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1 SUMMARY

Touchstone Archaeology has been commissioned to carry out an archaeological desk-based assessment in advance of the proposed development at 50 Chartfield Avenue, Putney as part of the planning application submitted by Scandia-Hus Ltd on behalf of Mr David & Mr Owen Pirt.

This Desk Based Assessment examines the wide variety of archaeological data held by GLHER and other sources. Based on this data the potential for archaeological sites either on or in the near vicinity of the proposed development can be summarised as:

- Prehistoric: Low
- Iron Age: Low
- Romano-British: Moderate
- Anglo-Saxon: Low
- Medieval: Low
- Post-medieval: High
- Modern: High

The Desk Based Assessment concludes that:

- The site has Moderate potential for any archaeological discoveries.

The PDA is located in the south of England, in southwest London, the London Borough of Wandsworth and the district and civil parish of Putney. It is situated in the centre of Putney, south of the south circular Road, north of the A3, Putney Heath and Putney village, east of Roehampton Lane and west of the A219. It is a detached house found on Chartfield Avenue (NGR: TQ 23165 74609) bounded east and west by other
detached houses of varying style. The north elevation faces Chartfield Avenue and the south faces into the garden and onwards to the gardens of neighbouring houses. (Fig.1).

2  INTRODUCTION

Touchstone Archaeology has been commissioned by Scandia-Hus to carry out an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment to supplement a planning application for the proposed development at 50 Chartfield Avenue, Putney SW15 6HG (Figure 1). The report has accessed various sources of information to identify any known heritage assets, which may be located within the vicinity of the Proposed Development Area. The PDA is centered on National Grid Reference: TQ 23165 74609.

Archaeological investigations, both recent and historic have been studied and the information from these investigations has been incorporated in the assessment.

WADHS are responsible for a large amount of the archaeological work in the area. In 1969 they carried out an excavation at 7 Coalcroft Road (020750/00/00 – MLO147) that revealed a Medieval Pit and a Post-medieval pit. In 1975 an excavation intended to locate the Roman Road at 14 Gwendolen Avenue (648107) uncovered part of the road and further investigations carried out in 1981 at the Hippodrome Theatre Car Park, Felsham Road (648067) discovered evidence of the Roman Road a Roman ditch.

A Watching Brief at Elliott School in 2012 by Archaeology South East revealed a medieval brick culvert and possible medieval linear wall and an undated field ditch.

This report is a desk-based appraisal from known cartographic, photographic and archaeological sources and is a research led statement on the archaeological potential of the proposed development.
It may be that intrusive investigations, such as a Geophysical Survey and/or an Archaeological Evaluation, with machine cut trial trenching, may be requested by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as a Planning Condition.

2.1 Geology and Topography

The Geological Survey of Great Britain (1:50,000) shows that the PDA is situated upon Bedrock Geology of London Clay Formation (clay and silt). This sedimentary bedrock was formed approximately 34 to 56 million years ago in the Palaeogene Period when the local environment was dominated by deep seas and infrequent slurries of shallow water sediments were redeposited as graded beds. Three million years ago, in the Quaternary period, superficial deposits of Head (clay, silt, sand and gravel) formed in a local environment dominated by subaerial slopes when material accumulated by downslope movements including landslide, debris flow, solifluxion, soil creep and hill wash.

The PDA sits at an average height of 98ft (30m) AOD.

2.2 National Policies

Relevant planning guidance relating to the historic environment is set out in paragraphs 126-141 of the Department for Communities and Local Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012), with particular relevance to the assessment paragraphs. 128 & 141 stating 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”.

“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”.

2.2.1 Regional Policies

Relevant planning guidance relating to the historic environment is set out in policy 7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology) of the Greater London Authority’s The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (GLA 2011), with particular relevance to the assessment paragraphs. B, E & 7.32 state that:

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

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

“7.32 Every opportunity to bring the story of London to people and ensure the accessibility and good maintenance of London’s heritage should be exploited. In particular, where new development uncovers an archaeological site or memorial, these should be preserved and managed on-site. Where this is not possible provision should be made for the investigation, understanding, dissemination and archiving of that asset”.

2.2.2 In order to secure a sustainable future for the historic environment GLAAS have developed The Research Framework for London in following three parts to identify what is significant, focus activities and prioritise the allocation of resources:

- A Resource Assessment – Archaeology of Greater London MOLA 2000 (Paper publication)
- A Strategy for Researching the Historic Environment of Greater London 2015 (On-line PDF, webpage, Social media and links to other groups)

The Strategy is intended to incorporate all aspects of the physical evidence for past human activity, incorporating Research elements, a Five-Year Action Plan, Strategic Actions, Research priorities and Case Studies. In addition, GLAAS have a number of
guidance papers that set out standards for archaeological work across Greater London.

