



# HAMPSTEAD HEATH London

London Borough of Camden

Historic environment assessment

June 2013



# Hampstead Heath Ponds London Borough of Camden

An historic environment assessment

**NGR 527012 186722**

## Sign-off history:

Issue No.	Date:	Prepared by:	Checked by	Approved by:	Reason for Issue:
1	19.06.2013	Coralie Acheson (Archaeology) James Dixon Charlotte Bossick (Built heritage) Juan Jose Fuldain Carlos Lemos (Graphics)	Jon Chandler Lead Consultant	Chris Thomas Contract Manager	First issue

Y code: AA683

## © Museum of London Archaeology

Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED  
tel 0207 410 2200 fax 0207 410 2201 email:generalenquiries@mola.org.uk

Museum of London Archaeology is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company registration number 07751831 and charity registration number 1143574.  
Registered office: Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED

# Contents

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Origin and scope of the report	3
1.2 Designated heritage assets	4
1.3 Aims and objectives	4
<b>2 Methodology and sources consulted</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3 Site location, geology and topography</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Site location	7
3.2 Geology	7
3.3 Topography	7
<b>4 Archaeological and historical background</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Overview of past investigations	9
4.2 Chronological summary	9
4.3 Management of the Heath in the 19th and 20th centuries	16
<b>5 Statement of significance: above ground heritage assets</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Introduction	19
5.2 Hampstead Chain	19
5.3 Highgate Chain	21
5.4 The setting of heritage assets	24
<b>6 Statement of significance: buried heritage assets</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1 Introduction	26
6.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival	26
6.3 Archaeological potential and significance	27
<b>7 Impact of proposals</b>	<b>31</b>
7.1 Proposals	31
7.2 Implications	31
<b>8 Conclusion and recommendations</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>9 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>10 Planning framework</b>	<b>48</b>
10.1 Statutory protection	48
10.2 National Planning Policy Framework	48
10.3 Greater London regional policy	51
10.4 Local planning policy	51
<b>11 Determining significance</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>12 Non-archaeological constraints</b>	<b>55</b>

<b>13</b>	<b>Glossary</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>59</b>
14.1	Published and documentary sources	59
14.2	Other Sources	60
14.3	Cartographic sources	60
14.4	Available site survey information checklist	61

## Figures

Cover: Fishing at Hampstead Pond, 1961

- Fig 1a *Site Location*
- Fig 1b *Plan of Hampstead Heath with key areas of proposed works highlighted*
- Fig 2 *Historic Environment Features Map*
- Fig 3 *Map of the Geology of Hampstead Heath (British Geological Survey, North London, sheet 256)*
- Fig 4 *Rocque's topographical map of the County of Middlesex, 1754*
- Fig 5 *Historic view of Caen Wood (Kenwood) House from the south of Wood Pond, c.1793*
- Fig 6 *Ordnance Survey Surveyor's drawings 2":mile, 1807–8*
- Fig 7 *Newton's map of Hampstead, 1814*
- Fig 8 *St Pancras map 1849*
- Fig 9 *Stanford's map of 1862*
- Fig 10 *Ordnance Survey 1st edition map, 1880s © Crown Copyright and database right [2013]. Ordnance Survey licence number 100023243 City of London Corporation.*
- Fig 11 *East facing view towards Men's Bathing Pond and Highgate No. 1 Pond, c.1890*
- Fig 12 *North-east facing aerial view of Viaduct Pond, 1907*
- Fig 13 *Boys fishing in Highgate No. 2 Pond and the Mixed Bathing Pond, c.1960*
- Fig 14 *East facing view of diving board at Highgate Men's Bathing Pond, 1961*
- Fig 15 *East facing view of dam and path between Hampstead No. 1 and No. 2 Ponds with rear gardens of South Park Hill beyond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 16 *North-east facing view of dam between Hampstead No. 2 Pond and the Mixed Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 17 *Changing facilities at the Mixed Bathing Pond, (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 18 *View of stream running through East Heath to the north of the Mixed Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 19 *Watercourse and intercept chamber north of Mixed Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 20 *View of entrance to brick culvert to the north of Mixed Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 21 *South-west facing view of spring on Pryors Fields (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 22 *North facing view of Viaduct Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 23 *19th century sheet piling on the south side of Viaduct Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 24 *North facing view of Vale of Health Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 25 *View south from Kenwood towards Wood Pond (centre) and Thousand Pound Pond (left) (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 26 *South-west facing view of Wood Pond and Stone Bridge (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 27 *South-east facing view of Sham Bridge in Thousand Pound Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*

- Fig 28 North facing view of Stock Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 29 East facing view of the changing facilities at the Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 30 North facing view of Bird Sanctuary Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 31 View of north end of Model Boating Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 32 West facing view of Bell Barrow (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 33 East facing view of the changing facilities at the Highgate Men's Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 34 North-east facing view of bank to the south of Highgate Men's Bathing Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 35 North facing view of Highgate No. 1 Pond (MOLA, 17.05.2013)*
- Fig 36 Plan showing zones of differing archaeological potential within Hampstead Heath and known historic boundaries and hedge lines (refer to Section 6.3)*

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

## Executive summary

The City of London has commissioned Museum of London Archaeology to carry out a historic environment assessment (also known as a 'heritage statement') in advance of proposed works to the Hampstead Heath ponds. The works would be focused on two north-west to south-east aligned chains of ponds in the western (the Hampstead chain) and eastern (the Highgate chain) part of East Heath. It would include improvements to bathing and lifeguard facilities at the Ladies Bathing Pond in the Highgate chain. The proposed improvements are required in order to reduce local flood risk and are likely to include alteration to some of the banking, dams and conduits.

This desk-based study assesses the impact on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains) and above ground heritage assets (structures of historic interest). Heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals comprise:

- **Prehistoric remains**, including features or finds relating to the exploitation of marsh resources (close to ponds), Bronze Age remains related to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (near Parliament Hill) and Mesolithic remains (on the higher ground). Such remains could be of medium to high significance.
- **Palaeoenvironmental remains**, preserving evidence of past environments and human interaction with them may survive in the area of the springs. Medium to low significance.
- **Medieval remains**, including quarry pits, field and parish boundaries, of medium to low significance.
- **Post-medieval remains**, including quarry pits, field boundaries and Napoleonic finds relating to the use of the Heath for military manoeuvres, of low significance.
- **The Highgate and Hampstead pond chains**, of medium significance.
- **Kenwood House and its grounds**, of very high significance.

The site is located at some distance from known Roman centres of settlement. It has been undeveloped throughout history, existing in various forms including wildwood, open heath and managed parkland.

Medieval and post-medieval quarrying is likely to have compromised the potential survival of earlier features although the quarry pits, their backfills and associated structures are of archaeological significance in themselves. Archaeological survival in open areas of the Heath that have never been developed will be high.

Proposals for work on the ponds are likely to include alteration of some of the banking, dams and conduits between the ponds. This is unlikely to impact on any material of heritage significance, but does have the potential to alter the appearance of the ponds, or parts of them.

While the nature of the proposed works to the ponds has yet to be established any works involving excavation would have an impact on any remains present within their footprint, including site stripping and any levelling carried out as part of temporary construction works. This would reduce the significance of any remains affected to negligible or nil.

It is recommended that the final proposal architectural and engineering drawings, when they are available, are appraised by a relevant heritage professional to determine whether the proposed works are likely to impact on the setting relationship between the ponds and the wider Heath landscape, preferably at a stage where design mitigation could be enacted against any negative impacts.

