



ST. MARY'S COLLEGE  
Waldegrave Road  
Twickenham  
TW1

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Archaeological desk-based assessment

January 2007

07 / 4107 / FULL

RECEIVED  
27 NOV 2007  
PLANNING



MUSEUM OF LONDON

Archaeology Service

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE  
Waldegrave Road  
Twickenham  
TWI

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Archaeological desk-based assessment

National Grid Reference: 515760 171950

Project Manager  
Author  
Graphics

Stewart Hoad  
Robert Cowie  
Carlos Lemos

**Museum of London Archaeology Service**  
© **Museum of London 2007**

Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED  
tel 020 7410 2200 fax 020 7410 2201  
email [molas@molas.org.uk](mailto:molas@molas.org.uk)  
web [www.molas.org.uk](http://www.molas.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

|           |  |           |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>Introduction .....</b>                                      | <b>2</b>  |
| 1.1       | Origin and scope of the report .....                           | 2         |
| 1.2       | Site status .....  | 2         |
| 1.3       | Aims and objectives .....                                      | 3         |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>Methodology and sources consulted .....</b>                 | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>Legislative and planning framework.....</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| 3.1       | National planning policy guidance .....                        | 5         |
|           | Archaeology .....  | 5         |
| 3.2       | Regional guidance: The London Plan .....                       | 6         |
| 3.3       | Local Planning Policy.....                                     | 6         |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>Archaeological and historical background .....</b>          | <b>8</b>  |
| 4.1       | Site location, topography and geology .....                    | 8         |
| 4.2       | Overview of past archaeological investigations .....           | 8         |
| 4.3       | Chronological summary .....                                    | 9         |
|           | Prehistoric period (c 500,000 – AD43) .....                    | 9         |
|           | Roman period (AD43–410).....                                   | 9         |
|           | Early medieval (Saxon) period (AD410–1066) .....               | 10        |
|           | Later medieval period (AD1066-1485).....                       | 10        |
|           | Post-medieval period (AD1485-present) .....                    | 10        |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>Archaeological potential .....</b>                          | <b>12</b> |
| 5.1       | Factors affecting archaeological survival .....                | 12        |
|           | Natural geology .....  | 12        |
|           | Past impacts.....  | 12        |
|           | Likely depth/thickness of archaeological remains .....         | 12        |
| 5.2       | Archaeological potential.....                                  | 12        |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>Impact of proposals.....</b>                                | <b>14</b> |
| 6.1       | Proposals.....   | 14        |
| 6.2       | Implications .....   | 14        |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>Conclusions and recommendations .....</b>                   | <b>15</b> |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>                                   | <b>16</b> |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>Gazetteer of known archaeological sites and finds .....</b> | <b>17</b> |
| <b>10</b> | <b>Bibliography .....</b>                                      | <b>18</b> |

10.1 Published and documentary sources.....18  
10.2 Cartographic sources .....19  
**11 Appendix 1: Borehole logs from the recent soil investigation.....20**

**FIGURES**

Cover: Detail from John Rocque’s map of 1746

Fig 1 Site location .....21  
Fig 2 Archaeological features map .....22  
Fig 3 Detail from John Rocque’s map of 1746 showing the approximate position of the site .....23  
Fig 4 Detail from Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25” map of 1863 .....24  
Fig 5 Detail from Ordnance Survey 25” map of 1914/1915.....24  
Fig 6 Detail from Ordnance Survey 25” map of 1934.....25  
Fig 7 Detail from Ordnance Survey 1:2500 map of 1962 .....25  
Fig 8 St Mary’s College: site plan showing existing Block R (adapted from Rivington Street Studio Architecture dwg no 05.01, November 06).....26  
Fig 9 St Mary’s College: proposed development (adapted from Rivington Street Studio Architecture dwg no 05.02, September 06).....27

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

## Summary (non-technical)

*Dobson White Boulcott Ltd on behalf of St Mary's College, Twickenham, has commissioned the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) to carry out an archaeological desk-based assessment of proposed development at St Mary's College, Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, TW1 4SX (National Grid Reference 515760 171950).*

*This desk-based assessment forms an initial stage of archaeological investigation of the area of proposed development (hereafter also referred to as the 'site') and may be required at a future date in relation to the planning process in order that the local authority can formulate appropriate responses in the light of any identified archaeological resource.*

*The site lies within an Area of Archaeological Priority as defined by the local authority, and is about 150m south of a Grade II\* listed garden belonging to Strawberry Hill.*

*The site has an uncertain but possibly moderate potential to contain archaeological remains, especially evidence for field systems and rural settlements dated to the prehistoric and Roman periods. Excavated evidence from other sites on both sides of the river between Richmond and Teddington suggest that any such remains would probably take the form of widely scattered cut features, such as ditches, gullies, pits and postholes. The site has low potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the early medieval, later medieval and post-medieval periods. Nevertheless, the presence of unrecorded early medieval remains of 5th- to 7th-century date cannot be ruled out altogether.*