2.2.3 Local Policies

Policy DMS 2 - Managing the Historic Environment pg.14, 2.19 – 2.31 relates to:

- Listed Buildings (Designated HA)
- Locally Listed Buildings (undesignated HA)
- Conservation Areas (Designated HA)
- War memorials (undesignated or designated HA)
- Registered Historic parks and gardens (Designated HA)
- Register of historic parks and gardens of local interest (undesignated HA)
- Scheduled ancient monuments (Designated HA)
- Archaeological priority areas (Designated HA)
- Any other building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance warranting consideration in planning decisions (undesignated HA)

Stating that:

“Policy DMS 2 d. Proposals for development involving ground disturbance in Archaeological Priority Areas (as identified on the proposals map), will need to be assessed and may be required to be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report. The recording and publication of results will be required and in appropriate cases, the Council may also require preservation in situ, or excavation”.

In addition, planning guidance relating to the historic environment is set out in paragraph 2.17-2.29 & Policy DMS 2 of Wandsworth Borough Council’s Wandsworth Local Development Framework: Development Management Policies Document (WBC 2012), with particular relevance to this assessment paragraph 2.28 and Policy DMS 2 paragraph (d) state that:

“2.28 All applications affecting a heritage asset or its setting must be accompanied by a Design & Access Statement which includes a Statement of Heritage Significance and Assessment of Impact on the Heritage. This shall be proportionate in detail to the value of the asset affected and the impact of the proposal. The Statement of
Significance and Assessment of Impact, should be carried out by a specialist historic environment consultant, where applications involve substantial change or demolition of a heritage asset or new buildings, which may impact on a heritage asset. Heritage assets included in this policy include: Listed buildings (designated HA) Locally listed buildings (undesignated HA) Buildings in conservation areas (designated HA) War memorials (undesignated or designated HA) Historic parks and gardens (designated HA) Locally registered parks and gardens (undesignated HA) Scheduled ancient monuments (designated HA) Archaeological Priority Areas (designated HA) Any other building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance warranting consideration in planning decisions (undesignated HA)

This Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the guidance in National, Regional and Local Frameworks.

Significance is defined in the NPPF Guidance in the Glossary as “the value of the heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic, or historical. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also it’s setting”. The setting of the heritage asset is also clarified in the Glossary 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”.

This Desk-Based Assessment therefore forms the initial stage of the archaeological investigation and is intended to inform and assist in decisions regarding archaeological mitigation for the proposed development and associated planning applications.

2.3 The Proposed Development

The proposed development will comprise of the demolition of the existing residential dwelling and the erection of a two-storey dwelling house including basement and habitable roof space (2015/5987).

2.4 Project Constraints

No project constraints were encountered during the data collection for this assessment.
3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.1 The Desk-Based Assessment was commissioned by Scandia-Hus on behalf of Mr David & Mr Owen Pirt in order to supplement a planning application for the proposed development at 50 Chartfield Avenue, Putney SW16 6HG (TQ 23165 74609), to establish the potential for archaeological features and deposits.

3.2 Desktop Study – Institute for Archaeologists (revised 2011)

This desktop study has been produced in line with archaeological standards, as defined by the Institute for Archaeologists (2014). A desktop, or desk-based assessment, is defined as being:

“a programme of study of the historic environment within a specified area or site on land, the inter-tidal zone or underwater that addresses agreed research and/or conservation objectives. It consists of an analysis of existing written, graphic, photographic and electronic information in order to identify the likely heritage assets, their interests and significance and the character of the study area, including appropriate consideration of the settings of heritage assets and, in England, the nature, extent and quality of the known or potential archaeological, historic, architectural and artistic interest. Significance is to be judged in a local, regional, national or international context as appropriate”. (CiFA 2014)

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Desk-Based Assessment

4.1.1 Archaeological Databases

The local Historic Environment Record (HER) held at Historic England provides an accurate insight into catalogued sites and finds within both the proposed development area (PDA) and the surrounding environs of Putney. The Archaeology Data Service Online Catalogue (ADS) was also used. The search was carried out within a 500m radius of the proposed development site.
Relevant HER data is included in the report. The Portable Antiquities Scheme Database (PAS) was also searched as an additional source, as the information contained within is not always transferred to the local HER.

4.1.2 Historical Documents

Historical documents, such as charters, registers, wills and deeds etc., were considered not relevant to this specific study.

4.1.3 Cartographic and Pictorial Documents

A cartographic and pictorial document search was undertaken during this assessment. Research was carried out using resources offered by Historic England, the Internet and Ordnance Survey Historical mapping (Figs. 3-14).

Map Regression 1789 - 1958

The Ordnance Surveyors’ Drawings (OSDs), compiled between 1789 and 1840, represent the first continuous topographic mapping of England and Wales and are the most detailed record of the landscape preceding full-scale industrialisation in the mid-19th century. These original manuscript maps, drawn primarily at scales of ca. 1:21,120 and 1:31,680, with the Kent series being the first maps produced.

