrounding area to the present day as indicated by mapping covering 1982 to 2011 (Figs. 17 to 19). The overall general layout of the site has not been altered. A playground has been constructed to the east of the site fronting Orde Hall Street, but this is not identified as such on any of the maps. The Hospital to the north of the site on Great Ormond Street was extended in the late 80's, aside from which there has been limited further change to the immediately adjacent area (Fig.18).

4.6.7 Whilst development took place during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries there is little evidence to suggest significant below-ground structures or other remains on the site.

#### 4.7 **Negative Evidence**

4.7.1 A watching brief undertaken on Southampton Row to the west of the site did not reveal any remains of archaeological significance (HER ELO4654 and MLO62747).

4.7.2 Archaeological investigations on Theobald's Road to the south of the site did not reveal any remains of archaeological significance (HER EL05713).

#### 4.8 **Assessment of Significance**

4.8.1 There are no designated archaeological assets on the study site or nearby. In addition the Greater London HER does not record any undesignated assets on the site.

4.8.2 NPPF requires that consideration is given to the possibility for as yet undiscovered archaeological assets. In this instance, the absence of archaeological evidence from the site and the immediate vicinity (250m study area), despite known remains within the wider surrounding 1km area, it is considered highly unlikely that (other than the possible occurrence of Palaeolithic artefacts of local interest only at depth within the Terrace Gravels), undiscovered assets will occur on the site.

## **5.0 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACTS ON HERITAGE ASSETS**

### **5.1 Site Conditions**

5.1.1 The site comprises approximately 1.88 hectares of land to the east of Bloomsbury Square and to the south of Queen's Square, known as the Tybalds Close Estate. It lies to the immediate east of Southampton Row, to the north of Theobald's Road, to the west of Lambs Conduit Street and to the south of Great Ormond Street. Two public highways (New North Street and Harpur Street) enter the site providing vehicle access. Additional pedestrian access is also gained via Barbon Close, Ormond Close and Orde Hall Road.

5.1.2 The historical mapping indicates that the site's primary recent use has been residential following redevelopment after bomb damage during World War II. The site is currently occupied by 9 five to fourteen storey buildings. There are variations in topography across the site and the site has been terraced to accommodate this (as illustrated by Plates 7 and 8), accordingly some of the blocks have lower ground floor levels (as detailed below):

- Windmill House: 7 storey building including a lower ground floor partial plant room and storage area (Plates 3 and 4)
- Blemundsbury Court: 11 storey building including a lower ground floor partial plant room and storage area (Plates 3 and 6 to 8)
- Chancellor's Court: 14 storey tower block including a basement boiler room (Plates 2, 5 and 8)
- Babington Court: 14 storey tower block including a basement housing an electronic switchboard installations (Plates 1 and 2)
- Falcon House: 8 storey building including a lower ground floor partial plant room and storage area
- Richbell House: 8 storey building (Plate 4)
- Devonshire Court: 5 storey building (Plate 2)
- Springwater House: 8 storey building with a lower ground floor partial plant room and storage area (Plate 3 and 4)
- Boswell House: 6 storey building with an underlying basement for plant and storage.

5.1.3 There is 0.4 hectares of open land within the site comprising children's playgrounds (Plate 5), community courtyards and other community space including some grassed and soft landscaped areas (Plates 1 and 2).

- 5.1.4 The site lies in an area which, following initial development in the 17<sup>th</sup> century has been subject to extensive redevelopment since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The site is bounded by Great Ormond Street to the north, beyond which lies Great Ormond Street Hospital. There is commercial development to the immediate north and commercial properties lie to the east beyond Lamb's Conduit Street. Further commercial properties, including Government Offices, lie off Theobalds Road to the south.
- 5.1.5 The 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century development of the site, bomb damage during World War II and any associated levelling for redevelopment in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is likely to have had a severe destructive archaeological impact. In particular, the construction of basements (beneath Blemundsby House, Windmill House, Springwater House, Richbell House and Falcon House) and associated terracing are likely to have had a destructive impact. Further, sub-stations are positioned on Orde Hall Road and Boswell Street and boilers are located in the base of Chancellor's Court and Springwater Houses.
- 5.1.6 The recent geotechnical site survey (Harrison Group 2012) revealed depths of made ground between 0.41m below ground level (bgl) (WST2) (stopped due to concrete) to 3.20m bgl (BHT4) frequently extending to depths of over 1.50m bgl as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 5.1.7 Overall, past development and landforming will have had an extremely severe and widespread cumulative negative archaeological impact, through the cutting of foundations, services and basements together with their subsequent grubbing out. In the areas of the existing and former buildings it is extremely unlikely that any archaeological remains will now survive.