*The development proposal will entail the removal of an all-weather playing surface and the construction of a new sports block, car park and access road. There may also be some landscaping involving tree-planting. The impact of ground works for the proposed scheme would probably either partially or completely remove any archaeological features within their footprints.*

*The decision on the archaeological response to this assessment rests with the Local Planning Authority and their designated advisor. However, given the substantial size of the proposed development area, its location on a well-drained river terrace near the river Thames and its archaeological potential it is likely that some form of archaeological evaluation would be required.*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Origin and scope of the report

1.1.1 Dobson White Boulcott Ltd on behalf of St Mary's College, Twickenham, has commissioned the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) to carry out an archaeological desk-based assessment of a proposed development at St Mary's College, Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, TW1 4SX (National Grid Reference 515760 171950: Fig 1).

1.1.2 The development will entail the removal of an all-weather playing surface and the construction of a new sports block, car park and access road. There may also be some landscaping involving tree-planting.

1.1.3 This desk-based assessment forms an initial stage of archaeological investigation of the area of proposed development (hereafter also referred to as the 'site') and may be required at a future date in relation to the planning process in order that the local authority can formulate appropriate responses in the light of any identified archaeological resource.

1.1.4 The desk-based assessment has been carried out in accordance with the standards specified by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA 2001) and the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers. Under the 'Copyright, Designs and Patents Act' 1988 MoLAS retains the copyright to this document.

1.1.5 Note: within the limitations imposed by dealing with historical material and maps, the information in this document is, to the best knowledge of the author and MoLAS, correct at the time of writing. Further archaeological investigation, more information about the nature of the present buildings, and/or more detailed proposals for redevelopment may require changes to all or parts of the document.

## 1.2 Site status

1.2.1 The site is designated as Metropolitan Open Land and lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the local authority. The latter corresponds roughly with the area occupied by the current college campus and includes the 18th-century house and grounds of Strawberry Hill (home of Horace Walpole). The site lies *c* 150m south of a Grade II\* listed garden belonging to Strawberry Hill.

**1.3 Aims and objectives**

1.3.1 The aim of the assessment is to:

- Describe the survival and extent of known or potential archaeological features that may be affected by the proposals;
- Assess the likely impacts arising from the proposals;
- Provide recommendations to further quantify the nature of the archaeological resources or mitigation aimed at reducing or removing completely any adverse impacts.

## 2 Methodology and sources consulted

- 2.1.1 For the purposes of this report the documentary and cartographic sources, including results from any archaeological investigations in the close proximity of the area of proposed development and a study area around it were examined in order to determine the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological remains that may be present within the site.
- 2.1.2 In order to set the site into its full archaeological and historical context, information was collected on the known archaeology within a 750m-radius study area around the area of proposed development, as held by the primary repositories of archaeological information within Greater London. These comprise the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record (GLSMR) and the London Archaeological Archive and Resource Centre (LAARC). The SMR is managed by English Heritage and includes information from past investigations, local knowledge, find spots, and documentary and cartographic sources. LAARC includes a public archive of past investigations and is managed by the Museum of London.
- 2.1.3 In addition, the following sources were consulted:
- MoLAS – Geographical Information System for Greater London, published local history, published historic maps and archaeological publications
  - Ordnance Survey maps
  - British Geological Survey (BGS) - geology map sheet 270
  - Site plans by Rivington Street Studio Architecture (September and November 2006, drawing nos 05.02 and 05.01)
  - Internet - web-published material including Local Plan
- 2.1.4 The following individuals were consulted: Jane Baxter (Richmond upon Thames Local Studies Library), Philip Boulcott (Dobson White Boulcott Ltd) and David Tucker (Rivington Street Studio Architecture).
- 2.1.5 The assessment included a site visit carried out on 19 December, 2006, in order to determine the topography of the site and existing land use, and to provide further information on areas of possible past ground disturbance and general archaeological potential. Observations made on the site visit have been incorporated into this report.
- 2.1.6 The degree to which archaeological deposits actually survive on the site will depend on previous land use, so an assessment is made of the destructive effect of the previous and present activity and/or buildings, from the study of available plan information, ground investigation reports, or similar.
- 2.1.7 Fig 2 shows the location of known archaeological sites and finds within the study area. These have been allocated a unique assessment reference number (DBA 1, 2, etc), which is listed in a gazetteer at the back of this report and is referred to in the text. A full bibliography and list of sources consulted may be found in section 10.