In an Exact Survey of the cities of London Westminster in 1761 (John Rocque: 53 x 71cm) the PDA is located within an area of open fields that surround a property marked as Percival Lewis Esquire. The River Thames, Putney village and The Upper Road (South Circular Road) are to the north; Putney Lane and Wandsworth are to the east and Rowhampton Lane and the area of Rowhampton is west. Putney Fair is to the northwest and from here a road leads south to the bowling green and Putney Heath (Fig.2).

In the OS Map of 1868 the PDA is within field number 220 that forms part of the estate of ‘Summerfield’. The property is made up of a long driveway that leads from Putney Park Lane to a house and formal gardens with buildings to the rear. The house is surrounded by a large fishpond, glasshouses, kitchen gardens, orchards and fields and joins the rear boundary of the properties that front Putney Heath. (Fig.3)

By the OS Map of 1896 the PDA is within field number 173. ‘Summerfield has undergone substantial development and is now known as ‘Solna’. The gardens remain in a similar layout but there are additional glasshouses and outbuildings and
the house has been rebuilt. The fields have been portioned off, including the filed that the PDA lays in. (Fig.4).

By the OS Map of 1916 the portioning off of the land around ‘Solna’ appears to have been in advance of a new high-density residential development that has spread south from the river to meet the its north boundary. The PDA has ben absorbed into the development and now forms the west garden area of plot 82 (1.100) on the new Chartfield Avenue. Chartfield Avenue is the southern most road in the development and is still under construction. Its northern flank has been partly developed but the southern flank has only five houses interspersed with areas of parkland, fields and empty building plots. (Fig.5).

By the OS Map of 1950-51 the development has continued south and Chartfield Avenue is well developed. The east boundary of the PDA is no longer joined with number 48 and so it is probable that it has become a single building plot and a small outbuilding has been constructed to the southern boundary of both properties. Solna Avenue is just west of the PDA and leads to a large building with an independent driveway possibly all that is left of the original ‘Solna’ property. The grounds have become parkland but the fishpond is still in situ. (Fig.6).

By the OS Map of 1953 -54 the PDA remains an empty plot. The property that was accessed via Solna Avenue has been demolished and the grounds that were parkland have become a series of access roads in preparation for further construction. The new Granard Primary School has been completed to the west. The fishpond remains in situ. (Fig.7).

By the OS Map of 1961-63 the development has continued south as far as the heath. The PDA has been developed into number 50 Chartfield Avenue. Several buildings associated with the new development have sprung up within the new development area – a day Nursery, a Community Centre, The Ranger Public House, a Welfare Centre and a Post Office. Elliott School has been constructed to the southeast and the Pond has been developed with buildings to the north and east flank and a small footbridge. (Fig.8).

By the OS Map of 1973-76 there has been little change (Fig.8).

By the OS Map of 1990-91 the large house at no.58 Chartfield Avenue to the west of Solna Avenue has been redeveloped into nine small dwellings and the area to the rear of the PDA has been developed into three. (Fig.9).
4.1.4 **Aerial Photographs**

The study of the collection of aerial photographs held by Google Earth was undertaken. In 1945 the area around the Thames River and Putney Bridge is well developed with high-density housing. Once past the south circular road the development continues in a more spacious fashion until it reaches Roehampton and here it gives way to an area of grassland interspersed with trees, hedges and ponds leading to the ‘Bowling Green’ in the south and joining Putney Heath. To the east of the A219 is Wandsworth and to the west is medium density housing leading to open fields and onwards to Richmond Park. The PDA appears to be undeveloped, possibly forming the garden of a neighbouring property. By 2001 Roehampton has been developed into medium density housing and a single detached house has been built on the PDA (Plates 1-2).

4.1.5 **Geotechnical Information**

To date, no known geotechnical investigations have been carried out at the site.

4.1.6 **Secondary and statutory resources**

Secondary and statutory sources, such as regional and periodic archaeological studies, landscape studies; dissertations, research frameworks and websites are considered appropriate to this type of study and have been included within this assessment where necessary.
5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Introduction

| Prehistoric  |  |
|--------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Palaeolithic | c. 500,000 BC – c.10,000 BC |
| Mesolithic   | c.10,000 BC – c. 4,300 BC |
| Neolithic    | c. 4.300 BC – c. 2,300 BC |
| Bronze Age   | c. 2,300 BC – c. 600 BC |
| Iron Age     | c. 600 BC – c. AD 43 |
| Romano-British | AD 43 – c. AD 410 |
| Anglo-Saxon  | AD 410 – AD 1066 |
| Medieval     | AD 1066 – AD 1485 |
| Post-medieval| AD 1485 – AD 1900 |
| Modern       | AD 1901 – present day |

Table 1 Classification of Archaeological Periods

The Archaeological record within the assessment area is diverse and should comprise possible activity dating from one of the earliest human period in Britain (the Neolithic) through to the post-medieval period. The geographic and topographic location of Putney is within a landscape that has been the focus of trade, travel and communication since the Neolithic. The PDA is situated south of the River Thames, a waterway that travels over 230 miles, rising at Thames Head in Gloucestershire and flowing through London to the North Sea. The river has historically been an economic resource, a maritime route, a boundary, a fresh water source, a food source and a leisure facility.

