

T H A M E S V A L L E Y

ARCHAEOLOGICAL

S E R V I C E S

**The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond,
London Borough of Richmond**

Desk-based Heritage Assessment

by Tim Dawson

Site Code PLR12/80

(TQ 1793 7520)

The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond

Desk-based Heritage Assessment

for Renworth Homes (Windsor) Ltd

In support of a detailed planning application

and Conservation Area Consent application

for the erection of three new townhouses, with car parking

and conversion of existing school building

for six residential units with car parking

by Tim Dawson

Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd

Site Code PLR 12/80

AUGUST 2012

Summary

Site name: The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond

Grid reference: TQ 17925 75200

Site activity: Desk-based heritage assessment

Project manager: Steve Ford

Site supervisor: Tim Dawson

Site code: PLR 12/80

Area of site: c.0.12ha

Summary of results: The Old School lies in an area of high archaeological potential with finds and features dating from the Palaeolithic period onwards being discovered nearby. Richmond itself was an important centre with its royal palace dating from the medieval period. While construction of the school in 1870 is likely to have disturbed at least the most shallow archaeological deposits, the area under the playground is less likely to have been truncated allowing for the preservation of archaeologically sensitive layers.

It is anticipated that it will be necessary to provide further information about the archaeological potential of the site from field observations, in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of the proposed residential development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. How the retention of the Old School, which is defined as a Local Building of Townscape Merit in the local planning authority's Unitary Development Plan, will be achieved as part of the proposed development is an important consideration as well.

Finally, the setting of nearby listed buildings within the Central Richmond conservation area also needs to be addressed through a sympathetic design and scale of the proposed new townhouses, in particular. The latter two considerations are dealt with in detail in the submitted parallel Design & Access Statement. That Statement also covers a number of heritage based issues, but this report focuses on the archaeological aspects in the main.

*This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder. All TVAS unpublished fieldwork reports are available on our website:
www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp.*

Report edited/checked by:	Steve Ford✓	19.07.12
	Steve Preston✓	19.07.12

The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond Desk-based Heritage Assessment

by Tim Dawson

Report 12/80a

Introduction

This report is an assessment of the archaeological potential of a roughly rectangular plot of land located at The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr C Watts of Maze Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr R Rowsell of Renworth Homes (Windsor), The Courtyard Office, 14 George V Place, Thames Street, Windsor, SL4 1QP (the client, and applicant) and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

A visit conducted on 18th July 2012, confirmed that the site currently consists of the main school building, dating from approximately 1870, with extensions built in 1894, and the 1950s (Milbank 2012). These buildings occupy the majority of the south and west areas of the site, with the remainder being Tarmacadam former playground (Fig. 2). The school buildings currently house Richmond Film Services, in office and storage uses, while the playground is the premises' car park (Pls 1–4). Topographically the site is largely flat although it is slightly higher than the road level to the south. It is bordered by Park Lane to the south, residential development to the west, and offices to the north and east. The development site has an area of c.0.12ha centred on NGR TQ 17925 75200. The site is located on 1st River Terrace gravel (Kempton Park Gravel Formation) (BGS 1981) at a height of approximately 5m above Ordnance Datum and the Thames flows around 1km to the west.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought for the demolition of the main School building and the more modern extensions. The main School building however would be re-built and replicated as it appears today, re-using as much of the original and existing building materials as possible. The replicated building would be converted to form five 2no bedroom, and one 3no bedroom residential units and there would also be a terrace of three townhouses along the rear boundary of the site

The Department for Communities and Local Government's *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF 2012) is the latest guidance at national level, setting out the framework within which local planning authorities should consider the importance of conserving, or enhancing, aspects of the historic environment, within the planning process. It requires an applicant to provide, as part of a planning application, sufficient information to enable the local planning authority to assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal. The historic environment is defined (NPPF 2012, 52) as:

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

Paragraphs 128 and 129 state that

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

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

A 'heritage asset' is defined (NPPF 2012, 52) as

'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'

'Designated heritage asset' includes (NPPF 2012, 51) any

'World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.'

'Archaeological interest' is glossed (NPPF 2012, 50) as follows:

'There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially may hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.'

Specific guidance on assessing significance and the impact of the proposal is contained in paragraphs 131 to 135:

- '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.

‘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.

‘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.

‘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.

‘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.

Paragraph 139 recognizes that new archaeological discoveries may reveal hitherto unsuspected and hence non-designated heritage assets

‘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.’

Paragraph 140 requires local planning authorities to ensure that any loss of heritage assets advances understanding, but stresses that advancing understanding is not by itself sufficient reason to permit the loss of significance:

‘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.’