Given the likely presence of deposits with potential for palaeoenvironmental remains it is considered that a geoarchaeological evaluation consisting of boreholes in the affected areas of Hampstead Heath might be suited to the initial stages of site-based investigation. This could be combined with a geotechnical survey carried out for engineering purposes. Based on the results of the geotechnical survey and depending on the nature and extent of the

*proposed works, it is possible that further site-specific archaeological investigation would be required, such as archaeological trial trenches/pits, in order to clarify the nature, extent and significance of any remains in the areas of proposed impact. This would allow the LPA to make an informed decision regarding the mitigation of any significant archaeological remains affected. It is possible that the preliminary investigations indicate that no further work is necessary, or that targeted archaeological excavation, and/or an archaeological watching brief for remains of lesser significance is carried out to achieve preservation by record.*

*Works which would have an impact on the historic fabric in and around the ponds should be preceded by recording. Due to the relatively homogenous nature of the heritage significance of the ponds and their construction, it is recommended that where future proposed works will alter their current appearance, that they be subject to archaeological built heritage recording to an appropriate level in the English Heritage guidelines (EH, 2006a).*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Origin and scope of the report

- 1.1.1 The City of London has commissioned Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) to carry out a historic environment assessment (also known as a 'heritage statement') in advance of proposed improvements to the hydrology and pond structures at Hampstead Heath in the London Boroughs of Camden and Barnet (National Grid Reference centred 527012 186722: Fig 1a). The works would be focused on two north-west to south-east aligned chains of ponds in the western (the Hampstead chain) and eastern (the Highgate chain; Fig 1b) part of East Heath. It would include improvements to bathing and lifeguard facilities at the Ladies Bathing Pond at one of the more northern ponds of the Highgate chain. The proposed improvements are required in order to reduce local flood risk and are likely to include alteration to some of the banking, dams and conduits.
- 1.1.2 The details of the proposed works has yet to be determined and the present desk-based study is intended to inform the preliminary design in terms of potential impact of the scheme on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains) and above ground heritage assets (upstanding structures and their setting). It may subsequently form part of a technical appendix in support of an Environmental Statement, assessing the impact of the proposed development (hereafter referred to as the 'site') on the historic environment which will enable the archaeological and conservation advisors to the relevant local planning authority (LPA) to formulate an appropriate response in the light of the impact upon any known or possible heritage assets. These are parts of the historic environment which are considered to be significant because of their historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest. These might comprise below and above ground archaeological remains, buildings, structures, monuments or heritage landscape within or immediately around the Hampstead Heath.
- 1.1.3 For the purposes of this assessment, Hampstead Heath is referred to hereafter as 'the site'. It comprises three main areas which make up the Heath in its entirety. These comprise East Heath (here including Kenwood House in the north, Parliament Hill in the south, the Vale of Heath and Hampstead ponds in the west and the Highgate ponds in the east); North End and Sandy Heath to the west of Spaniard's Road and east of North End Way (including the Hampstead Heath Extension), and West Heath with Golder's Hill Park on the western side of North End Way. Whilst the archaeology of the whole Heath and a study area buffer around it is considered in order to set the proposed scheme into its full historic environment context, it should be noted that the proposed improvements would be located within a much smaller area - along the valley bottoms of two valleys in East Heath, which hold the Hampstead and Highgate pond chains.
- 1.1.4 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the project brief (Atkins, 2013), along with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG 2012; see section 10 of this report) and to standards specified by the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA Oct 2012/Nov 2012), English Heritage (2006, 2007, 2008, 2010), and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS 2009). Under the 'Copyright, Designs and Patents Act' 1988 MOLA retains the copyright to this document.
- 1.1.5 Note: within the limitations imposed by dealing with historical material and maps, the information in this document is, to the best knowledge of the author and MOLA, correct at the time of writing. Further archaeological investigation, more information about the nature of the present buildings, and/or more detailed proposals for redevelopment may require changes to all or parts of the document.

## **1.2 Designated heritage assets**

- 1.2.1 Hampstead Heath contains a large number of designated (protected) heritage assets, shown on Fig 2.
- 1.2.2 A barrow known locally as Boadicea's Grave to the north-west of Parliament Hill is a scheduled monument (Fig 2; **HEA 25**).
- 1.2.3 A number of listed buildings on the Heath comprise one Grade I listed building (**HEA 75**), 12 Grade II\* listed buildings, and 52 Grade II listed buildings.
- 1.2.4 Kenwood in the northern part of the Heath is a Grade II\* registered parks and garden, as is The Hill (Inverforth House) in the eastern part of West Heath
- 1.2.5 There are two areas of ancient woodland and a site of special scientific interest; the Hampstead Heath Woods. There are a number of historic hedgerows, protected under the Hedgerow Regulations.
- 1.2.6 The southern part of Hampstead Heath is bordered by Hampstead Conservation Area and then northern part by Highgate Conservation Area (Camden).
- 1.2.7 The western part of West Heath is located in an archaeological priority area defined by the LB of Barnet.

## **1.3 Aims and objectives**

- 1.3.1 The aim of the assessment is to:
  - identify the presence of any known or potential heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals;
  - describe the significance of such assets, as required by national planning policy (see section 10 for planning framework and section 10.4.1 for methodology used to determine significance);
  - assess the likely impacts upon the significance of the assets arising from the proposals; and
  - provide recommendations to further assessment where necessary of the historic assets affected, and/or mitigation aimed at reducing or removing completely any adverse impacts upon heritage assets and/or their setting.

## 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 site and a study area around it were examined in order to determine the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any heritage assets that may be present within the site or its immediate vicinity and has been used to determine the potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets of any specific chronological period to be present within the site.
- 2.1.2 In order to set the site into its full archaeological and historical context, information was collected on the known historic environment features within Hampstead Heath and a 500m study area around the area of proposed development, as held by the primary repositories of such information within Greater London. These comprise the Greater London Historic Environment Record (HER) and the London Archaeological Archive and Resource Centre (LAARC). The HER 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. The study area was considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the site. Occasionally there may be reference to assets beyond this study area, where appropriate, e.g., where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.
- 2.1.3 This assessment is a review of existing sources intended to form a baseline of heritage assets likely to be affected by the proposed works. It is not a comprehensive survey of Hampstead Heath with new features identified.
- 2.1.4 In addition, the following sources were consulted:
- MOLA – Geographical Information System, the deposit survival archive, published historic maps and archaeological publications
  - English Heritage – information on statutory designations including scheduled monuments and listed buildings
  - English Heritage – National Record for the Historic Environment (NHRE) via the Pastscape website. The NHRE can occasionally hold additional information.
  - Camden Record Office – historic maps and published histories
  - London Society Library – journals and published histories
  - The City of London – historic Ordnance Survey maps from the 1880s and c 1986 (© Crown Copyright and database right 2013. Ordnance Survey licence number 100023243 City of London Corporation).
  - Hampstead Heath Management Plan – City of London (2007). Including information on historic features within the heath including hedgerows and land boundaries. British Geological Survey (BGS) – solid and drift geology digital map; online BGS geological borehole record data
  - Atkins – Hampstead Heath Statement of Significance (City of London); Historic background and issues paper (City of London, 2006), brief for desk based assessment (Atkins, 2013)
  - Internet - web-published material including LPA local plan, and information on conservation areas and locally listed buildings.
- 2.1.5 The assessment included a site visit carried out by MOLA Buildings Archaeologist James Dixon on the 17th of May 2013 in order to determine the topography of the

site and existing land use and the nature of the existing buildings, and to provide further information on areas of possible past ground disturbance and general historic environment potential in particular along the chain of ponds in East Heath. The survey included each of the ponds of the Highgate and Hampstead chains, with further survey confined to those areas of the Heath within the setting of the ponds, to consider views and other setting issues. Observations made on the site visit have been incorporated into this report and form the basis of the statement of significance for built heritage assets in section 5. This report has not considered each individual listed building due to the similarity of many of the settings and potential impacts involved with them. The site visit considered views to and from the two adjacent conservation areas (Highgate Conservation Area, Haringey borders the north of the Heath, but it not thought to be relevant to this study) and the groups of assets at Vale of Health and around Kenwood as single receptors.