5.2 History of the site

The name Putney may derive from the Anglo-Saxon family name of ‘Puttan’ and the old English ‘hyp’ meaning ‘landing place’, therefore referring to ‘Puttan’s landing place’ or ‘Puttan’s Wharf’. In the Domeday book of 1086, it is known as the ‘Vill of Putelei’ forming part of the Manor of Mortlake and producing an income of 20s, probably from the ferry that provided the crossing to Fulham.
A prehistoric river crossing may well have been the origins of a settlement at Putney, the restricted width of the river and the geology of the riverbed at this point making it suitable for an ancient ford. Prehistoric track ways leading from the Fulham Road across the river and through Putney suggest a natural route of communication from the east of London to Western Surrey and evidence of occupation on both banks of the river at this point suggest a crossing that dates from prehistoric times.

A settlement may have been established to manage the river crossing and evidence has shown that the waterfront at Putney was a focal point of life over a period of some three thousand years. The Wandsworth Historical Society has been deeply involved in a long-standing survey of the Thames foreshore where a rare 4th-3rd century BC Iron Age sword and a 5th to 7th century fish trap have been uncovered.

A ferry is known to have been in place during the Roman period and a Roman settlement, excavated in 1977 by WHS, existed just west of the bridge in the Felsham Road area and Roman burial urns were found in Bemish Road in 1962. It has been suggested that the grounds of Fulham Palace may have been a winter camp for Vikings and later a Roman military camp and that Putney would have functioned as the gateway via the river crossing.

The medieval village that had grown on the bank of the river, centred on the present ‘High Street’ and was sustained by both farming and ferrying. The first mention of a church at Putney was in 1292 and later in 1302, when Archbishop Winchelsey recorded a public ordination. The Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin was originally a chapel of ease for Wimbledon and despite the fact that it was rebuilt in 1836, parts of the church still date to the 15th century.

Roehampton, just west of the PDA was a village within Putney parish responsible for its own agriculture and managed by its own local officials. Early Anglo-Saxon buildings have been excavated here although it is thought that the settlement dates back much further. The village began its life in Roehampton Lane area and was surrounded by a medieval hunting park.

Fishing had always been part of Putney’s history but at the time of the Conquest a
fishery was established here and it is noted that salmon, sturgeon and even porpoise were regularly part of the catch. Putney had such a foothold on the right of fishing in the Thames that in 1580 there was a dispute with the tenants of Wandsworth when the Wandsworth fisherman were denied their fishing room by the tenants of Putney. Eventually after some contest, the Lord Mayor and Council of London intervened and their rights were restored.

The plague arrived in 1625 and despite being a thoroughfare and having considerable contact with London Putney faiired far better than neighbouring Mortlake. Only Twenty-five victims were recorded in the first year although this worsened with its return in 1665 when seventy-four people died.

During the civil war of 1642-1651 Putney became a hive of activity when Oliver Cromwell, Earl of Essex built a bridge of boats over the river from Fulham and constructed forts on each side, to enable him to cross into Surrey and follow the Kings army south of London. In 1647 the village became the headquarters of the Parliamentary army; their councils, held in St Mary’s church, were later published as the ‘Putney debates’ and one year later the Heath became the meeting place of the Surrey Petitioners to Parliament.

The bridge of boats had sparked the idea of a permanent bridge, but in 1670, the ‘Rulers of the Company of Waterman’ refused a proposal on the grounds that ‘their society of 60,000 souls would thereby by ruined’ and the crossings remained.

The Heath was a central point of Putney life in 17th century. In 1684 Charles II reviewed his forces there and in 1767 George III reviewed the guards and in 1799 the Surrey volunteers. It was a noted rendezvous for highwaymen; Dick Turpin hiding his guns inside the nearby Green man public house and Jerry Abershawe’s body being gibbeted here as a warning to others. The Heath was also a noted place for duels, not least William Pitt, Chancellor of the Exchequer who fought a bloodless battle there in 1798 with William Tierney, MP.

A bowling green was constructed on the Heath in 1696 and a house built nearby, named Bowling Green House was a fashionable place of entertainment and gambling
with large rooms for public breakfasts and assemblies. It became the residence and place of death of William Pitt and later the home of Henry Lewis Doulton, the pottery manufacturer, but was demolished in 1933 and replaced with an art deco style house.

In 1729, Percival Lewis Esquire, who owned the Manor of Tooting and Downton House in Radnorshire, bought a tract of land at Putney Heath and in 1740, built a house there. He appears from the map to own most of the land bounded by the estate at Putney Park to the north, Putney Park Lane to the west, the Heath to the south and Putney Lane to the east. The land that he owned would eventually become Chartfield Avenue but in 1761 was still under his ownership. In 1804 the house was sold to Archibald Cochrane, who owned plantations and slaves in Antigua and then in 1804 Susannah North, Dowager Countess of Guildford, bought it. The House was rebuilt by Lady Guildford in 1828 and was known as North House. It is probable that between 1761 and 1842 (the time of the first OS Map of the area) some of the lands were sold off or developed into large properties such as ‘Summerfield’, of which the PDA forms part. The house is shown with orchards and gardens that were probably a market garden selling profitable produce in London’s Covent Garden.