### 3 Legislative and planning framework

#### 3.1 National planning policy guidance

##### *Archaeology*

- 3.1.1 Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning (PPG16) sets out the Secretary of State's policy on archaeological remains, and provides many recommendations subsequently integrated into local development plans. The key points in PPG16 can be summarised as follows:

Archaeological remains should be seen as a finite and non-renewable resource, and in many cases highly fragile and vulnerable to damage and destruction. Appropriate management is therefore essential to ensure that they survive in good condition. In particular, care must be taken to ensure that archaeological remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. They can contain irreplaceable information about our past and the potential for an increase in future knowledge. They are part of our sense of national identity and are valuable both for their own sake and for their role in education, leisure and tourism.

Where nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by a proposed development there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation.

The key to informed and reasonable planning decisions is for consideration to be given early, before formal planning applications are made, to the question of whether archaeological remains are known to exist on a site where development is planned and the implications for the development proposal.

When important remains are known to exist, or when archaeologists have good reason to believe that important remains exist, developers will be able to help by preparing sympathetic designs using, for example, foundations which avoid disturbing the remains altogether or minimise damage by raising ground levels under a proposed new structure, or by careful siting of landscaped or open areas.

If physical preservation *in situ* is not feasible, an archaeological excavation for the purposes of 'preservation by record' may be an acceptable alternative. From an archaeological point of view, this should be regarded as a second-best option. Agreements should also provide for the subsequent publication of the results of any excavation programme.

Decisions by planning authorities on whether to preserve archaeological remains *in situ*, in the face of proposed development, have to be taken on merit, taking account of development plan policies and all other material considerations – including the importance of the remains – and weighing these against the need for development.

Planning authorities, when they propose to allow development which is damaging to archaeological remains, must ensure that the developer has satisfactorily provided for excavation and recording, either through voluntary agreement with the archaeologists or, in the absence of agreement, by imposing an appropriate condition on the planning permission.

### 3.2 Regional guidance: The London Plan

- 3.2.1 The over-arching strategies and policies for the whole of the Greater London area are contained within the GLA's London Plan (Feb 2004) also include statements relating to archaeology:

Policy 4B.14 Archaeology The Mayor, in partnership with English Heritage, the Museum of London and boroughs, will support the identification, protection, interpretation and presentation of London's archaeological resources. Boroughs in consultation with English Heritage and other relevant statutory organisations should include appropriate policies in their UDPs for protecting scheduled ancient monuments and archaeological assets within their area."

### 3.3 Local Planning Policy

- 3.3.1 The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames's *Unitary Development Plan* (UDP) was adopted in 1996. The *Unitary Development Plan: First Review* was adopted by the Council for development control purposes on 1 March 2005. The policies set out in this document determine the position of archaeology as a material consideration in the planning process and incorporate recommendations from the Department of the Environment's *Planning Policy Guidance Note 16* (PPG 16). Richmond's policies on archaeology are summarized below:

#### BLT 7 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

**Para 6.31** The Council will seek to promote the conservation, protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage of the Borough, including industrial archaeology, and will encourage the interpretation and presentation of sites, finds and research to the public.

**Para 6.32** The Council is committed to developing the potential of archaeological sites in terms of education, recreation and tourism. This will involve agreements with developers who will be expected to include design, land use and management safeguards for archaeological sites affected by their proposals. The term 'archaeology' may include industrial sites, buildings, machinery and artefacts of the 19th and 20th centuries where these are of historic or architectural interest.

#### BLT 8 EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

**Para 6.33** Where development proposals may affect archaeological remains or areas of archaeological potential as identified on the archaeological constraints map (see Map 7) the Council will encourage early discussion of the implications with developers and specialist bodies where appropriate. The Council may require the applicant to arrange and make adequate provision, including funding, for an archaeological field evaluation, according to a written specification agreed with the Council, before proposals can be considered.

**Para 6.34** Prospective developers should include as part of their research into the development potential of a site which they undertake before they make a planning application, an initial assessment of whether the site is known or likely to contain archaeological remains by consultation with the appropriate specialist bodies, normally English Heritage. Where this indicates that important remains may exist the Council may require an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out before any decision on the planning application is taken. This will probably involve a ground survey and small

scale trial trenching carried out by a professionally qualified archaeologist. This evaluation will help define the character and extent of the remains and thus indicate the weight that should be attached to their preservation. It will also be helpful in identifying potential options for minimising or avoiding damage. The Council will normally expect developers to provide the results of such assessments and evaluation as part of their application: where necessary it will consider service of a direction under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988 to require provision of information. The Council wishes to endorse the spirit of the Code of Practice already established by The British Archaeologists and Developers Liaison Group. *Map 7 shows Archaeological Constraints in the Borough.*

#### **BLT 9 DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES**

**Para 6.35** Where development affects sites of archaeological importance the Council will normally require that the applicant satisfies the Council that appropriate provision, including funding, has been made for the remains to be preserved in situ, or in exceptional cases where preservation in situ is not appropriate or feasible, excavated and recorded. A condition will normally be attached to any consent granted requiring these works to be carried out.