In determining the potential heritage impact of development proposals, ‘significance’ of an asset is defined (NPPF 2012, 56) as:

‘The value of a heritage asset to this, and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.’

while ‘setting’ is defined as:

‘The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’

The London Borough of Richmond’s Development Management Plan (2011) includes a number of detailed planning policies relating to developments within conservation areas and those affecting archaeological sites and listed buildings. It also identifies the area as of archaeological potential within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by English Heritage and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service. The proposal site is within the Central Richmond conservation area, meaning that Policy DM HD 1 (Conservation Areas - designation, protection and enhancement) applies. This states that:

‘The Council will continue to protect areas of special significance by designating Conservation Areas and extensions to existing Conservation Areas using the criteria as set out in PPS 5 and as advised by English Heritage.

‘The Council will prepare a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for each Conservation area, these will be used as a basis when determining proposals within or where it would affect the setting of, Conservation Areas together with other policy guidance.

‘Buildings or parts of buildings, street furniture, trees and other features which make a positive contribution to the character, appearance or significance of the area should be retained. New development (or redevelopment) or other proposals should conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.’

The proposal site also lies adjacent to a row of listed buildings, and therefore Policy DM HD 2 (Conservation of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments) also applies:

‘The Council will require the preservation of Listed Buildings of special architectural or historic interest and Ancient Monuments and seek to ensure that they are kept in a good state of repair by the following means:’

‘5. protecting the setting of Ancient Monuments and Listed Buildings where proposals could have an impact;’

The issue of development on sites which contain archaeological remains is addressed in Policy DM HD 4 (Archaeological Sites):

‘The Council will seek to protect, enhance and promote its archaeological heritage (both above and below ground), and will encourage its interpretation and presentation to the public. It will take the necessary measures required to safeguard the archaeological remains found, and refuse planning permission where proposals would adversely affect archaeological remains or their setting.’

As the proposal site lies within 500m of the Old Deer Park, a listed park, and the Buffer Zone for the World Heritage Site of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, policies DM OS 4 (Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes) and DM HD 5 (World Heritage Site) also apply. These state respectively:

‘Parks and gardens as well as landscapes of special historic interest included in the Register compiled by English Heritage and other historic parks, gardens and landscapes referred to in para 4.1.11 below’ [i.e. Royal Botanic Gardens Kew and Old Deer Park] ‘will be protected and enhanced. Proposals which have an adverse effect on the settings, views, and vistas to and from historic parks and gardens, will not be permitted.’

and:

‘The Council will work with others, to protect, promote, interpret, sustainably use, conserve and where appropriate enhance the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew World Heritage Site and its setting including the buffer zone by conserving its Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity and significance.

‘Development proposals should not cause adverse impact to the World Heritage Site or its setting that would compromise its Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity and significance, and give appropriate weight to the World Heritage Site Management Plan.’

Issues relating to the effect of the development on the existing designated Local Building of Townscape Merit; the conservation area, and listed buildings nearby are all dealt with in the submitted Design & Access Statement.

Methodology

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute *for* Archaeologists paper ‘*Standards in British Archaeology*’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Greater London Historic Environment Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

General background

Archaeological deposits and finds of all periods on the brick earth and gravel deposits of West London are well known, having come to light during observations carried out over many years during gravel and brick clay extraction (MoLAS 2000) and the study of aerial photographs (e.g., Longley 1976). Large scale developments, especially in the vicinity of Heathrow Airport, have revealed extensive deposits of both the prehistoric and historic periods (e.g., Grimes and Close-Brooks 1993; Barrett *et al.* 2000; FA 2006).

Palaeolithic flint flakes and several hand axes have been dredged from the bed of the present River Thames at Mortlake and Richmond, but these were in a very rolled condition suggesting that they were not *in situ* (Wymer 1987, 27). The site lies on the First Terrace gravel, which is the latest of the gravel terraces formed by the downcutting of the river Thames.

Any Palaeolithic finds recorded therefore have been re-deposited during re-working of older gravels. The numerous Mesolithic flint implements recovered from the foreshore of the Thames in Surrey, and from dredging, indicate Mesolithic activity on the floodplain gravels, although these sites are now either eroded or submerged beneath alluvium (Ellaby 1987, 57; MoLAS 2000, 55). There is also considerable evidence of Mesolithic occupation on the higher terrace deposits, especially in nearby Richmond Park. For the Neolithic period, concentrations of artefacts have been found on an area of gravel overlying the London Clay at Richmond Park and many axes came from the Thames between Ditton and Battersea (Field and Cotton 1987, 79).

Bronze Age activity in the vicinity of the site is also dominated by stray artefacts, mostly of bronze tools, weapons and ornaments dredged from the Thames, especially for the middle and late Bronze Ages (Needham 1987). There is surprisingly little evidence of Iron Age or Roman occupation of the general environs of the site but again with finds of these periods dredged from the river.