In the late 17th century Putney saw a new experimental ‘fireproof house’ created by David Hartley, in which King George and Queen Charlotte breakfasted while the fire raged on the floor below but was prevented from spreading by copper and lead sheets between the floors. An obelisk by George Dance was commissioned by the Corporation of London in 1788 to commemorate the event. From 1796 to 1816 Putney Heath hosted a station in the shutter telegraph chain that connected the Admiralty in London, via 10 signal stations, to its naval ships in Portsmouth enabling a message to be sent within 15 minutes; The system was replaced in 1822 by a semaphore station that formed part of a semaphore line until 1847.

By 1865 Putney was largely park or heath with some arable, some pasture and a little market garden. The ferry to Fulham had been replaced in 1729 by a wooden
bridge. It proved to be a success and within two years the income from the tolls reached £1500.00. Consequently, an Act was passed in 1881, allowing the Metropolitan Board of Works to build a stone bridge of five arches and King Edward VII laid the foundation stone.

Roehampton Cricket Club, established in 1842 and one of the oldest cricket teams in London, of which sir Ernest Shackleton was an honorary member, has played on the village green since 1859. The Chelsea Water Company, owners of the underground reservoir, allowed construction of the club pavilion on its property.

Putney was until this time in the Hundred of Brixton and the County of Surrey but the loss of the area of Roehampton as an independent district had reduced its size considerably and in 1855 the parish became the responsibility of the Metropolitan Board of Works and was absorbed into the Wandsworth District. From the river it rose to 50ft AOD reaching its peak of 150ft at the Heath and sloping off again to Richmond Park. The Heath covered some 400 acres and was occupied by several handsome villas that commanded a view extending over the Thames to Harrow-on-the-Hill, Hampstead and Highgate. Several notable people lived there including Lady Grantham, Lord Dover, Lord Clifden, J D Charrington of brewing fame and the US financier J P Morgan.

The old embankment had been from 1845, the starting place of the Oxford and Cambridge Boat Race and became renowned for its rowing clubs including the Leander Club, the London Rowing Club and the Thames Rowing Club. The Metropolitan Amateur Regatta was established here in 1866.

The growing population required St John’s Church to be built as a chapel of ease for St Mary’s in 1859 and in 1874 All Saints church, known for its William Morris and Burne Jones stained glass, was built by the architect George Street on land donated by the Earl of Spencer.

Putney expanded dramatically in the 1880’s with the addition of 27 new streets, a new bridge, the district railway, and an embankment. The development of transport routes made the area desirable to ‘city gents’. In 1889 it became part of the County of London and in 1900 Wandsworth District became a Metropolitan Borough.
WWII bought bombing raids over London and in Putney four German V1 flying bombs struck the area, one destroying the pavilion.

5.3 This section of the assessment will focus on the archaeological and historical development of this area, placing it within a local context. Each period classification will provide a brief introduction to the wider landscape (500m radius centered on each site of the PDA), followed by a full record of archaeological sites, monuments and records within the site’s immediate vicinity. Time scales for archaeological periods represented in the report are listed on page 25 in Table 1. A preliminary review of the cultural heritage data shows that the site has low archaeological potential.

5.4  Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Historic Parks & Gardens and Conservation Areas

The PDA is set within an Archaeological Priority Area, however, no events, monuments, Listed Buildings, farmsteads, historic parks & gardens or conservation areas are recorded within the confines of the proposed development area (PDA). Three find-spots, two monuments, two listed buildings and three buildings are within the vicinity of the PDA. No Listed buildings share intervisibility with the PDA.

The report has accessed various sources of information to identify any known heritage assets, which may be located within the vicinity of the Proposed Development Area. Archaeological investigations, both recent and historic have been studied and the information from these investigations has been incorporated in the assessment.
6. **ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL**

6.1 Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age

The Palaeolithic represents the earliest phases of human activity in the British Isles, up to the end of the last Ice Age. Palaeolithic dated material occurs in various places on the banks of the river Thames but is particularly focused around the Putney and Fulham area because of the river crossing. There are eight records of Palaeolithic finds within the assessment area. An ovate hand axe found in 1902 c.100m East of the PDA, a flint scraper held in the Ashmolean museum, two flint flakes, two implements of Le Moustier type, a small hand axe and a blunt and oval artefact (030804/00/00-MLO119, 023208/00/00-MLO717, 031089/00/00-MLO120, 031090/00/00-MLO120, 031091/00/00-MLO120, 031088/00/00-MLO122, 031536/00/00-MLO132, 020704/00/00-MLO144). Some of the artefacts can no longer be traced and the provenance and location of the find is unconfirmed, however, they are testament to Palaeolithic activity within the assessment area.