**Para 6.36** The proposals map identifies scheduled ancient monuments. The archaeological constraints map identifies areas with archaeological potential where sites of importance could exist. Not all sites of archaeological importance will necessarily be on the constraints map. Established procedures of consultation and evaluation must be followed in preparing development proposals. On sites of archaeological importance the Council will ensure, wherever possible, that archaeological remains are preserved in situ. However, this need not prevent the development of the site providing that special attention is paid to the protection of remains through the careful design of buildings and their foundations. In considering such proposals the Council will liaise with English Heritage and other appropriate organisations. Where proposals will cause significant damage to sites of acknowledged importance the Council will refuse planning permission. In exceptional circumstances, where the Council decides that preservation in situ is not justified and that development resulting in destruction of the remains should proceed, it will have to satisfy itself before granting planning permission that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of the remains. Such excavation and recording should be carried out before development commences, working to a brief agreed by the Council and with advice from archaeological consultants. To achieve this, a legal agreement may be sought, or a condition may be imposed. If, following the granting of planning permission, the site is found to contain previously undetected archaeological remains, the Council will seek to enter into negotiations and agreement with the developer to resolve any conflicts. Remains deemed to be of national importance can be scheduled by the Secretary of State in which case the developer would need to seek separate scheduled monument consent. Applications for financial assistance may be made to English Heritage in particular cases.

- 3.3.2 The Council has designated a number of Areas of Archaeological Priority in the borough. The present site lies within one of these Areas.

## 4 Archaeological and historical background

### 4.1 Site location, topography and geology

- 4.1.1 The site is located in the grounds of St Mary's College, Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, TW1 4SX (National Grid Reference 515760 171950: Fig 1). It is in an area of open ground in the south-west corner of the campus. The site is bounded by Waldegrave Road to the west, a sports hall and the gardens of houses in Waldegrave Park to the south, and a gymnasium and playing field to the east. The main college buildings lie to the north.
- 4.1.2 The site falls within the historic parish of Twickenham, and lay within the county of Middlesex prior to being absorbed into the administration of the Greater London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
- 4.1.3 The site lies on fairly level ground. The adjacent stretch of Waldegrave Road lies at 11m OD. The nearest Ordnance Survey benchmarks are located 40m west of the site at 239 Waldgrave Road (value 11.66m OD), and 80m south of the site at the front end of a wall between 5 and 7 Waldegrave Park (value 10.83m OD).
- 4.1.4 The site lies just under 500m west of the current course of the Thames, although the local drift geology suggests that the river once ran closer to the site (river alluvium lies about 320m to the east) (British Geological Survey 1981). Building work at 51 Strawberry Vale (DBA 1), 400m to the north-east, revealed alluvial shelly sand and clay, which must have been deposited within a former course of the Thames.
- 4.1.5 Until the 19th century a small stream openly flowed about 300m to the north of the site. It appears on 17th- and 18th-century maps, and is named as 'Cross deep' on John Rocque's map of 1746. On the Twickenham Inclosure Award Map of 1819 it is shown running between Waldegrave Road and Tower Road before disappearing at the Cross Deep Road, where presumably it ran through a culvert before joining the Thames.
- 4.1.6 A survey (trial holes and boreholes) of the site was recently completed by a structural engineer. The results of the survey should be available in a formal report at the end of January 2007 (D Tucker, pers comm. 19.12.2006).
- 4.1.7 The results of an archaeological evaluation in 1992 on the site now occupied by Crown Hall and Cashin Hall (60m to the south-west) suggest that river terrace gravel lies at a depth of 0.94m below ground level (Sloane 1992; DBA11).

### 4.2 Overview of past archaeological investigations

- 4.2.1 There has been very little archaeological investigation in the immediate locality. Those that have been undertaken have been small-scale evaluations and watching briefs (see Section 9).
- 4.2.2 The results of these investigations, along with other known sites and finds within the study areas, is discussed by period, below.