The earliest Saxon site in Surrey is at Ham, south of Richmond, where a sunken-featured building, together with a 5th-century pottery was revealed (Poulton 1987, 207). To the south is the presumed Saxon royal residence at Kingston where six kings were crowned between AD 902 and 958 (Poulton 1987, 211). Also, nearby Richmond Palace may have a Saxon origin.

After the Norman Conquest, moated houses or homesteads occur throughout Surrey and a single example is known on the Thames at Richmond (Turner 1987, 231). Also, a Carthusian religious house was located at Sheen and a house of the Friars Observant was located nearby (Turner 1987, 239; 225).

Richmond Palace was one of the most important buildings in England, one of eleven Royal houses in Surrey, primarily associated with Henry VII and Elizabeth I.

Sheen (the early name for Richmond) had already had a palace or palaces as well as a manor house: Edward III transformed a manor house at Sheen into a palace, but this was demolished in the late 14th century. Henry V began building a new palace at Sheen, in the garden of the first palace, and had a manor house (Byfleet-at-Sheen) rebuilt while he waited for the palace, which was not complete on his death, and which burnt down in 1497. Richmond Palace was then built by Henry VII, triggering a spate of the building of other grand houses or palaces nearby by the great and the powerful (e.g., Hampton Court, Nonsuch, Oatlands) (Thurley 2004, 155–6). The court moved between these great palaces, rarely staying longer than 6 weeks at one place, and naturally producing a considerable impact on the local populations.

Several archaeological investigations on the site of the palaces of Richmond/Sheen over several decades have demonstrated the survival of substantial Tudor remains, often no more than 0.8m below the modern surface,

in places even shallower (Cowie and Cloake 2001). The earliest remains found include some dating perhaps from the 15th century.

Greater London Historic Environment Record

A search was made on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) on 15th June 2012 for a radius of 500m around the proposal site. This revealed 144 entries within the search radius although only the archaeological investigations and those listed buildings closest to the site have been addressed here. The archaeological events and World Heritage Site are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1. Listed buildings within 100m of the proposal site are also included in Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 2. The GLHER also indicates that the proposal site lies within the Central Richmond Conservation Area.

Palaeolithic

The GLHER contains one record of a Palaeolithic findspot [**Fig. 1: 1**] for the study area. This consisted of two flint axes and two un-retouched flakes although it is not known exactly where or when they were found. If they came from the river their ultimate origin could have been anywhere upstream.

Bronze Age

Similarly, the GLHER also records three further findspots for the Bronze Age, all different types of bronze spearhead, again apparently with no detailed provenance. Two of these findspots are recorded at the same general grid reference as the Palaeolithic tools [**1**] while the third was found c.100m to the south, a point which may reflect its actual findspot [**2**].

Prehistoric

Two archaeological evaluations, one at Parkshot House [**Figs 1 and 2: 3**] and one at 16-17 George Street [**Fig. 1: 4**], recovered examples of worked flint of a general prehistoric date. The work at Parkshot House, c.70m east of the proposal site, collected 37 pieces of struck flint and 104 fragments of burnt flint, most of which were residual although some were found in subsoil horizons of possible prehistoric date. The 16-17 George Street evaluation, c.400m south of Park Lane, discovered a single prehistoric worked flint in a deposit overlying the natural gravel.

Roman

Three GLHER records relate to Roman finds within the study area. The first of these is a single 3rd-4th century potsherd found during the archaeological evaluation at Parkshot House [**3**] while the other two concern finds made on the site of Richmond Palace. A denarius (coin) of Trajan was found in 1870 on the north-eastern edge of the palace site [**5**] and residual Roman finds were recovered during excavations at 1 Old Palace Place [**6**]. This limited evidence is insufficient to suggest that the area was occupied during the Roman period.

Medieval

Records for medieval finds are spread across the entire search area with features ranging from buried soils to remains of Richmond Palace. The closest finds to the proposal site are from the evaluation at Parkshot House [3] which exposed 12th century features and ploughsoil dating to the medieval period. Pottery and a ditch were found at 16-17 George Street [4] and an iron key dating to the 14th or 15th centuries was discovered near the site of the palace in 1798 [5]. Remains of the medieval palace, particularly deep deposits which probably represent the in-filled moat, were excavated during an evaluation at Asgill Lodge [8] on the north-western edge of the palace site (Cass 2008) while residual medieval finds were recovered from excavations at 1 Old Palace Place on the north-eastern side [6]. Closer to the proposal site, at Duke Street Baptist Church [7] c.200m to the south of the site, medieval horticultural soil was identified overlying the natural geology during a watching brief. The World Heritage Site of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew has its origins in parkland which once belonged to the medieval palace at Richmond. While the Gardens themselves are c.1km north of the proposal site [9], a buffer zone designed to protect their setting cuts across the western end of Park Lane, c.50m to the west of the site [Fig. 2: 9].