- 2.1.6 In terms of built heritage and heritage landscape, the report considers the wider Heath as a single receptor. Where listed buildings are not mentioned individually in the text, it is assumed that they either have no potential for adverse impact by any scheme of works on the ponds, or that they are already assessed under a group impact.
- 2.1.7 Fig 2 shows the location of known historic environment features within the study area. These have been allocated a unique historic environment assessment reference number (**HEA 1, 2**, etc), which is listed in a gazetteer at the back of this report and is referred to in the text. Due to the large number of built heritage assets within the study area, the figure and gazetteer have been arranged to show only those likely to be of concern to this study. Practically, this has left only listed buildings within the heath itself and the conservation areas surrounding it, where potential impacts on the conservation area are thought to both supersede and incorporate impacts on individual assets. Archaeological Priority Zones are shown where appropriate. All distances quoted in the text are approximate (within 5m).
- 2.1.8 Section 10.4.1 sets out the criteria used to determine the significance of heritage assets. This is based on four values set out in English Heritage's *Conservation principles, policies and guidance* (2008), and comprise evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value. The statements of significance have been considered under two broad headings: 'above-ground assets' and 'buried assets'. The former are visible and tangible, and thus their significance is more evident. This is not usually the case for buried assets. The report assesses the likely presence of such assets within (and beyond) the site, factors which may have compromised buried asset survival (i.e. present and previous land use), as well as possible significance.
- 2.1.9 Section 12 contains a glossary of technical terms. A full bibliography and list of sources consulted may be found in section 14. This section includes non-archaeological constraints and a list of existing site survey data obtained as part of the assessment.

### 3 Site location, geology and topography

#### 3.1 Site location

- 3.1.1 Hampstead Heath ('the site') is located in north London to the north and east of Hampstead and to the south and west of Highgate (NGR 527012 186722: Fig 1). The ponds which are to be the focus of the proposed works lie in the eastern part of East Heath, in the eastern part of the site. The Highgate chain runs along the eastern boundary of the Heath and the Hampstead chain runs from the centre of the Heath to its southern boundary at South End Road.
- 3.1.2 West Heath and North End/Sandy Heath, fall within the historic parish of St Johns Hampstead in the LB of Barnet. East Heath, including the Highgate ponds, falls within the historic parish of St Pancras in the LB of Camden. Both parishes lay within the county of Middlesex.

#### 3.2 Geology

- 3.2.1 Geology can provide an indication of suitability for early settlement, and potential depth of remains.
- 3.2.2 The British Geological Survey 1:50,000 scale map of North London (sheet 256; Fig 3) shows that the geology of the Heath comprises London Clay capped in the centre and west of the Heath by the sands and clays of the Bagshot Beds and the Claygate formation. In some places there are areas of gravel which are part of the Stanmore gravel formation.
- 3.2.3 The British Geological Survey holds the logs of several boreholes drilled within Hampstead Heath. Two boreholes drilled in the eastern part of the Heath, one close to the south of the Highgate ponds while the other was close to the southern end of the Hampstead ponds, both recorded London Clay directly below the ground surface. Further to the west however, boreholes drilled in East Heath and Sandy Heath encountered sand of the Bagshot beds overlying the London Clay.

#### 3.3 Topography

- 3.3.1 Topography can provide an indication of suitability for settlement, and ground levels can indicate whether the ground has been built up or truncated, which can have implications for archaeological survival (see section 6.2). The topography of the Heath varies considerably and is only described very generally here. The main elements of the topography are closely associated with the river systems and geology and large scale hand-dug Clay and gravel extraction in the 19th century (and earlier).
- 3.3.2 Hampstead Heath lies across the Hampstead-Highgate ridge of permeable Bagshot Sands which forms a high ridge running approximately north-east to south-west through the centre of the Heath. The highest point on the ridge within the Heath is c 134.0m above Ordnance Datum (OD), on Spaniard's Road. To the east and west of the ridge the ground falls away fairly steeply.

##### *East Heath*

- 3.3.3 Rainwater percolates through the upper sands of the Bagshot Beds ridge, along which Spaniard's Road runs, until it reaches the impermeable London Clay where it comes out through spring lines at the base ridge to form numerous streams. On East Heath, east of the ridgeline, the water runs off down two roughly north-west to south-east valleys. The natural watercourses have since been utilised to form the Hampstead (on the west) and Highgate (on the east) ponds respectively.
- 3.3.4 There is considerable local variation in topography with a number of smaller

tributary streams feeding into these two main river valleys. An Ordnance Survey contour map (10m intervals) indicates that the land generally slopes down to the south-east, from the ridge at Spaniard's Road down to the south-eastern corner of the Heath beside the Swimming Lido and Gordon House Road at around 50.0m OD.

- 3.3.5 Both the river channels of the Hampstead and Highgate pond chains flow to the south-east and meet in the area of Kentish Town to form the western arm of the River Fleet. This is one of the main tributaries of the Thames, which has been culverted below ground along its length to join the Thames at Blackfriars to the south-east (Barton 1992, 23).
- 3.3.6 The original streams along the valleys of the pond chains flow between the ponds appearing at intervals before disappearing into underground culverts (Fig 18 and Fig 35). The valley bottoms are quite marshy despite the creation of the ponds in the 17th and 18th centuries. Springs feed into the pond chains at several locations (Fig 22).

#### *North End and Sandy Heath*

- 3.3.7 At North End and Sandy Heath the ground level slopes down gradually to the north from 136.0m OD on Spaniard's Road down to 80.0m OD at the southern end of the The Hampstead Heath Extension, which is relatively flat. Ground levels do vary considerably locally across the general slope at North End and Sandy Heath however due to historic quarrying activity.

#### *West Heath*

- 3.3.8 On West Heath ground level slopes down to the north-west gradually from 136.0m OD on Spaniard's Road down to 80.0m OD at the edge of Golder's Hill Park. There is a north-west to south-east valley formed by the watercourse from a springline that feeds into the Leg of Mutton Pond. This eventually flows towards the Dollis Brook, a tributary of the River Brent, c 1.1km to the west of the boundary of Hampstead Heath (Barton 1992, 113).

## 4 Archaeological and historical background

### 4.1 Overview of past investigations

- 4.1.1 Hampstead Heath covers a large area in north London. There have been 27 archaeological investigations within a 500m study area. The majority are located around the perimeter of the Heath. There have been three investigations within the Heath itself.
- 4.1.2 Between 1976 and 1981 an early Mesolithic settlement site was discovered and excavated in the western part of the West Heath (**HEA 2**). Palaeoenvironmental studies were also carried out as part of this investigation which has allowed a detailed understanding of the landscape of the area over time to be built up.
- 4.1.3 In 1992, a watching brief of a pipeline, which ran across the East Heath along its eastern edge from north to south (**HEA 7**) found evidence of Mesolithic activity, and isolated finds from later periods.
- 4.1.4 In 2006, MOLA carried out an archaeological watching brief during improvement work at the pond south of Kenwood House (**HEA 6**). This found remains of a timber structure extending into Wood Pond which dated to the 17th or 18th century, although its purpose was unclear. An elm water pipe, part of a system to connect the ponds was also found.
- 4.1.5 There have been several archaeological investigations in the Bodicea's tumulus in East Heath (**HEA 25**) by local enthusiasts in 1894, but only a few pieces of charcoal were found. The site is now a scheduled monument.
- 4.1.6 All other investigations focused on already developed areas outside of the Heath itself where, in most cases, earlier activity had already removed all but post-medieval remains (**HEA 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 102, 103 and 126**). In five cases only truncated natural deposits were observed (**HEA 4, 9, 18, 21 and 23**).
- 4.1.7 The results of these investigations, along with other known sites and finds within the study area, are discussed by period, below. The date ranges below are approximate.