The Mesolithic period reflects a society of hunter-gatherers active after the last Ice Age. There are three records Mesolithic finds within the assessment area. A flint blade found in Howards Lane, c.400m northwest of the PDA, in 1960 (MLO14494) and a microlith (031173/00/00-MLO104) and an axe or hoe (031223/00/00-MLO130) are both recorded but their location and provenance is unconfirmed.

The Neolithic period, the beginning of a sedentary lifestyle based on agriculture and animal husbandry, is represented by seven records within the assessment area. A flint blade found in Howards Lane, c.400m northwest of the PDA, in 1960 (MLO14494) and an axe or hoe, a polished flint axe, a green stone axe, three implements, an arrowhead and a mace head (031223/00/00-MLO130, 031225/00/00-MLO130, 031227/00/00-MLO130, 031230/00/00-MLO130, 031229/00/00-MLO132, 020731/00/00-MLO144) are all recorded but their location and provenance are unconfirmed.

The Bronze Age, a period of large migrations from the continent and more complex social developments on a domestic, industrial and ceremonial level is not represented in the assessment area.

There are several records that reflect prehistoric activity within the search area, however, most of the records have an unconfirmed location or provenance and therefore their proximity to the PDA cannot be established. The potential for finding
remains that date prior to the Iron Age within the confines of the proposed
development is therefore considered Low.

6.2 Iron Age
The Iron Age is, by definition a period of established rural farming communities with
extensive field systems and large ‘urban’ centres. The GLHER has no record dating to
the Iron Age period, therefore the potential for finding remains that date to this
period within the confines of the development site is also considered low.

6.3 Romano-British
The Romano-British period is the term given to the Romanised culture of Britain
under the rule of the Roman Empire, following the Claudian invasion in AD 43,
Britain then formed part of the Roman Empire for nearly 400 years.

The predominant feature of the Roman infrastructure within Britain is arguably the
extensive network of Roman roads connecting administrative centres: the towns to
military posts and rural settlements (villas, farmsteads and temples) increasing the
flow of trade, goods, communications and troops. London or Londinium was a major
commercial centre of the Roman province of Britannia, replacing Colchester
Camulodunum as the Provincial capital. Putney was the site of a ferry river crossing
and a settlement during the Roman period and the assessment area includes two
records that reflect this. A fragment of Mosaic and pottery were found at Howards
lane, c.300m north east of the PDA (020795/00/00-MLO246, 020794/00/00-
MLO274). The potential is therefore to be considered as moderate.

6.4 Anglo-Saxon

The Anglo-Saxon period is not represented within the assessment area. Therefore, it
is reasonable to conclude that the potential for finding remains dating to the Anglo-
Saxon period in the PDA is considered as Low.

6.5 Medieval

The medieval period is represented with five records within the assessment area. A
watching Brief, c.200m southeast of the PDA, uncovered a brick culvert (ELO12529)
and an excavation, c.400m north revealed a pit (020750/00/00-MLO147). A socketed
Iron spear head and a Waterford farthing of Edward I are recorded as finds,
however, their location and provenance is unconfirmed (031345/00/00-MLO131,
The presence of medieval archaeology within the assessment area is poorly represented, therefore, the potential for finding remains dating to the medieval period is considered as low.

6.6 Post Medieval to Modern

The Post Medieval period is represented within the assessment area by a Park record relating to Putney Heath, c.500m south of the PDA, which now forms part of Wimbledon and Putney Commons and is the remains of the common grounds within the area. Formerly the grounds of Bovet Tracey, the site of a landscape plan by Capability Brown in 1774 and the location of a Bowling Green installed by the Lord of the Manor, Earl Spencer in the 17\textsuperscript{th} Century (MLO104421). Innes Gardens, c.300m south, is a second Park record that relates to the grounds of Gifford House and includes an 18\textsuperscript{th} century icehouse and a pond (MLO104558). The area is now within an Archaeological Priority Area (DLO35479). Gifford House, c.300m west, stood in its own grounds with a bowling green and was owned by the Charrington Brewing family. During WWI it was opened as a convalescent home, continuing after the war as a home for discharged soldiers (MLO106959). It was demolished in the 1950’s and replaced by the Ashburton Housing Estate. The village pond, c.300m south, once formed part of ornamental gardens and was in place from at least the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century (MLO93918). A pair of semi-detached houses dating to the 1850’s are recorded as locally listed buildings in Howards Lane, c.400m north of the PDA (MLO104721). Elliott School is a Grade II Listed Building, constructed in 1955 as a purpose built concrete framed school, c.500m southeast (MLO93857). Our Lady of Pity and St Simon’s Stock Roman Catholic Church dates to 1906 and is a locally listed building located c.400m south (MLO104716). The PDA formed part of a former 19\textsuperscript{th} century estate and the area was heavily developed during the modern period, therefore, the potential for finding remains dating to the post-medieval period is considered as high.