Post-medieval

The majority of GLHER records for the study area concern sites of post-medieval date. Archaeological evaluation at 12 Eton Street c.300m south of the proposal site uncovered a 19th century brick foundation [Fig. 1: 2] while the investigations at Parkshot House recorded garden soil and cut features [3]. A series of three evaluations and one watching brief along George Street revealed a variety of post-medieval features. At numbers 9-10 George Street, 19th century basements were found [4], at 16-17 George Street, several phases of post-medieval building were identified [4], further northeast at number 22, the remains of Georgian buildings and a mortar-surfaced yard were uncovered [11] and at 29-34 building foundations, wells and ditches were found [11].

A range of structural remains dating to between the 16th and 18th centuries were recorded during several archaeological investigations at Maids of Honour Row and The Old Palace [5] while an in-filled channel, pottery, a brick floor and a truncated pit were found during various works at Oak House, The Retreat and Old Palace Place, c.100m to the southeast [6]. On the north-western edge of the palace site evaluation at Asgill Lodge [8] uncovered post-medieval made ground and an excavation and watching brief at Old Palace Lane [8] recorded an early 17th century revetment wall and moat along with a later brick structure and cess pits. Elsewhere on the palace site structures which had reused building materials from the palace were identified during a watching brief at Friars Lane [10] and excavations at Trumpeters' House [15] revealed the palace cellars, Tudor masonry structures and demolition from the Privy Lodgings.

To the north of the palace a building survey and watching brief recorded the 1830s house at 8 Old Palace Lane [17]. Approximately 200m east of the proposal site a watching brief at 19-23 Church Road identified a 19th century garden wall and associated soil [12] and an evaluation at Lichfield Gardens uncovered a post-medieval quarry or rubbish pit [16]. The Royal Botanic Gardens, created in 1759, [9] and the Old Deer Park to the south [18], both once part of the parkland belonging to Richmond Palace and the latter still Crown property, both have extensive post-medieval landscape features.

The study area contained 129 records relating to listed buildings however only six of these, all Grade II, are within 100m of the proposal site and are of relevance when assessing the impact the development will have on its local area (Fig. 2). The United Reformed Church [Fig. 2: 13A], built in Gothic style as a Presbyterian church in 1884-5, is listed for its cathedral-like interior. It was the site of a watching brief which recorded the presence of two late post-medieval pits and a 19th century brick wall as well as noting that the area appeared to be widely truncated with post-medieval made ground lying directly on top of the natural gravel.

Facing Little Green, c.80m south of the proposal site, are numbers 1 and 2 [13B] and number 3 [13C] Little Green. The former are a pair of 18th century houses while the latter is a late 18th-/early 19th-century house. On the southern side of Park Lane where it joins Parkshot c.30m southeast of the proposal site is Parkshot Cottage [14C], an early 18th century house with a modern wing to the rear. Immediately adjacent to The Old School site to the east are four listed buildings: 4, 5 and 6 Parkshot [14A] and 3 Parkshot [14B]. The first three make up an early 18th century terrace with number 5 having been modified to form the entrance to Salem Baptist Chapel while number 3 is an early 19th century house.

Modern

Modern features are recorded at archaeological investigations including the evaluation at 9-10 George Street [Fig. 1: 4] and the watching brief and building recording at 1-4 Maids of Honour Row [5]. The entrance to a Cold War-era bomb shelter was identified during an evaluation at The Old Palace, Maids of Honour Row [5] and building features were recorded at Lichfield Gardens [16] and 8 Old Palace Lane [17]. Both the Royal Botanic Gardens [9] and the Old Deer Park [18] contain modern elements, including the London Welsh Rugby Football Ground [19] in the latter.

Unknown

One site recorded in the GLHER, a watching brief at The Old Palace [5], uncovered two undated features.

Negative

An evaluation c.400m south of the proposal site at 10 Paradise Road [20] identified no finds or features of archaeological interest.

World Heritage Sites

The Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew is a UNESCO World Heritage Site (WHS 1084) and is listed as follows:

‘This historic landscape garden features elements that illustrate significant periods of the art of gardens from the 18th to the 20th centuries. The gardens house botanic collections (conserved plants, living plants and documents) that have been considerably enriched through the centuries. Since their creation in 1759, the gardens have made a significant and uninterrupted contribution to the study of plant diversity and economic botany.’

The local planning policies concerning development in the vicinity of the World Heritage Site and its Buffer Zone are outlined above. The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew World Heritage Site Management Plan (RBG 2011) details the provision of a Buffer Zone around the site and raises concerns about development immediately outside this Zone.