### 4.3 Chronological summary

#### *Prehistoric period (c 500,000 – AD43)*

- 4.3.1 Stratified remains of fauna and flora possibly dating to the Palaeolithic period have been found at Popes Grove, Twickenham (**DBA 2**; Leeson and Laffan 1894), about 750m to the north of the site. Although no artefacts of Mesolithic date have been found in the immediate vicinity of the site, a large number of Mesolithic flint implements and waste material has been collected from Ham Fields, including cores, microliths and axes/adzes (Lacaille 1966).
- 4.3.2 The main evidence for Neolithic occupation in Twickenham comes from Church Street, where a linear feature (possibly a water channel but more probably a ditch) produced a substantial assemblage of Early Neolithic pottery and struck flints (Sanford 1968; 1970). In addition, a number of stray finds of Neolithic and Bronze Age date have been found in the surrounding area, especially in Ham Fields and the Thames (**DBA 3–DBA 5**; Adkins and Jackson 1978; Lawrence 1929, 76–9). Indeed, the Thames in west London has been one of the richest sources of Bronze Age metalwork in Britain. Local river finds include two dagger blades, a spearhead, two axes and a leaf-shaped sword from the Thames near Pope's Villa, about 800m north-east of the site.
- 4.3.3 Fragmentary evidence for Bronze Age field systems in the form of ditches has been found in Twickenham at Pope's Grotto public house (**DBA 6**) and the site of South Middlesex Hospital, c 2.5km north of the site (Cowie 2001, 248–51). At the former an east–west ditch containing struck flints was traced for a discontinuous length of 18.5m.
- 4.3.4 Evidence for two Bronze Age burial mounds has been found a short distance to the south of the study area. The nearest was a barrow in Sandy Lane, Teddington, about 1.6km to the south of the site, which was investigated in 1854 (Akerman 1855; Howe 2005). The other burial site was at Hurst Park, East Molesey, about 3km south-west of the site (Andrews 1996).
- 4.3.5 Little evidence of Iron Age activity has been found near the site. An unidentified feature at Pope's Grotto public house (**DBA 6**) produced a sherd of pottery probably dating to either the late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age. Other stray finds of Iron Age date from the area include pottery from Ham Fields on the opposite bank (**DBA 7**; Field 1983, 180–82), and a hoard of potin coins from Eel Pie Island (Smith 1920, 18). Excavations at St John's Hospital, Twickenham, 1.8km north-east of the site, revealed a number of features provisionally dated to the Iron Age, including two postholes, two parallel gullies and a ditch (Hoad 1995).

#### *Roman period (AD43–410)*

- 4.3.6 There have been few finds of Roman date in the locality. Pottery has been recovered from two sites in the study area (**DBA 8** and **DBA 9**). However, outside the study area several sites have produced archaeological evidence suggesting that a series of farmsteads once extended along the riverbank in this area. They include St. John's Hospital (see above), where several Late Roman drainage ditches and an enclosure ditch were recorded, and Heathcote

Road Nursery, Twickenham Bridge, approximately 3km north-east of the site, where traces of buildings dated to 1st to 2nd centuries AD were found (Hoad 1995).

*Early medieval (Saxon) period (AD410–1066)*

- 4.3.7 The site lies roughly midway between Twickenham and Teddington, which are both mentioned in Saxon documents. The first reference to Twickenham (*tuican hom*) is in a charter of 704 (Gelling 1979, no. 191; Sawyer 1968, no. 65), while the earliest probable reference to Teddington is in the will (AD 968–971) of Aelfheah, ealdorman, who left land to his brother at ‘*Tudincgatun*’ (Sawyer 1968, no. 1485). Both places are also mentioned in other supposedly Saxon charters, but these are regarded as forgeries.
- 4.3.8 Although documentary sources suggest that estates were being farmed in the locality during the Saxon period no physical evidence for activity dating to this period has been found in the immediate vicinity of the site. The nearest known Saxon settlement sites were those investigated at Ham and Hurst Park, respectively 1km to the east and 3km to the south-west (Andrews 1996; Cowie and Blackmore in prep).

*Later medieval period (AD1066–1485)*

- 4.3.9 Neither Twickenham nor Teddington are mentioned in the Domesday survey of 1086, although small nucleated villages subsequently developed in both places. Both had medieval churches dedicated to St Mary. Little archaeological evidence has been found for these settlements, although excavations in Twickenham revealed a rubbish pit containing 15th-century pottery at 29 and 31 King Street (Cowie 1996; Greenwood and Maloney 1997, 53) and a medieval ditch in Church Street car park (Girardon and Heathcote 1989, 76), respectively 1.2 and 1.5km north-east of the site.
- 4.3.10 During the later medieval period the site was probably farmland more than 1km from the medieval villages of Twickenham and Teddington.

*Post-medieval period (AD1485–present)*

- 4.3.11 The site appears to have remained undeveloped throughout the post-medieval period despite lying near local thoroughfares.
- 4.3.12 In the late 17th century the site lay to the south of a modest villa in an area known as ‘Strawberry Hill Shot’. John Rocque’s map of 1746 shows the area of the site among fields to the south of a small group of buildings. In 1748 Horace Walpole bought the house with five acres of land and over the next few decades transformed the property, named simply Strawberry Hill, into a gothic ‘castle’ (Weinreb and Hibbert 1983, 833; VCH 1962, 143).
- 4.3.13 In 1846 it passed (via Walpole’s Waldegrave relatives) to Frances, Countess Waldegrave, who substantially restored and enlarged the house. The 1863 Ordnance Survey map clearly shows the buildings and gardens of Strawberry Hill (**DBA 10**), and those of other properties (named on later maps as The Cedars and Elm Cottage) immediately to the south. The site itself lay in fields a little further to the south, which were divided by boundaries

(probably fences) and a narrow strip of trees (all aligned east–west).