### 4.2 Chronological summary

#### *Prehistoric period (800,000 BC–AD 43)*

- 4.2.1 The Lower (800,000–250,000 BC) and Middle (250,000–40,000 BC) Palaeolithic saw alternating warm and cold phases and intermittent perhaps seasonal occupation. During the Upper Palaeolithic (40,000–10,000 BC), after the last glacial maximum, and in particular after around 13,000 BC, further climate warming took place and the environment changed from steppe-tundra to birch and pine woodland. It is probably at this time that England saw continuous occupation. Erosion has removed much of the Palaeolithic land surfaces and finds are typically residual. A Palaeolithic hand axe was found c 545m south of Hampstead Heath in 1897 (**HEA 100**) but other than that no finds dated to this period have been found within the study area, as recorded by the GLHER.
- 4.2.2 The Mesolithic hunter-gather communities of the postglacial period (10,000–4000 BC) inhabited a still largely wooded environment. The river valleys of the Heath and its spring lines would have been favoured in providing a predictable source of food (from hunting and fishing) and water. Evidence of activity is characterised by flint tools rather than structural remains. A Mesolithic settlement site was excavated by the Hendon and District Archaeological Society between 1976 and 1981 in West Heath, close to the Leg of Mutton pond (**HEA 7**). Over 61,000 pieces of worked flint

were found, including tools, cores and flakes, which indicate that tools were being produced on the site. Several other artefacts, described as possible 'rubbing stones' were found which may have been used for working animal hides or polishing stone or bone tools. Several pits containing burnt flint and a number of stake holes were also found. Thermoluminescence and radiocarbon dating indicate a date for the site of 7641 BC ± 900, which places the site in the earlier part of the Mesolithic period (Collins and Lorimer, 1989: 9–61).

- 4.2.3 Unstratified Mesolithic flints were also found in the northern part of the pipeline watching brief in the eastern part of East Heath in 1992 (**HEA 7**). More Mesolithic flint finds are recorded within the Heath in the GLHER (**HEA 115** and **116**), and beyond it (**HEA 122**). A study of the pollen found in cores taken from the marshy area near a spring during the excavation of the Mesolithic site (**HEA 2**) indicate that during the Mesolithic period the area which today forms Hampstead Heath would have been heavily forested. Around 94% of the pollen dating to this period was tree pollen. This consisted mostly of lime (54%) mixed with oak (30%) and elm (16%). Smaller number of birch, pine and ivy were also present (Collins and Lorimer, 1989, 95).
- 4.2.4 The Neolithic (4000–2000 BC) is usually seen as the time when hunter gathering gave way to farming and settled communities, and forest clearance occurred for the cultivation of crops and the construction of communal monuments. Pollen records indicate forest clearance over large areas of the British Isles during this period, a pattern reflected in the pollen record from the West Heath Mesolithic site (**HEA 2**), which showed signs of forest clearance at this time caused by a combination of clearance and elm decline. Charred grain was also found in the cores indicating the introduction of cereal crops in the vicinity. Hampstead Heath would still have been forested in parts but areas of marsh are indicated by the pollen of marshy plants. Dung beetles preserved from this period indicate that cattle may have been grazed in the area, which is likely to have been mixed wet and woodland pasture (Collins and Lorimer 1989, 96–97). A fragment of a Neolithic polished stone axe was found within the Heath in the early 20th century (**HEA 118**) and a possible Neolithic blade shaped into a fabricator was found c 150m to the north (**HEA 105**).
- 4.2.5 The Bronze Age (2000–600 BC) is characterised by technological change, when copper and then bronze eventually replaced flint and stone as the main material for everyday tools. It is seen as a period of increasing social complexity and organised landscapes, probably due to increasing pressure on available resources. The pollen record indicates that there were almost no trees in the area during the Bronze Age, while higher amounts of cereal and herb pollen indicate more intensive farming (Collins and Lorimer 1989, 97). The changes in social structure at this time are reflected in a change in the type of funerary monuments erected. A Bell barrow, an Early to Middle Bronze Age form of round barrow, is located in the East Heath, north-west of Parliament Hill. The barrow is located at the crest of a hill on a sloping hillside with views looking out towards Highgate in the east and south towards central London (Fig 32). The barrow is a scheduled monument, one of only 250 known examples in England (English Heritage website), the majority of which are in the South West, and may contain both archaeological and environmental information. While popularly known as 'Boadicea's Grave' the mound dates from over a thousand years before her death. An antiquarian excavation in 1894 found only a few pieces of charcoal and it was concluded at the time that the acid soil must have completely removed any evidence of a burial.
- 4.2.6 During the Iron Age (600 BC–AD 43), the climate deteriorated with colder weather and more rainfall. The period is characterised by expanding population, which necessitated the intensification of agricultural practices and the utilisation of marginal land. Hillforts were established in lowland Britain, linked to tribal land ownership. The pollen record indicates a regeneration of the woodland in the area.

Hampstead Heath once more became an area of forest and it remained so until the Early Medieval period (Collins and Lorimer 1989, 97).

- 4.2.7 Struck flint tools, cores and flakes have been found across the study area (**HEA 99, 117, 118, 120 and 121**). In 1940, possibly during extraction of sand for sand bags in the Vale of Health, a possible prehistoric occupation site was found with both stone tools and pot sherds found (**HEA 99**).