Cartographic and documentary sources

The place name of Richmond was first recorded for the area in 1502 when Henry VII renamed the settlement of Sheen as *Richemount* after his earldom, meaning ‘strong hill’ from the Old French *riche* + *mont* (Cameron 1996, 88; Mills 1998, 287). Sheen derives from *scēon*, the Old English for ‘the sheds or shelters’ (Mills 1998, 308). The manor is not recorded in Domesday Book (Williams and Martin 2002) and it is not until 1299 that Edward I is recorded as having resided at Sheen for part of the year but there is no indication of when the first palace may have been built (VCH 1911, 523).

There seem to have been at least two palaces and a manor house at Sheen before Henry VII had Richmond Palace built (or perhaps renamed one of the earlier ones). It is likely that Edward III built the original palace, as he died at Sheen and Richard II was already there on Edward’s death. Details of the history of the several palaces are readily available (VCH 1911; Cowie and Cloake 2001) and are not repeated extensively here. By the late 17th century Richmond palace was in decay and the lodge in the Little (royal) Park at what is now Kew became the favoured royal lodging.

Richmond Park was enclosed by Charles I, originally as a deer park, and hunting in the park was only abolished in 1904.

The growth of the rest of Richmond primarily dates from the 19th century, the population in 1785 (apart from inmates of the workhouse and almshouses) was 815, but even by the middle of the 19th century it was no more than a village. It was as a result of the growth in population that a bridge was finally built between 1774

and 1777, but only with the coming of the railway in the 1840s did its proximity to London lead to rapid growth, with a population of 9,255 by 1851, over 22,000 in 1891 and 25,000 by 1901.

Newspaper cuttings viewed in Richmond Local Studies Library document the date for the construction of the school on the site in Park Lane as 1870 although as an institution it had existed since 1796, having been founded shortly after the arrival of French émigrés and the foundation of the Catholic Mission in Richmond (Richmond and Twickenham Times, 19th June 1970).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site's later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is Saxton's 1573 map of Surrey, Sussex, Middlesex and Kent (Fig. 3). This marks the position of Richmond, presumably the location of the palace, with the village of *Shene* to the north. Due to the scale and the pictorial nature of the map no further details can be determined. Speed's map of Surrey of 1611 (Fig. 4) shows a similar layout with Richmond and *Shyne* with the only major difference being an extra town symbol being added next to the existing one for Richmond.

The map produced by Senex in 1729 (not illustrated) shows Richmond in some detail with buildings and roads plotted although these seem only representative as it is hard to match them with the modern layout. Rocque's maps of London (1766, not illustrated) and Surrey (1768, Fig. 5) show the 18th-century settlement with the Green and Royal Park clearly visible. It is possible to identify Parkshot road and make out the approximate area of the proposal site although it is difficult to tell whether it is open ground or not.

The first map to show the neighbourhood of the proposal site in detail is Richardson's map of the Manor of Richmond which was produced in 1771 (Fig. 6). This shows the area of Park Lane covered by enclosed plots, presumably fields, with an ornamental grove of trees and surrounding woodland at the western end. The proposal site itself exists as a field similar in size and shape to the present plot and almost identical to that shown on the 1866 First Edition Ordnance Survey (see below). Lindley and Crossley's map of 1793 and the Greenwoods' map of 1823 (neither illustrated) clarify the situation somewhat, showing an avenue of trees just to the west of the buildings on the west side of Parkshot, following the line of the road.

The First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1866 (Fig. 7) shows the proposal site as what appears to be a garden with trees around the border and two footpaths leading north-south and east-west. Immediately to the north and east are the back gardens to houses along *Park Shot*, to the south is another open field or garden and to the west a

larger field. The map sheet to the north is not available but it appears that the avenue of trees noted on previous maps has been removed, at least in the vicinity of the proposal site. Other major changes in the area include the construction of the London and South Western Railway and the increase in density of occupation, particularly to the east of Parkshot.

The study area has developed dramatically by 1896 and the Second Edition (Fig. 8), the most important change being the construction of the school on the site itself and the laying down of Park Lane, which extends just over 100m west of Parkshot. The school buildings only occupy the southern half of the site with the north being left open, presumably as a playground. To the west of the site a house and Christ Church have been built, to the north is now a Public Baths while a chapel has been constructed in the back gardens of two of the houses on *Park Shot* to the east. The map sheet to the north was available for study and showed that the avenue of trees noted on the maps of 1793 and 1823 is still in existence *c.*200m to the north of the proposal site on an alignment which would have passed the site *c.*50m to the northwest.

After an interval of seventeen years the next map to show the site is the 1913 Third Edition Ordnance Survey (Fig. 9). By this time the school has been enlarged with the new wing extending northwards from the building's western end and Park Lane has been extended by another 100m. In the school yard, to the north of the main building, a pair of small structures have been built along the boundary wall. In the wider area Christ Church to the west has been removed and a pavilion erected beyond and houses to the north of the site have been replaced by a single larger building.