- 4.3.14 By the beginning of the 20th century the surrounding area had become largely suburban in character, although the 1914–1915 Ordnance Survey map indicates that the site itself had changed little. The northern part of the site was apparently open ground, while its southern part was covered by a belt of trees.
- 4.3.15 In the 1920s Strawberry Hill was bought by the Catholic Education Council and became a teachers' training college. The 1934 Ordnance Survey map shows the site as playing fields fringed by trees on the south side. A small pavilion stood where the north-west corner of the existing Block R stands today. The 1962 Ordnance Survey map shows that the trees on the south side of the site had been reduced to a single well spaced row, and that a similar row of trees had been planted along the Waldegrave Road side of the playing fields.

## 5 Archaeological potential

### 5.1 Factors affecting archaeological survival

#### *Natural geology*

- 5.1.1 The site lies on the sands and gravels of the First River Terrace (British Geological Survey 1981).

#### *Past impacts*

- 5.1.2 Apart from the construction of the all-weather playing surface the site has apparently been completely unaffected by modern development.
- 5.1.3 Historic maps show the site in the 17th and 18th century as farmland and from the mid 19th century as being partly open ground and partly occupied by trees. Any archaeological features on the site may have been damaged by agricultural activity and root disturbance, and by the construction of the all-weather playing surface, but cut features such as pits or ditches would probably survive relatively intact.

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

- 5.1.4 Trenches excavated 60m to the south-west (where Crown Hall and Cashin Hall now stand) during an archaeological evaluation in 1992 revealed river terrace sand and gravel at a depth of 0.94m below ground level (Sloane 1992; **DBA 11**). A 0.30m-thick layer of red-brown sandy, clayey silt with moderate pebbles covered the gravel. This was interpreted as an uncultivated land surface. An undated posthole, 0.34m in diameter and 0.41m deep, cut this land surface. Successive layers of ploughsoil and topsoil overlay the posthole.
- 5.1.5 The sequence described above suggests that early land surface or soil horizon and features potentially of archaeological interest might lie at a depth of c 0.5 to 0.6m below modern ground level in the general area of the site. This appears to be borne out by the logs provided by the recently completed ground investigation, which have been added as an appendix at the end of this report.
- 5.1.6 During a site visit undertaken by the author in December 2006 the all-weather playing surface overlying the site of the proposed new block was inspected. The playing surface was rectangular in plan and of unknown thickness. Its north side was level with the adjacent playing field, but its south side was between 0.5m and 0.2m higher than the adjacent ground. This suggests that there is a correspondingly greater thickness of make-up for the surface on its south side.

### 5.2 Archaeological potential

- 5.2.1 The nature of possible archaeological survival in the area of the proposed



development is summarised here, taking into account the levels of natural geology and the level and nature of later disturbance and truncation discussed above.

- 5.2.2 *The site has an uncertain but possibly moderate potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the prehistoric period.* The site's location on well drained gravel terrace close to predictable resources of the River Thames would have been attractive to early farmers and settlers. Excavated evidence and stray finds from both sides of the river between Richmond and Teddington suggest that widely scattered cut features associated with field systems, rural settlements and possibly substantial earthworks are present in the area, and that some may fall within the area of the proposed development. Such features might include ditches, gullies, pits and postholes.
- 5.2.3 *The site has an uncertain but possibly moderate potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the Roman period.* For the reasons as outlined above it is likely that widely dispersed features associated with Romano-British fields and farms are present in the general locality of the site, and that some may fall within the area of the proposed development.
- 5.2.4 *The site has low potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the early medieval and later medieval periods.* There are no known archaeological sites of this period in the study area, and the nearest documented medieval settlement sites lie some distance from the site in the centres of Twickenham and Teddington. Nevertheless, the presence of unrecorded early medieval remains of 5th- to 7th-century date cannot be ruled out altogether.
- 5.2.5 *The site has low potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the post-medieval period.* There were no documented buildings on the site during this period, and maps from the middle of the 18th century suggest that the site itself was never developed. Therefore, significant archaeological features of this period are unlikely to be present, although field drains and boundary ditches (especially on an east-west alignment) might lie within the area of the proposed development. The site lies c 150m south of A Grade II\* listed garden associated with Strawberry Hill, which comprises a historically well-defined area quite separate from the site.

## **6 Impact of proposals**

### **6.1 Proposals**

- 6.1.1 The proposed development scheme, although still being finalised, will mainly entail the construction of a new sports block, which would be linked to the existing R Block sports building to the east. The site of the proposed building is currently occupied by an all-weather playing surface, which would be removed prior to construction.
- 6.1.2 The proposed building would have strip foundations that would support a suspended slab. It would not have a basement (D Tucker, pers comm. 19.12.2006).
- 6.1.3 The proposed scheme would include the construction of a car park with space for 11 vehicles on the west side of the building, and an access road around the north, south and west side of the building.
- 6.1.4 The proposed sports block would be screened from Waldegrave Road with new trees, planted to the west and north-west of the building.