#### *Roman period (AD 43–410)*

- 4.2.8 In AD 43 the Romans invaded Britain and subsequently founded a settlement 6.7km south-east of the site, which they called *Londinium*. *Londinium* developed as a centre of trade and became the capital city of the Roman province. A series of roads led out from *Londinium* to Roman settlements across the country. The site is located 2.4km east of Watling Street, the Roman Road from London (Marble Arch) to St Albans (*Verulamium*) (Margary 1967, 171, 189). A possible Roman road might run along the western side of Hampstead Heath (**HEA 114**), although the location given by the GLHER is based on a projected continuation of a known road.
- 4.2.9 As the city of *Londinium* grew in size, the area around it became increasingly involved in the provision of foodstuffs for the expanding capital. This area was known as the *territorium* of *Londinium*, which may have maintained more direct control over it to ensure the regularity of supply (Lakin *et al.* 2002, 2). Investigations in east London have shown that the *territorium* was most probably composed of a managed agricultural landscape of settlement and scattered farms close to a network of roads which allowed produce to be brought into the city (MoLAS, 2000, 150).
- 4.2.10 The developing city of *Londinium* also required industrial goods including pottery. An important area of Roman pottery production was located at Highgate Woods 1.8km north of the site (site code: HW70; MoLAS, 2000, 143). During the 1st and 2nd centuries (c AD 50–160) a small group of kilns at Highgate Wood produced initially coarse kitchenware in local forms before changing to produce more ‘Romanised’ wares at the beginning of the 2nd century. Pottery production on the site ceased in the late 2nd century. There is no settlement near the pottery kilns, and it is suggested that the site represents the working area of a group of itinerant potters, who regularly returned to the site over the period (Brown and Sheldon, 1974, 224). London provided the main market for this pottery (Symonds and Tomber, 1991, 82), which may possibly have been transported down a precursor to Holloway Road to the Roman city. It is possible that pottery production extended into the study area.
- 4.2.11 Shrines and temples were often established at springheads and on high ground, and the head of the Fleet in association with the high ground at Highgate and Hampstead Heath, may have attracted similar structures (MoLAS, 2000, 157). Roman activity is indicated by a number of finds from area around Hampstead Heath. A single late Roman coin was found during an archaeological watching brief of a pipeline in the eastern part of East Heath (**HEA 7**) and another 3rd century coin was found by chance in the Vale of Health in 1978 (**HEA 99**). Roman pottery was found in a post-medieval feature during excavation of Mount Vernon Hospital (**HEA 19**), c 390m south of the border of the Heath, and an isolated sherd was found c 270m south of the Heath in 1964 (**HEA 97**). A Roman cremation burial is reported to have been found c 105m south of the Heath in 1774 (**HEA 104**), although no other evidence of Roman burial has been found in the area. More uncertainly a pavement, allegedly of Roman date, was found in Highgate at the top of the Holly Lodge Estate, c 380m east of the site in 1947–9 (**HEA 98**). It was made of bricks laid out in a Herringbone pattern and might possibly suggest the presence of a villa. A hoard of 4th century coins is reported to have been found by chance in Highgate Village, although no evidence of this has been seen (**HEA 101**).

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

- 4.2.12 Following the withdrawal of the Roman army from England in the early 5th century AD the whole of the south-east of England fell into an extended period of socio-economic decline. In the 9th and 10th centuries, the Saxon Minster system began to be replaced by local parochial organisation, with formal areas of land centred on nucleated settlements served by a parish church. Hampstead Heath straddles the boundary between two parishes; Hampstead to the west and St Pancras to the east. It is known that much of the Heath was covered in a 'wildwood' (Elrington, 1989).
- 4.2.13 The earliest reference to Hampstead comes from a record of King Offa (AD 755–794 AD) who founded a monastery in St Albans which he granted lands in a large area called 'Henamstede'. In AD 986 the land reverted to the Crown and was granted to the Church, later the abbey, at Westminster (Cleaver 1981, 2). The Charter which granted the land to the Church at Westminster described a 'hedge' as part of the Manor's eastern boundary, possibly surviving as a ditch which runs along the high ground to the east of the Hampstead Ponds (Land Use Consultants 2006, 4, **HEA 133**).
- 4.2.14 In 1222 the estate of William de Blemont, which included lands which are today part of Hampstead Heath, was granted to Holy Trinity, Aldgate. Several stretches of the boundary of this estate are thought to be identifiable today (see Fig 2; City of London, 2007; Land Use Consultants, 2006:4).
- 4.2.15 The northern part of the parish of St Pancras formed part of the land held by the Canons of St Paul's, either directly from the King or from the Bishop of London (Baker and Elrington 1980, 122). It is likely that the parish church was located near St Pancras village, on the site of St Pancras Old Church, 3.7km south-east of Hampstead Heath. Although the parish church is likely to have been located some distance away, it is thought that there was an early medieval settlement located around Pond Square, c 800m east of the boundary of Hampstead Heath (GLHER 082046).
- 4.2.16 In the early medieval period there was a small settlement in Hampstead, probably a single farm as indicated by the place name, and by the Domesday Book which records there being one villain, five bordars and one serf (*VCH Middlesex ix*). Fragments of Anglo-Saxon pottery have been found on the Heath, at the excavations at the Leg of Mutton pond on West Heath (**HEA 2**) but no other finds dating to this period have been found within the study area. It is known that charcoal burning was carried out on the Heath, which would have been heavily wooded at the time, in the 10th century (Elrington 1989). The main settlement in the parish developed to the south and east of the Heath in the area of the modern day Hampstead Village.

*Later medieval period (AD 1066–1485)*

- 4.2.17 During the later medieval period Hampstead Heath lay to the west of the developing settlement of Highgate and east of the important road over Highgate Hill. It is likely that much of the Heath was wooded, although pollen from cores taken during excavations in West Heath (**HEA 2**) indicate forest clearance from c AD 1200 when cornflower pollen appears in the record. Throughout the later medieval period the Heath was rough moorland, used for grazing, gathering, digging sand and collecting brushwood (Elrington 1989). The lower lying areas would have remained marshy due to the number of springs.
- 4.2.18 The manor of Hampstead remained in the possession of Westminster Abbey after the Norman Conquest of AD 1066 (Elrington 1989, 66–71). Domesday Book (AD 1086) describes the manor as worth 55 shillings with seven inhabitants.
- 4.2.19 A Royal Charter of AD 1227 confirming the ownership of Holy Trinity Aldgate of land in the area of Hampstead Heath refers to 'all their wood and heath as enclosed on

all sides with a ditch in the parish of St Pancras of Kentisseton' (Cleaver 1981, 2), indicating that the area was mixed wood and heathland.

- 4.2.20 In the 14th century, the Bishop of London built a road across Highgate Hill c 750m east of the boundary of Hampstead Heath, to replace the now impassable old road around the Hill (Weinreb and Hibbert 1995, 389). To pay for the upkeep of the road the Bishop erected a tollgate, which was called the High Gate (Willey 2006, 241). The existing hamlet adopted this name and rapidly developed as a resting place on the road, where travellers could rest before or after attempting the route up or down Highgate Hill (Richardson 2004, 6). A number of medieval roads are listed surrounding the area of the Heath (**HEA 107, 108, 109, 110, 112** and **113**). While no medieval finds have been made within the Heath itself a medieval patterned floor was found c 240m to the south (**HEA 102**) and isolated medieval finds have been made in this area also (**HEA 123** and **124**).

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

- 4.2.21 In the post-medieval period parts of Hampstead Heath were developed and others were subject to large scale hand-dug mineral extraction. Throughout the period the sandy ridge that runs through the centre of the Heath continued to be quarried, so much so that one commentator in the early 19th century remarked that “the whole face of the Heath is become so mutilated that the prospect of beauty is nearly destroyed” (Elrington 1989).
- 4.2.22 One of the greatest changes to happen in the heath in the post-medieval period, along with the construction of Kenwood House and its grounds in the 17th century (discussed separately in section 4.3), was the establishment of chains of ponds. The Hampstead Ponds along the western part of East Heath were the first to be established in 1589. This resulted from an Act of Parliament of 1546, which was passed in order to improve the ready supply of clean water to the capital. The Highgate chain followed later in the 17th century for the same reason (Cleaver 1981, 4). The ponds were created by damming each of the two valleys at various points. The earthen dams present today may date from this period, and may have been made up using material excavated to create the ponds (Fig 33). Several of the ponds are supported by significant earthen banks on their southern sides, which act as dams (Fig 34). Between ponds the water today flows both through surface level channels and through brick culverts (Fig 18 and Fig 35). It is possible that culverts dating from the late 17th and early 18th century may survive.
- 4.2.23 Rocque’s map of the county of Middlesex in 1754 (Fig 4) shows Hampstead Village with the heath to the north-west of it. The ‘Ken Wood’ is shown in the northeastern part of the heath close to the Highgate string of ponds mislabelled as the Hampstead Ponds. To the west of these in another valley a second string of ponds is shown - the Hampstead chain. Parliament Hill Fields is shown as pasture and meadow divided by hedgerows. Open heathland is shown in the northern part of the present area with a road running between Hampstead and Kenwood House. Evidence of sand quarrying can be seen in the Sandy Heath area where a deep depression is shown with hachures.
- 4.2.24 A map of the area around Hampstead from 1807–1808 (Fig 6) made from Ordnance Surveyors drawings shows that the higher sandy ridge was rough ground, pocked with sand pits, while the lower lying areas in the western part of the Heath, and in the northern extension area was divided into small fields. The forested area of Kenwood is shown, and the Highgate and Hampstead strings of ponds can be seen. Houses are shown along the roads which ran through the Heath, and along Hampstead Lane in the north.
- 4.2.25 Newton’s map of the Parish of Hampstead, 1814 (Fig 7) shows the Hampstead side of the Heath. The land to the east of the chain of ponds is marked ‘Demense’ and would have been farmed by the landowner. It is shown as being divided into small

fields which would most likely have been marked by hedgerows. The ponds of the Hampstead water works are shown in the southern part of the Heath. Four ponds are shown, the southernmost of which was in-filled in 1891 (Cleaver 1981, 5).