6.7 Summary of Potential

The desk-based assessment has considered the archaeological potential of the site but this potential can only be tested by fieldwork. Research has shown that the PDA may contain archaeological sites and these can be summarised as:
• Prehistoric: Low
• Iron Age: Low
• Roman: Moderate
• Anglo-Saxon: Low
• Medieval: Low
• Post-Medieval and Modern: High

7. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 Introduction

Cartographic Regression, Topographical Analysis, and Historic Research have provided evidence for the historic use of the site. By collating this information we have assessed the impact on previous archaeological remains through the following method of categorisation:

• **Total Impact** - Where the area has undergone a destructive process to a depth that would in all probability have destroyed any archaeological remains e.g. construction, mining, quarrying, archaeological evaluations etc.

• **High Impact** – Where the ground level has been reduced to below natural geographical levels that would leave archaeological remains partly in situ either in plan or section e.g. the construction of roads, railways, buildings, strip foundations etc.

• **Medium Impact** – Where there has been low level or random disturbance of the ground that would result in the survival of archaeological remains in areas undisturbed e.g. the installation of services, pad-stone or piled foundations, temporary structures etc.

• **Low Impact** – Where the ground has been penetrated to a very low level e.g. farming, landscaping, slab foundation etc.
7.2 Existing Impacts

7.2.1 Cartographic regression (4.1.3), Topographic analysis (4.1.4) and Historical research (5.2) indicate that the site began as open fields and by the 19th century formed part of the land attached to a property known as Summerfield, later to be known as Solna. During this period it was subject to agricultural or horticultural processes. During the 20th century it became a plot of land on Chartfield Avenue, possibly forming part of the gardens of 48, Chartfield Avenue. It was developed c.1960 into a single detached house with garden.

Therefore, previous impacts to archaeological remains from construction are considered to be high in this area.

7.2.2 Agriculture became gradually more intense over time and by the modern era it was mechanised. Although the farming process rarely penetrates below the upper layers of the ground, plough truncation can have a significant impact on preserved shallow deposits. The site is within an enclosure that was once subject to agricultural or horticultural use, however, it was subject to development during the 20th century and the construction process would have been far more destructive than agricultural or horticultural processes therefore the impact of agriculture is considered to be low.

7.3 Proposed Impacts

7.3.1 The general development of the site

At the time of preparing this archaeological assessment, the extent of the proposed development was for the demolition of the existing residential dwelling and the erection of a two-storey dwelling house including basement and habitable roof space.

7.3.2 The very nature of construction can have a negative impact on below ground deposits through the movement of plant, general ground disturbance and contamination and excavation. Therefore, extensive impact can be expected within
the development area once construction begins. However, the site has already been subject to the construction process during the c.1960’s, therefore the impacts are reduced.

7.3.3 With due consideration to the impacts sited above the following is an assessment of the specific impacts and their relation to this development:

- Ground contamination from the storage and use of materials may have an adverse effect on soil sampling and recording of shallow deposits – **Low impact**
- Ground vibration, weight displacement and surface disturbance from the movement and use of plant and machinery may cause disruption of shallow features and deposits – **Low impact**
- Ground penetration from the erection of access equipment, barriers etc. could result in isolated damage to shallow features and deposits – **Low impact**
- Landscaping may result in the displacement of shallow features and deposits – **Low impact**
- Ground stripping and levelling could remove shallow deposits and features and leave the archaeological horizon open to damage or destruction from the foot, plant or vehicle traffic – **Low impact**
- Trenching for the installation of services may involve the removal of shallow deposits or features and further damage the archaeological horizon sited immediately below or neighbouring archaeology – **Low impact**
- The excavation of the foundations may result in the entire removal of the archaeological feature or deposit from a localised area, subsequently intruding on related neighbouring archaeology – **High impact**
- The long-term effect of the development will be in the new use of the site and changes resulting therein. In this case the possibility of higher foot and vehicular traffic to the site – **Low impact**
7.4 Proposed mitigation for the impact of the construction process

Adherence to the general requirements required by HSE, to increase safety, reduce risk and lessen the impact of the construction process.

8. MITIGATION

The purpose of this archaeological desk-based assessment was to provide an assessment of the contextual archaeological record, in order to determine the potential survival of archaeological deposits that may be impacted upon during any proposed construction works.

The assessment has generally shown that the area to be developed is within an area of low archaeological potential.

9. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Setting of Listed Buildings

One of the tasks of the site visit was aimed to identify any designated heritage assets within the wider context of the PDA in accordance with The Setting of Heritage Assets – English Heritage Guidance (English Heritage 2011). This guidance states that “setting embraces all of the surroundings (land, sea, structures, features and skyline) from which the heritage asset can be experienced or that can be experienced from or with the asset” (The Setting of Heritage Assets, English Heritage 2011).