## 5.2 **Proposed Development**

5.2.1 The proposed development is currently at RIBA Stage D. Public consultation was undertaken in 2011 (Camden Council 2011).

5.2.2 The proposals comprise: Construction of mixed development to provide 93 units of new mixed tenure residential (Class C3); 249 sqm of new/replacement community facilities (Class D1); an energy centre, refuse, cycle and caretakers facilities and associated landscape and public realm improvement works including enhanced childrens play. The

provision of a new internal access road and the reorganisation of car parking within the site and surrounding area.

5.2.3 In general the re-development proposals allow for a combination of:

- New central public space/square
- Public realm improvements
- Development and location of key frontages
- Updated key pedestrian routes and a possible loop road
- Possible relocation of play area on Orde Hall Street (whilst play area fronting Old Gloucester Street would be retained).

5.2.4 In view of the study site's generally low/limited archaeological potential and the likely widespread severe negative impact of previous and existing development, the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant archaeological impact.

### 5.3 **Impacts on Heritage Assets**

5.3.1 Whilst there is evidence for past activity within the 250m radius and further afield within the wider surrounding 1km area, there is no evidence for any particular potential at the site or in the immediate surrounding area. In the absence of designated or undesignated archaeological assets it is concluded that the proposed development is unlikely to have either a significant or widespread archaeological impact on remains that are other than of local importance.

## **6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 In accordance with central and local government planning policy, as set out in NPPF, the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 and the Local Development Framework (LDF), a desk-based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study site.
- 6.2 The study site can be considered to have a generally low/limited archaeological potential whilst past impacts, namely 18<sup>th</sup> /19<sup>th</sup> century development, 20<sup>th</sup> century bomb damage and subsequent re-development are likely to have had a cumulative widespread severe impact.
- 6.3 Development proposals are therefore unlikely to have any significant archaeological impact.
- 6.4 Consequently, based on the available evidence, it is anticipated that no archaeological mitigation measures will be required in this instance.



## **SOURCES CONSULTED**

### 1. **General**

British Library

Greater London Historic Environment Record

### 2. **Bibliographic**

Camden Council. 2011. Tybalds Estate First Round Consultation Report

CampbellReith. 2012. Tybalds Close Estate, Camden, London Feasibility Stage Geoenvironmental Drainage and Flood Risk Desktop Study. Unpublished Report.

Domesday Book *Middlesex* 1975 Phillimore Edition

Harrison Group 2012 Preliminary Site Investigation Logs

Margary, ID.1955. Roman Roads in Britain

MoLAS/English Heritage *The Archaeology of Greater London 2000*

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

Wymer *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain* 2 vols. 1999

### 3. **Cartographic**

1572 Braun and Hogenberg

1682 Morgan

1720 Stow

1746 Rocque

1799-1819 Horwood

1851 Town Plan

1874-1875 Ordnance Survey

1877-1878 Ordnance Survey

1880 Ordnance Survey

1882 Ordnance Survey

1895-1896 Ordnance Survey  
1896 Ordnance Survey  
1898 Ordnance Survey  
1911-1922 Ordnance Survey  
1916 Ordnance Survey  
1920 Ordnance Survey  
1937 Ordnance Survey  
1938 Ordnance Survey  
1940-1951 Ordnance Survey  
1946 Bomb Damage map  
1946-1949 Historical Aerial Photography  
1949 Historical Aerial Photography  
1952-1953 Ordnance Survey  
1953-1954 Ordnance Survey  
1957 Ordnance Survey  
1958-1966 Ordnance Survey  
1965 Ordnance Survey  
1965-1968 Ordnance Survey  
1966-1968 Ordnance Survey  
1966-1974 Ordnance Survey  
1972-1974 Ordnance Survey  
1974-1976 Ordnance Survey  
1979 Ordnance Survey  
1982-1990 Ordnance Survey  
1983 Ordnance Survey  
1985 Russian Military Mapping  
1991 Ordnance Survey  
1991-1995 Ordnance Survey  
1992-1995 Ordnance Survey  
1995 Ordnance Survey  
1999 Ordnance Survey  
2006 Ordnance Survey  
2011 Ordnance Survey