- 4.2.26 The St Pancras part of Hampstead Heath is shown on a Parish map of 1849 (Fig 8) shows Kenwood House and grounds in the northern part of the Heath (discussed separately in section 4.3, below), with fields to the south. Parliament Hill can be seen as a prominent hill and the Highgate chain of ponds and Boudicea's tumulus are clearly shown. The area was divided into fields with hedgerows marked as being owned by the Right Honourable Earl of Mansfield.
- 4.2.27 Stanford's map of 1862 (Fig 9) shows the Heath with footpaths and hedgerows marked. Some of the small roads and footpaths shown on the map continue in use today, such as Sir T.M.Wilson's Private Road and the footpath which crosses it running north-east to south-west. The development of the pond chains can be seen. The Highgate and Hampstead ponds are shown much as they are today, although the southernmost pond in the Hampstead chain is no longer extant. The eastern part of the Heath is shown as being divided into fields by hedgerows, with footpaths running through them. In the north-east the wood and parkland of Kenwood House is shown. The labels on the map show that only the western part of the Heath, as far east as the Hampstead ponds, was considered to be part of the Heath at this time, and the area is labelled as being Furze and pits, indicating that it was rough open heath land at this time used heavily for sand quarrying. The quarrying of sand had been common practice throughout the medieval and post-medieval period. The sand was of high quality and could be used by both builders and iron founders. In 1811 it is recorded that the lord of the manor was receiving payments on 20 cart loads of sand a day (Elrington, 1989, 75–81).
- 4.2.28 The Ordnance Survey 1st edition 6":mile map, dating to the 1880s (Fig 10), shows Hampstead Heath in a way that is recognisable but smaller than it is today. Several of the modern features in Parliament Hill Fields, including the Lido and the Athletics Track were built in the 20th century and are not shown. The northern extension had not yet been added and it, like Parliament Hill Fields in the south-east is shown as farmland divided by hedgerows. The Bronze Age barrow is labelled as a tumulus, and is shown covered with trees. Evidence for quarrying both of sand and clay can be seen, with a sand pit shown just to the south-west of the Vale of Health, and a brickworks is shown to the west of the Highgate ponds chain (**HEA 132**), the southernmost pond of which had yet to be filled in.

#### *Kenwood House (17th century–present)*

- 4.2.1 The area to the north of the Heath forms the Kenwood Estate and House, comprising 112 acres of landscaped gardens (Fig 5).
- 4.2.2 The present layout of the grounds dates from the late 18th century, though it also includes areas which are older in date. The original Kenwood House and its terrace was created in the 17th century by John Bill, the royal printer who bought the "280 acres of land well covered with large timber...set out as a capital messuage of brick, wood and plaster, eight cottages, a farm-house and windmill, fishponds, etc" in June 1660 from Sir James Harington (Lovell and Marcham 1936, 114–132).
- 4.2.3 The house and grounds were sold numerous times throughout the 17th and early 18th century, and in 1711 a sale described the property as "Cane Wood House with four ponds containing two acres, land adjoining the kitchen garden containing two acres, and woodland containing 22 acres". An avenue of limes at the house was first planted around 1726 to extend the terrace, however it was greatly reduced by severe storms in 1987 (English Heritage website).
- 4.2.4 When the property was purchased by the 3rd Earl of Bute, John Stuart, in 1746 he considerably enlarged the estate (English Heritage website). Maps of this date show

that formal gardens stretched down the bank in front of the house to four fishponds beyond (*ibid*).

- 4.2.5 Following the purchase of the house by William Murray, 1st Earl of Mansfield, in 1754 the house and grounds underwent remodelling and landscaping by architect Robert Adam. Adam described the grounds of the house at this time and it is clear that far fewer trees existed within the grounds as “there (was) a noble view let into the house and terrace, of the City of London, Greenwich Hospital, and the river Thames, the ships passing up and down, with an extensive prospect...on both sides of the river” (Lovell and Marcham 1936, 114–132).
- 4.2.6 Murray more than doubled the size of the estate by buying or renting neighbouring land and replaced Bute's formal gardens, merging some of the fishponds to become Wood Pond (Weir Pond was left) and the grandly named Thousand Pound Pond, named presumably because of its cost (English Heritage website). Murray also planted many of the beech and oak trees seen within the grounds today and was fond of exotic plants which he grew in his orangery. In 1785 he erected a hothouse where peaches and grapes were grown (*ibid*). During this period a lawn or pleasure garden lay in front of the house on the south which was enclosed by walls, and the kitchen garden lay close to the road on the west side, beyond a stable and laundry court (Lovell and Marcham 1936, 114–132).
- 4.2.7 Following Lord Mansfield's death in 1793 his heir, the 2nd Earl of Mansfield, inherited Kenwood House and commissioned Humphry Repton to improve the gardens (*ibid*). An engraving dated to 1793 (Fig 5) shows the house and grounds, with a terrace looking down towards the Thousand Pound Pond. Repton's idea was to create a series of meandering paths around the estate and he broke up the wide views in the parkland by planting groves of trees. His remodelling also included moving Hampstead Lane away from the house, separating the two by an ancient ridge of woodland called Prospect Hill (English Heritage website). In front of the house the walled forecourt was removed to create a Half Moon Lawn, and the kitchen garden to the west was converted into an intricate flower garden (*ibid*). This had 19 beds which was later doubled, however today these have been replaced by lawn. A 200 acre model farm at Kenwood dates to Repton's time though it is not believed he designed it, this would have provided the estate with fresh produce.
- 4.2.8 By the time the 6th Earl inherited Kenwood at the beginning of the 20th century he had plans to sell the land off for building, though a campaign to protect the land meant that this never happened. Money was raised to buy nearly 140 acres for the public which became known as Kenwood Fields and South Kenwood but the house, estate buildings and 74 acres were bought by the art collector and philanthropist Edward Cecil Guinness, 1st Earl of Iveagh. The house (the ‘Iveagh Bequest’) was donated to the nation by Lord Iveagh when he died in 1927, and opened to the public in 1928. The grounds today are much as Repton designed, and one third of the estate (Kenwood and North Wood) is a site of special scientific interest, designated by Natural England.