The proposal site goes without change for the remainder of the first half of the 20th century, with Richmond expanding and developing around it. In 1959 the Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 10) shows that a further extension has been added to the existing one resulting in the school buildings covering roughly two thirds of the site area. This is the first map to label the school as St Elizabeth's R C School. Other developments include the construction of The Gateways residential blocks immediately to the west of the proposal site and what are presumably garage lock-ups to the east. The site undergoes only minor changes before it reaches its present state (Fig. 2). These consist of the removal of the sheds against the northern boundary by 1986 and its change of use from a school to a warehouse with ancillary office space, by 1973. Developments in the wider area in this time period include the construction of the terrace on the opposite side of Park Lane, which occurs between 1973 and 1986, and, in the same interval, the demolition of the former public baths to the north and their replacement with the current magistrates' court.

Geotechnical test pits

The British Geological Survey (BGS) online database provides details of four boreholes which have been sunk in the vicinity of the proposal site. Two are immediately to the north at Richmond Court House (TQ 1792 7524 and TQ 1798 7523) and two to the south on the opposite side of Park Lane (c. TQ 1788 7517, exact positions not known). The full reports are provided in Appendix 3 below.

All four of the boreholes record a similar stratigraphy comprising c.1.10m of made ground overlying c.4.00m of coarse yellow-brown sand and gravel, c.0.25m stiff brown clay and then firm grey fissured silty clay to the bottom of the boreholes. In the two boreholes to the north of the site there is an extra layer of brown clayey sand above the yellow-brown sand and gravel, although in one of these it contains brick and is listed as made ground. These sections suggest that there is little or no topsoil or buried soil with the made ground giving way to the natural gravel without any intervening layers.

Listed buildings

As mentioned previously, there are 129 listed buildings within 500m of the proposal site although only six are within 100m. Of these six, only three have direct line-of-sight to The Old School and a potential redevelopment of the site could therefore have some effect on their settings, to various degrees. The three listed buildings are all Grade II level and are described as follows:

Parkshot Cottage [Fig. 2: 14C]

‘Early C18 house. Two storeys, 3 windows, brown brick with red dressings. Segmental arched window openings, flush sash boxes. Modern wing behind of no interest.’

3 Parkshot [14B]

‘Early C19. Three storey house, 2 windows. Parapeted brick front. Doorway in coved, arched recess with radial-patterned fanlight. Square gauged-headed sash windows.’

4, 5 and 6 Parkshot [14A]

‘Early C18 terrace. Two storeys over basement, attic. Three windows wide each. Brown brick with red dressings. Tiled gambrel roof with dormers. Rusticated stucco doorcases. Ground floor front of No 5 has been altered to form an entrance to the Salem Baptist Church, with pointed archaves. Segmental headed flush framed sash windows retaining some of glazing bars. Staircase remaining inside.’

The proposed development on The Old School site has therefore been specifically designed to respect the settings of the above listed buildings in order not to detract from their settings. This is dealt with more fully in the submitted Design & Access Statement.

Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields

The Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, incorporating the Old Deer Park, lies c.200m to the northwest of the proposal site, and are Grade I listed on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England (1000830). The listing gives an extended description of the Gardens and the Old Deer Park including details of their setting, composition and histories. This is summarised by the following sentence:

‘A botanic garden established in the early C18 and increased in size under Sir William Hooker in the mid C19. The gardens were set within a royal park and remodelled periodically by leading designers.’

The Royal Botanic Gardens, containing several listed buildings, is physically separated from the Old Deer Park to the south by an 18th century ha-ha. The Old Deer Park is now occupied by the Royal Mid-Surrey Golf Club (founded 1892) with other public sports facilities along the southern edge and the Royal Observatory (listed Grade I) to the west.

There are no registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

Historic Hedgerows

There are no hedgerows, historic or otherwise, on the site.

Aerial Photographs

The site area lies within an urban area which has been developed since before the advent of aerial photography. No photographic collections have therefore been consulted.

Discussion

The main heritage asset on the site itself is the designated Local Building of Townscape Merit, although this building is not on the Statutory lists. It remains to establish if there may be potential for previously unknown other heritage assets, that is, below-ground archaeological remains.

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

While the proposal site appears to have been fields and gardens until the construction of the school in 1870, excavations a short distance away uncovered finds and features dating from the prehistoric period onwards. It is

possible that the construction of the school and its subsequent extensions will have disturbed the upper levels of the ground beneath and therefore destroyed any shallower archaeological deposits. However, deeper deposits and any in the playground area are less likely to have been disturbed.

Documentary sources show that Richmond has been an important centre from the medieval period onwards while archaeological investigations have revealed occupation of earlier dates still. As such the site has a high archaeological potential as reflected by its position within a designated archaeological priority area, in particular along its northern edge where the new townhouse development is proposed.

It is anticipated therefore that it will be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. A scheme for this evaluation will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Borough and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor. Such a scheme could be implemented by an appropriately worded condition to any planning permission granted.