### **6.2 Implications**

- 6.2.1 The construction of the proposed building would require the excavation of trenches for strip foundations and for drains and other services, which would probably either partially or completely remove any archaeological features within their footprint.
- 6.2.2 It would also probably entail shallower but more extensive ground reduction for the removal of the existing all-weather surface and topsoil, which might either partially or completely remove any archaeological features in the stripped area.
- 6.2.3 Ground reduction would be needed in those areas designated for the proposed car park and access road, which might either partially or completely remove any archaeological features in the stripped area.
- 6.2.4 The excavation of tree-planting pits might either partially or completely remove any archaeological features, although any such damage would probably be minor and localised. There might also be subsequent damage to archaeological features caused by root disturbance.

## 7 Conclusions and recommendations

- 7.1.1 The site lies within an Area of Archaeological Priority as defined by the local authority, and is about 150m south of a Grade II\* listed garden belonging to Strawberry Hill.
- 7.1.2 The site has an uncertain but possibly moderate potential to contain archaeological remains, especially evidence for field systems and rural settlements dated to the prehistoric and Roman periods. Excavated evidence from other sites on both sides of the river between Richmond and Teddington suggest that any such remains would probably take the form of widely scattered cut features, such as ditches, gullies, pits and postholes. The site has low potential to contain archaeological remains dated to the early medieval, later medieval and post-medieval periods. Nevertheless, the presence of unrecorded early medieval remains of 5th- to 7th-century date cannot be ruled out altogether.
- 7.1.3 The development will entail the removal of an all-weather playing surface and the construction of a new sports block, car park and access road. There may also be some landscaping involving tree-planting. The impact of ground works for the proposed scheme would probably either partially or completely remove any archaeological features within their footprints.
- 7.1.4 The decision on the archaeological response to this assessment rests with the Local Planning Authority and their designated advisor. However, given the substantial size of the proposed development area, its location on a well-drained river terrace near the river Thames and its archaeological potential it is likely that some form of archaeological evaluation would be required.

## **8 Acknowledgements**

This report was commissioned by Philip Boulcott, Dobson White Boulcott Ltd on behalf of the client St Mary's College Twickenham.

The author would like to thank the following for their help during the preparation of this report: Philip Boulcott (Dobson White Boulcott Ltd) and David Tucker (Rivington Street Studio Architecture) for information about the proposed development, Stewart Hoad for project management and Jane Baxter (Richmond upon Thames Local Studies Library) for assistance with research. Carlos Lemos prepared the figures in this report.

## 9 Gazetteer of known archaeological sites and finds

9.1.1 The table below represents a gazetteer of known archaeological sites and finds within the 750m-radius study area around the site. The gazetteer should be read in conjunction with Fig 2.

| DBA No. | Description   | Site code/<br>SMR No. |
|---------|---|-----------------------|
| 1       | 51 Strawberry Vale: contractor's excavations revealed undated natural deposits, which were recorded by MoLAS during a watching brief. They comprised an undulating gravel surface (once the Thames riverbed) overlaid by successive alluvial deposits of shelly sand and clay. Similar shelly deposits on nearby foreshore sites at Ham and Richmond Lock have been dated to the Mesolithic period. | SWV04                 |
| 2       | Popes Grove, Twickenham: stratified remains of Palaeolithic fauna and flora   |                       |
| 3       | 53-59 Strawberry Vale: prehistoric flake  | 021077                |
| 4       | Ham: prehistoric flake  | 02090401              |
| 5       | Stoney Deep, River Thames: neolithic axe  | 020851                |
| 6       | Pope's Grotto public house, Cross Deep/Holmes Road: an E-W Bronze Age ditch and a Late Bronze Age or Early Iron cut feature were recorded by MoLAS during a watching brief in 1999. Residual flint artefacts dated to the Neolithic were also recovered.  | POP92                 |
| 7       | Ham Fields: Iron Age potsherd   | 021055                |
| 8       | Ham: Roman potsherd   | 021035                |
| 9       | Strawberry Hill: Roman vessel   | 021043                |
| 10      | St Mary's College, Waldegrave Road: Grade II* listed garden, formerly the gardens of Strawberry Hill, the 18th-century home of Horace Walpole   | 226007                |
| 11      | Block A, St Mary's College, Strawberry Hill, Twickenham: uncultivated surface above natural gravels was cut by a posthole, overlain by ploughsoil (both undated) and sealed by topsoil  | SME92                 |
| 12      | 317 Waldegrave Road / Tower Street, Twickenham: watching brief  | WGV03                 |