#### *Development within the Vale of Health (18th century to present)*

- 4.2.9 The Vale of Health is a hamlet accessed by a lane from East Heath Road and surrounded entirely by the Heath. It lies within a small valley beside the Bagshot Beds spring line and at the head of the Hampstead pond chain.
- 4.2.10 The earliest reference to this area is from a document dating to 1714 stating that Samuel Hatch, a harness maker was granted a piece of boggy waste land on the site known as “Gangmoor”, and by 1720 he had built cottage at what was subsequently called Hatch's or Hatchett's Bottom (Elrington 1989, 71–73). In 1762 a single enclosure, approached by an unfenced track from Heath Street, contained a barn, stable, and cowshed, for which ground rent was payable to the lord of the manor, and possibly a cottage next to a small pond, which may have been Hatch's

cottage (*ibid*). In 1777 the Hampstead Water Co. enlarged the pond and drained the marshy ground, and three cottages were built there for the poor in 1779.

- 4.2.11 Tan pits are known to have existed at Hatch's Bottom in the late 18th-century, and by 1808 the enclosure which had been leased by the lord of the manor had become the site of a varnish factory (Elrington 1989, 71–73). Around this date another cottage was constructed by a chimney sweep, and the area became increasingly used for laundering clothes (*ibid*).
- 4.2.12 The name Vale of Health was first mentioned in 1801 and it is possible that it was invented in a deliberate attempt to change the image of the area. This may have been undertaken by John Rudd, a builder, who acquired most of the grants of waste made during the later 18th century and probably built the seven houses and two cottages which were sold at his death in 1801 (*ibid*).
- 4.2.13 The area became increasingly middle-class from the early 19th-century and the area was described as having 'unbounded prospects' of Kent and the River Thames, and screening from north winds by trees and the lie of the land. By 1821 the inhabitants, petitioning for the removal of the poor houses, observed that the neighbourhood had 'greatly increased in respectability' through the 'improvement of property' (Elrington 1989, 71–73). An increasing number of cottages were constructed at the Vale during this period and we home to wealthy and well-known tenants including Byron and Shelley who found the area perfect for poetry-writing (*ibid*).
- 4.2.14 During the 1860s–70s some of the existing houses were demolished and the area extended further into existing wasteland for the construction of villas, many of which are listed today. Building ended in 1872 when the Metropolitan Board of Works bought the heath, however copyholders and freeholders could still build on their estates, so the Vale grew within the existing confines. By 1890 there were 53 houses in the Vale (Elrington 1989, 71–73).
- 4.2.15 Numerous hotels and social clubs within the Vale attracted negative attention and failed during the late-19th–early 20th-centuries, and the Vale was described in 1911 as vulgarised by its tavern, tea gardens, merry-go-rounds, and slot machines, however it did continue to attract distinguished residents (*ibid*).
- 4.2.16 Since 1945 the Vale has changed less than any other district in Hampstead. New luxury flats have been constructed but these have not altered the village-like atmosphere for the area. Listed buildings included the early 19th-century group from Rudd's estate, Vale House, Cottage, and Lodge, North and South Villas, Hunt Cottage, and the weatherboarded (possibly 18th-century) Woodbine and Old cottages; Chestnut Cottage to the west, from before 1812, with the Vivary and Lavender cottages opposite, which were probably built either in 1845 by William Hooper or in 1846 by H. Hill; the Villas on the Heath, dating from the 1860s, and Byron Villas, from 1903 (**HEA 27, 40, 52, 57, 58, 67, 68, 71, 90, 92**).

### 4.3 Management of the Heath in the 19th and 20th centuries

#### *Hampstead Heath Act 1871*

- 4.3.1 The Hampstead Heath Act of 1871 authorised the Metropolitan Board of Works to purchase Hampstead Heath for £45,000 from Sir John Maryon Wilson and Spencer Maryon Wilson (The Hampstead Heath Act, LMA: E/MW/H/261/02). Included in the sale was the Heath with "all the trees, shrubs, gorse, and plants growing or being thereon, and all mines and minerals therein or thereunder..." (*ibid*). East Park and land adjacent to the Heath was not included in the sale (Elrington 1989, 75–81).
- 4.3.2 The Act set out a number of clauses, importantly including that "the Board shall for ever keep the Heath open, unenclosed, and unbuilt on, except as regards such parts thereof as are at the passing of this Act enclosed or built on" (The Hampstead

- Heath Act, LMA: E/MW/H/261/02). It also authorised the Board “to plant trees and shrubs on the Heath for purposes of shelter or ornaments, and to make temporary inclosures for the protection thereof” (*ibid*). Other aspects of the Act allowed the construction of new public roads, providing they were lined with trees on either side,
- 4.3.3 The land was taken over in 1872, and due to the spread of housing north and west of the heath additions were soon made to the area (Elrington 1989, 75–81). These additions included the creation of Judges’ Walk. By 1879 it is believed that the Heath comprised 240 acres of land (*ibid*).
- 4.3.4 The Hampstead Heath Enlargement Act of 1886 also granted Parliament Hill to the Board.

#### *William Robinson’s Report, 1898*

- 4.3.5 A series of letters dated prior to 1898 (LMA: PK/GEN2/2) outline a number of concerns that both the general public and officials had with the Heath. The mistreatment of the Heath is expressed, along with concerns relating to the state of the ponds and plants and the number of dying trees.
- 4.3.6 William Robinson, a well-known gardener at the time, was commissioned to carry out a survey of the Heath by the Hampstead Heath Protection Society and to put forward ideas for its future preservation. During his survey he noted that within the “fine series of ponds” the water plants had been destroyed and the boundaries had been made too rigid, meaning that they appeared unnatural, something he disapproved of. Robinson not only believed in creating a natural-looking Heath, but also in the idea that it should appear “open (and) breezy”. Relating to this were observations he made about the placement of trees on the east side of Spaniards Road as they blocked impressive views. Robinson also noted that some of the small pools had disappeared due to the drought. Robinson was determined that the Heath would be different to other existing parks, and wrote that “the introduction of the conventional path or garden path would be deplorable” due to the natural-look he advocated.
- 4.3.7 In Robinson’s letter he outlined suggestions about the types of vegetation that should be planted in order to meet his ideals for the Heath. It was strongly felt that native trees should be planted rather than those from other countries which were usually found in English parks. In addition he believed that these should not only include common species but also species such as aspen and field maple and shrubs such as viburnum. The nature and habitats of the vegetation was to be taken into consideration when planting to avoid “muddled shrubbery” and he argued that whatever was planted should be grouped together in picturesque ways which appeared as natural as possible. Recommendations were also made for the maintenance of the Heath regarding the fact that the grassy areas should not be mowed and the uneven areas should be planted with sloe, furze and broom and then protected from sheep and rabbits.
- 4.3.8 The Heath’s pools and ponds also formed a large part of Robinson’s recommendations. It was stated that native plants should be restored within the areas of water, and the pool boundaries removed in order for them to appear more natural. In the ponds used for swimming, vegetation was suggested for the outer boundaries, allowing access but maintaining the natural appearance. As it had been found that some of the small ponds had dried up, Robinson was clear to state that this should be prevented as far as possible. It was written that the larger natural pools in particular should be maintained and kept due to their value in reflecting the light, and also as they encouraged native vegetation to grow alongside the water.

#### *Water Management at Hampstead Heath*

- 4.3.9 During the early 20th-century the open spaces and ponds at Hampstead Heath

were the under the control of the London County Council, followed by the GLC, and later the City of London Corporation. The Hampstead Heath Act gave permission to the New River Company, later the Metropolitan Water Board, to utilise the ponds at Hampstead Heath through a series of leases. The final lease expired in 1936 and the MWB no longer required use of the ponds due to the growing desire for filtered water (LMA: CL/PK.2/85).