References

- Barrett, J C, Lewis, J S C and Welsh, K, 2000, 'Perry Oaks - a history of inhabitation Part 2', *London Archaeologist*, **9**
- BGS, 1981, *British Geological Survey*, 1:50,000 Sheet 270, Solid and Drift Edition, Keyworth
- Cameron, K, 1996, *English Place Names*, London
- Cass, S, 2008 'Asgill Lodge, Old Palace Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond: An archaeological evaluation', Thames Valley Archaeological Services unpublished report 07/144b
- Cowie, R and Cloake, J, 2001, 'A archaeological survey of Richmond Palace, Surrey', *Post-Medieval Archaeol* **35**, 3-52
- Ellaby, R, 1987, 'The Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic in Surrey', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 165-96
- FA, 2006, *Landscape Evolution in the Middle Thames Valley*, Framework Archaeology, monogr **1**, Oxford/Salisbury
- Field, D and Cotton, J, 1987, 'Neolithic Surrey: a survey of the evidence', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 71-96
- Grimes, W F and Close-Brooks, J, 1993, 'The excavation of Caesar's Camp, Heathrow, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1944', *Proc Prehist Soc* **59**, 303-6
- Hanworth, R, 1987, 'The Iron Age in Surrey', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 139-64
- London Borough of Richmond, 2011, *Development Management Plan*, Twickenham
- Longley, D, 1976, 'The archaeological implications of gravel extraction in north-west Surrey', *Surrey Archaeol Soc Res Vol 3*, 1-35 Guildford
- Milbank, D, 2012, 'The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond: building survey', Thames Valley Archaeological Services unpublished report 12/80b
- Mills, A D, 1998, *Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford
- MoLAS, 2000, *The Archaeology of Greater London; an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area now covered by Greater London* Museum of London Archaeology Service Monogr
- Needham, S, 1987, 'The Bronze Age', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 97-137
- NPPF, 2012, *National Planning Policy Framework*, Dept Communities and Local Government, London
- Poulton, R, 1987, 'Saxon Surrey', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 197-222
- RBG, 2011, *Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew: World Heritage Site Management Plan*, Kew

- Thurley, S, 2004, 'The impact of royal landholdings on the county of Surrey 1509-1649' in J Cotton, G Crocker and A Graham (eds), *Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey; towards a research framework for the county*, Surrey Archaeol Soc, Guildford, 155-68
- Turner, D J, 1987, 'Archaeology of Surrey, 1066-1540', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 223-61
- VCH, 1911, *Victoria History of the Counties of England: Surrey*, **iii**, London
- Williams, A and Martin, G H (eds), 2002, *Domesday Book: A Complete Translation*, London
- Wymer, J J, 1987, 'The Palaeolithic period in Surrey', in J Bird and D G Bird (eds), *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, Guildford, 17-30

APPENDIX 1: Historic Environment Records within a 500m search radius of the development site