## 10 Bibliography

### 10.1 Published and documentary sources

- ACAO, 1993 Association of County Archaeological Officers, *Model briefs and specifications for archaeological assessments and field evaluations*, Bedford
- Adkins, R, and Jackson, R, 1978 *Neolithic Stone and Flint Axes from the River Thames: an Illustrated Corpus*, British Museum Occasional Paper No.1
- Akerman, J R, 1855 Notes of antiquarian researches in the Summer and Autumn of 1854 – Teddington Middlesex, *Archaeologia* 36, 175–6
- Andrews, P, 1996 Hurst Park, East Molesey, Surrey, in P Andrews and A Crockett *Three excavations along the Thames and its tributaries, 1994*, 61–4
- BADLG, 1986 British Archaeologists and Developers Liaison Group, *Code of practice*, London
- Cowie, R, 1996 29 & 31 King Street, Twickenham, London: an archaeological evaluation, unpub MoL rep
- Cowie, R, 2001 Prehistoric Twickenham, *London Archaeol*, 9.9, 245–52
- Cowie, R, and Blackmore, L, in prep *Early and Middle Saxon rural settlement in the London region*, MoLAS Monogr
- DoE, 1990 Department of the Environment, *Archaeology and planning: a consultative document*, Planning Policy Guidance Note 16, London
- IFA, 2001 Institute of Field Archaeologists, *By-laws, standards and policy statements of the Institute of Field Archaeologists, standard and guidance: desk-based assessment*, rev, Reading
- Field, D, 1983 Ham: The Edwards Collection, *Surrey Archaeol Collect* 74, 169–84
- Field, D, and Wooley, A R, 1984 Neolithic and Bronze Age ground stone implements from Surrey: morphology, petrology and distribution, *Surrey Archaeol Collect* 75, 86–109
- Gelling, M, 1979 *The early charters of the Thames valley*, Leicester
- Girardon, S, and Heathcote, J, 1989 Excavation round-up 1988: part 2, London boroughs, *London Archaeol* 6.3, 72–80
- Greenwood, P, and Maloney, C, 1997 London fieldwork round-up 1996, *London Archaeol* 8, Suppl 2, 31–64
- Hoad, S, 1995 Romans in Twickenham, *London Archaeol* 7.14, 378–82
- Howe, K, 2005 *The Bronze Age barrow at Teddington*, Borough of Twickenham Local History Society, pap no. 85
- Lacaille, A D, 1966 Mesolithic facies in the transpontine fringes, *Surrey Archaeol Collect* 63, 21–9
- Lawrence, G F, 1929 Antiquities from the Middle Thames, *Archaeol J* 86, 76–7
- Leeson, J R, and Laffan, G B, 1894 Geology of the Pleistocene Deposits in the Valley of the Thames at Twickenham, *Q J Geol Soc Lond* 50, 453–60
- Museum of London, 2003 *A research framework for London archaeology 2002*, London
- Needham, S, and Burgess, C, 1980 The later Bronze Age in the Lower Thames Valley: the metalwork evidence, in J Barret and R Bradley (eds) *The British later Bronze Age*, British Archaeological Reports 83, 445–9
- Sanford, R, 1968 *Excavation in Church Street, Twickenham 1966*, Borough of Twickenham Local History Society Paper No. 12
- Sanford, R, 1970 Neolithic Twickenham, *London Archaeol* 1. 9, 199–201

- Sawyer, P H, 1968 *Anglo-Saxon Charters - an annotated list and bibliography*  
Sloane, B, 1992 St Mary's College, Strawberry Hill, Twickenham, Middlesex: an archaeological evaluation, unpub MoL rep  
Smith, R A, 1920 Specimens from the Layton Collection in Brentford Public Library, *Archaeologia* 69, 18  
VCH 1962 *Victoria County History, Middlesex*, 3  
Weinreb, B, and Hibbert, C (eds), 1995 *The London encyclopaedia*, London

## 10.2 Cartographic sources

### *Standard London maps*

- Rocque, J, 1746 'Exact Survey of the City of London Westminster and Southwark and the Country 10 Miles Round', reproduced in Margary, H, 1971 'Exact Survey of the City of London Westminster and Southwark and the Country 10 Miles Round' by John Rocque, 1746, Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

### *Ordnance Survey maps*

- Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25" map (1863)  
Ordnance Survey 25" map (1914/1915)  
Ordnance Survey 25" map (1934)  
Ordnance Survey 1:2500 (1962)

### *Geology map*

- British Geological Survey, 1981 South London Sheet 270, solid and drift edition, Ordnance Survey

### *Engineering/Architect's drawings*

- Rivington Street Studio Architecture, St Mary's College R Block, site location plan, dwg no 05.01, November 06  
Rivington Street Studio Architecture, St Mary's College R Block, site plan, dwg no 05.02, September 06