The Listed Buildings share no intervisibility with the PDA (Plates 3-6)

9.1 Archive

Subject to any contractual requirements on confidentiality, two copies of this desk-based assessment will be submitted to Wandsworth Borough Council (Heritage) within 6 months of completion.
9.2 Reliability/Limitations of Sources

The sources that were used in this assessment were, in general, of high quality. The majority of the information provided herewith has been gained from either published texts or archaeological ‘grey’ literature held at Historic England and therefore considered as being reliable.

9.3 Copyright

Touchstone Archaeology and the author shall retain full copyright on the commissioned report under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights are reserved, excepting that it hereby provides exclusive licence to Scandia-Hus (and representatives) for the use of this document in all matters directly relating to the project.

Zoe Schofield.
13th May 2016
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### APPENDIX 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELO12529</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>c.200m SE</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>2012 Watching Brief – Archaeology South East – Medieval brick culvert, brick footing possible medieval, field drain undated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELO12851</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>c.200m SE</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2012 Heritage Statement – RSK Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELO13119</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>c.200m SE</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2013 DBA – RSK Environment Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELO13204</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>c.200m SE</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2013 DBA – Hyder Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELO13802</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>c.100m S</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>2013 Building recording KM Heritage – ARK Putney Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020750/00/00-MLO147</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>c.400m N</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>1969 Excavation by P Greenwood – Medieval and post medieval pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030804/00/00-MLO119</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>c.100m E</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Ovate hand axe – Mid Acheulian – found 1902. Sources differ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023208/00/00-MLO717</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>c.100m E</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Ovate hand axe – Mid Acheulian – found 1902. Sources differ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO93857</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>c.500m SE</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Purpose built school with reinforced concrete frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO104716</td>
<td>Locally Listed Building</td>
<td>c.400m S</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Our Lady of Pity and St Simon’s Stock Roman Catholic church dating to 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020795/00/00-MLO246</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>c.300m NE</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Fragment of Roman mosaic – Howards Lane - MOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020794/00/00-MLO274</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>c.300 NE</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Roman pottery – Howards Lane - MOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO104721</td>
<td>Locally Listed Building</td>
<td>c.400m N</td>
<td>Post Med-Modern</td>
<td>Numbers 65-67 Howards Lane – semi detached houses dating to 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO14494</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>c.400m NW</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Mesolithic to Neolithic flint blade unstratified, found 1960 Howards Lane - MOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031173/00/00-MLO104</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>Microlith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031089/00/00-MLO120</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Flint scraper – Ashmolean Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031090/00/00-MLO120</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Flint flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031091/00/00-MLO120</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>2 implements of Le Moustier type - BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031088/00/00-MLO122</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Small hand axe - BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031534/00/00-MLO130</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2 flint flakes of 80mm and 90mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031223/00/00-MLO130</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mesolithic-Neolithic</td>
<td>Axe or hoe – Charterhouse Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031225/00/00-MLO130</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Polished flint axe – Charterhouse or BM Sturge Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031227/00/00-MLO130</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>3 implements – BM Sturge Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031230/00/00-MLO130</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Arrowhead – BM Sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031345/00/00-MLO131</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Early Medieval</td>
<td>SA iron spearhead socketed - MOL, received 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031357/00/00-MLO131</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Iron spearhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031358/00/00-MLO131</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Waterford farthing of Edward I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031536/00/00-MLO132</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Flint flake – BM Sturge Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031229/00/00-MLO132</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Green stone axe – Description &amp; sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020704/00/00-MLO144</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>Artefact blunt oval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020731/00/00-MLO144</td>
<td>Find Spot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Mace head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO104421</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>c.500m S</td>
<td>Medieval-Modern</td>
<td>Near Putney Heath – former grounds of Bovey Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO106959</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>c.300m W</td>
<td>Post Med-Modern</td>
<td>Country house owned by Charrington Brewing family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO104558</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>c..300m S</td>
<td>Post Med-Modern</td>
<td>Innes Gardens former grounds of Gifford House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO93918</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>c.300m S</td>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>Village pond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II - Plates

Plate 1. 1940 Google Earth

Plate 2. 2014 Google Earth
Plate 3. View of Site (looking North)

Plate 10. View of Site (looking south)
Plate 11. View of Site (looking east)

Plate 12. View of Site (looking west)
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Figure 1. Potential Development Area (PDA)
Figure 2. John Rocque 1746 – ‘An exact survey of the Citys of London, Westminster and Boroughs of Southwark with the country near 10 miles round’ with the location of the PDA marked.
Figure 3. OS Map of 1868 County Series 1:2500
Figure 4. OS Map of 1896 County Series 1:2500
Figure 5. OS Map of 1916 County Series 1:2500
Figure 6. OS Map of 1950-51 National Grid 1:2500
Figure 7. OS Map of 1953 National Grid 1:2500
Figure 8. OS Map of 1963 National Grid 1:2500
Figure 9. OS Map of 1973-76 National Grid 1:1250
Figure 10. OS Map of 1991 National Grid 1:1250