<i>No</i>	<i>HER Ref</i>	<i>Grid Ref (TQ)</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1	MLO10647	1800 7500	Findspot	Palaeolithic	Two flint axes and two unretouched flakes.
	MLO18970	1800 7500	Findspot	Bronze Age	Leaf-shaped bronze spearhead, found June 1918.
	MLO18988	1800 7500	Findspot	Bronze Age	Basal-looped bronze spearhead, found 1885.
2	MLO23454	1800 7490	Findspot	Bronze Age	Part of a bronze socketed spearhead.
	ELO3232 MLO75098	1803 7491	Evaluation	Post-medieval	19th century brick foundation found at 12 Eton Street.
3	ELO4279 MLO61839 MLO61841 MLO61842 MLO61844 MLO61845 MLO61846	1802 7524	Evaluation	Prehistoric, Roman, medieval, post- medieval	37 pieces of residual struck flint and 104 fragments of burnt flint, a Roman potsherd, 12th century features, 12th-14th century ploughsoil and post-medieval garden soil and cut features found at 10-12 Parkshot/5-10 Kew Road (Parkshot House).
4	ELO3358 MLO64400 MLO64401 MLO64402 MLO64404 MLO64407 MLO64408	1785 7481	Evaluation	Prehistoric, medieval, post- medieval	Prehistoric worked flint, medieval pottery and ditch and remains of several phases of post-medieval buildings found at 16-17 George Street.
	ELO3354 MLO66654	1780 7480	Evaluation	Post-medieval, modern	19th century and modern basements found at 9-10 George Street.
5	MLO18993	1760 7490	Findspot	Roman	Denarius of Trajan found in Richmond in 1870.
	MLO19046	1758 7492	Findspot	Medieval	14th/15th century iron key, found 1798.
	ELO8381 MLO90952 MLO99302 MLO19133	17617 74917	Watching brief, building recording	Post-medieval, modern	Post-medieval and modern features at 1-4 Maids of Honour Row.
	ELO143 MLO75643	1759 7492	Watching brief	Post-medieval	16th century walls and later features found at The Old Palace.
	ELO6977 MLO98334 MLO101009	17597 74931	Excavation	Post-medieval, modern	17th-18th century building remains and modern Cold War bomb shelter found at The Old Palace, Maids of Honour Row.
	ELO4735 MLO62877 MLO62875 MLO62870	1759 7492	Watching brief	Post-medieval, unknown	16th and 18th century structural remains and undated features found at The Old Palace.
	ELO11267	17667 74827	Excavation	Roman, medieval, post- medieval	Three phases of activity: 15th-17th, 17th and 17th-19th centuries, and residual Roman and medieval finds at 1 Old Palace Place.
6	ELO11167	1768 7481	Watching brief	Post-medieval	Shallow excavation found only 16th/17th century pottery at Oak House.
	ELO11602 ELO12342	1768 7475	Evaluation	Post-medieval	In-filled post-medieval channel and remains of 19th century structures found at The Retreat. One trench with post-medieval features at The Retreat.
	ELO5161 MLO78179	17660 74830	Watching brief	Post-medieval	Earlier brick floor found at 2 Old Palace Place.
	ELO774 MLO76242	17660 74830	Evaluation	Post-medieval	Base of a truncated pit found at Old Palace Place.
	ELO7728 MLO99304	17928 75012	Watching brief	Medieval	Medieval horticultural soil found overlying natural geology at Duke Street Baptist Church.
	ELO8605 MLO19133	17481 74941	Evaluation	Medieval, post- medieval	Deep deposits possibly representing the medieval palace moat and later post-medieval made ground found at Asgill Lodge.
8	ELO141 MLO77284 MLO77283 MLO77285	1745 7492	Excavation, watching brief	Post-medieval	Early 17th century moat and revetment wall, 17th century brick structure and two 18th century cess pits found at Old Palace Lane.
	DLO33112 MLO101340	1794 7618	World Heritage Site, Park	Medieval, post- medieval, modern	Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew - royal park with the botanic gardens established in the 18th century. WHS 1084.
10	ELO1471 MLO77286	1754 7489	Watching brief	Post-medieval	Building reusing materials from Richmond Palace found at Friars Lane.
11	ELO3357 MLO64535 MLO64536	1788 7484	Watching brief	Post-medieval	Remains of Georgian buildings and mortared yard surface found at 22 George Street.
	ELO10500 MLO63606 MLO63605 MLO63607	1792 7488	Evaluation	Post-medieval	17th-18th century building foundations, wells and ditches found at 29-34 George Street.

<i>No</i>	<i>HER Ref</i>	<i>Grid Ref (TQ)</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Comment</i>
12	ELO2996	1817 7522	Watching brief	Post-medieval	19th century garden wall and soil found at 19-23 Church Road.
13A	DLO26335 MLO91338 ELO6085	17952 75093	Listed building Watching brief	Post-medieval	United Reformed Church - former Presbyterian church, built 1884-5. Late post-medieval pits and brick wall found at former United Reformed Church.
13B	DLO26134 MLO91137	17928 75118	Listed building	Post-medieval	1 and 2 Little Green - 18th century houses.
13C	DLO25992 MLO91009	17917 75122	Listed building	Post-medieval	3 Little Green - late 18th-/early 19th-century house.
14A	DLO26526 MLO91529	17963 75202	Listed building	Post-medieval	4, 5, 6 Parkshot - early 18th century terrace with No. 5 modified to form entrance to Salem Baptist Chapel.
14B	DLO26435 MLO91438	17960 75196	Listed building	Post-medieval	3 Parkshot - early 19th century house.
14C	DLO25976 MLO90993	17945 75168	Listed building	Post-medieval	Parkshot Cottage - early 18th century house with modern rear wing.
15	ELO147 MLO77288 MLO77287	1750 7485	Excavation	Post-medieval	Various remains of Richmond Palace found at Trumpeters' House.
16	ELO3870 MLO3955	1820 7510	Excavation	Post-medieval, modern	Post-medieval quarry or rubbish pit and modern building features found at Lichfield Gardens.
17	ELO8689 MLO91020	17479 74994	Watching brief, building recording	Post-medieval, modern	1830s house and remains of 1970s extension at 8 Old Palace Lane.
18	MLO102917	17552 75660	Park	Post-medieval, modern	Old Deer Park - fragment of the original park of Richmond Palace.
19	MLO102977	1795 7554	Rugby pitch	Modern	London Welsh Rugby ground within the Old Deer Park.
20	ELO10268	17989 74847	Evaluation	Negative	No archaeological finds/features at 10 Paradise Rd.

Listed Buildings Grade II unless stated.