- 4.3.10 The City Corporation expressed their desire to drain the ponds in order to prevent flooding and high costs associated with their maintenance, and a number of letters from officials dated between 1936–7 show them to have supported this idea (LMA: CL/PK.2/85).
- 4.3.11 However, by 1939 it had been decided that the correct action to take was for the Council to assume control of the ponds, and maintain them as public swimming areas (LMA: CL/PK.2/85).
- 4.3.12 It can be seen through numerous correspondences that the public felt strongly about losing the swimming ponds, and plans to transform one of the ponds into a lido were argued against. It was considered that such plans would prevent “many poor people” from using the space, and the natural facilities provided at the Heath ponds were favoured over purpose-built swimming pools (LMA: CL/PK.2/85).
- 4.3.13 It is clear that over time many of Robinson’s recommendations for the Heath were carried out, and much of the way that the Heath is experienced today is down to his opinions and beliefs. Today however, much of the Heath is covered with trees which obscure the views between areas. The ponds in the Hampstead and Highgate chain are recognisable in form from earlier maps, although it is clear from concrete reinforced dams and sheet piling that there have been consistent improvements and maintenance to the ponds carried out since their creation (Fig 33 and Fig 36).
- 4.3.14 Many areas within Hampstead Heath today are designed landscapes. Trees were planted alone or in avenues as parkland features, including varieties which had not been seen in the pollen records before such as walnut, sweet chestnut and horse chestnut (Collins and Lorimer 1989, 98). As a result many of the older trees may be heritage assets, part of the designed parkland.

## **5 Statement of significance: above ground heritage assets**

### **5.1 Introduction**

- 5.1.1 In accordance with the NPPF, the following section provides a statement based on professional and expert judgement on the likely significance (which is a reflection of the value or importance) of above ground heritage assets, derived from the perceived historical, evidential, aesthetic and communal value.
- 5.1.2 The assessment focuses on the two pond chains that form part of the proposed hydrology and pond improvement scheme. In the following assessment, significance of the ponds has been derived from elements of ponds construction, as well as their existence as bodies of water. This is followed by a section discussing the setting of nearby above ground heritage assets which might potentially be affected by any proposed works to the ponds.
- 5.1.3 The report does not include an assessment of the heritage significance and setting of the majority of above ground assets within the site and surrounding study area, as views to and from these are entirely obscured by existing topography and vegetation (even when considering the likely vegetation cover in winter months). It is assumed that any improvement works would not entail tall new constructions. The potential difference in settings during winter as opposed to spring/summer has not been explicitly assessed, although it is assumed that the density of foliage around most of ponds would lessen the likelihood of such settings changing between seasons.
- 5.1.4 In accordance with NPPF the assessment should be in proportion to asset significance and consequently other than the ponds themselves, historic character and setting has only been considered for relevant above ground assets of high (eg Grade II listed building/conservation area) and very high (Grade I/II\* listed building) significance.

### **5.2 Hampstead Chain**

- 5.2.1 The Hampstead Chain (Fig 1b) runs down the slope of the western half of East Heath, from Vale of Health Pond in the north to Hampstead No. 1 Pond in the south.
- 5.2.2 As discussed in section 4.2, this chain of ponds is the earliest of the two chains and was established in the 16th century by Act of Parliament in order to facilitate the controlled supply of water to the capital via the Fleet. The extent to which the current pond footprints resemble those of the original is not known, but it is likely that they are very similar. The ponds will have been cleared and cleaned at various times as part of their maintenance and the exact nature of the below-water state of the ponds is currently unknown.
- 5.2.3 The overall construction of the pond chain around a natural watercourse is particularly clear in the Hampstead Chain as much of the watercourse between the ponds is visible, if not accessible. Below, each of the ponds will be briefly described as assets themselves and in terms of their setting relationship with the wider Heath and other assets in their immediate vicinity.
- 5.2.4 It has not been possible to ascertain the exact nature of the connecting culverts between each of the ponds as these are below ground and/or inaccessible for inspection due to vegetation or access restrictions. In some instances, the sluices were visible, but it is assumed here that the culverts will be a mixture of 19th century brick and more modern material.
- 5.2.5 All of the ponds in the Hampstead chain have been afforded medium significance. This significance, although in some cases having individual nuances, is in large part due to the existence of the ponds as a group. They carry clear aesthetic and communal values for their very location as bodies of water within the Heath

landscape, many of which are public amenities of long standing. Their historical and evidential values are derived from their long historical role as a solution to a water-management issue, both locally and city-wide.

#### *Hampstead No. 1 Pond*

- 5.2.6 The furthest south of the chain, Hampstead No. 1 Pond, is the largest of the Hampstead Chain. It has largely natural banking although its eastern edge, where it borders South Hill Park could not be observed although it appeared to be a natural bank running up to the garden wall of the houses. This pond has a few interventions into its bank including a 20th century brick sluice in its south bank and two slipways/platforms in its south-east, incorporating some late 19th century cast iron fencing. The pond is held to its south by a substantial earth bank although this is largely obscured by foliage. An equally substantial earthen bank separates this pond from Hampstead No. 2 Pond (Fig 15). As a structure in its own right, Hampstead No. 1 Pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.2.7 The pond is largely obscured from the south due to foliage and its earth bank. It has a significant setting relationship with a terrace of 19th- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century houses on South Bank Hill to its east which overlook it from a very short distance away. To the west, the pond is not visible from any great distance due to the topography of the Heath itself and it is therefore not thought to have any significant setting relationship with Hampstead Conservation Area, an asset of High significance, which has a stronger relationship with the open space of the Heath as a whole. The pond has a stronger setting relationship with Hampstead No. 2 Pond as the two share a damming earth bank and it is possible to stand between them and observe the full length of both. Overall, the setting relationships between the pond and Hampstead No. 2 Pond, South Hill Park and the open space of the Heath to the west contribute positively to its significance as a heritage asset.

#### *Hampstead No. 2 Pond*

- 5.2.8 In contrast to its southern neighbour, Hampstead No. 2 Pond has largely concrete banking. This is especially evident on its southern bank, where the concrete provides the northern side of the earthen bank between this pond and Hampstead No. 1 Pond, and on its northern bank, where a causeway-dam separates it from the Mixed Bathing Pond (Fig 13, 16). The eastern edge of the pond runs right up to the garden walls of the houses on South Hill Park. The western bank appears to be natural. Hampstead No. 2 Pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.2.9 The pond has the same range of setting relationships as Hampstead No. 1 Pond and those with the ponds either side of it, the open space of the Heath and the houses of South Hill Park contribute positively to its significance as a heritage asset.

#### *Mixed Bathing Pond*

- 5.2.10 The banking of the Mixed Bathing Pond is largely obscured by foliage and all of its banks except its south were inaccessible at the time of survey. The southern bank, where the pond meets the causeway-dam that separates this pond from Hampstead No. 2 Pond, is reinforced with steel sheet piles. In its north-east, the Mixed Bathing Pond incorporates a small complex of changing rooms and a lifeguard station. These are fairly modern light timber buildings on brick foundations, these presumably resting on a cement slab (Fig 17). The Mixed Bathing Pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.2.11 The pond is obscured by foliage on all but its south bank. Despite this, it has significant setting relationships with Hampstead No. 2 Pond and with the wider Heath to its west.

### *Viaduct Pond*

- 5.2.12 Viaduct Pond (Fig 12, 22) lies some distance to the north of the Mixed Bathing Pond. It has very steep banks on all but its south side (the valley with watercourse running through it). The banks of the pond are largely natural, with the exception of the aforementioned south bank with is of steel sheet piling (Fig 23) overlaid with a chunky wood veneer. The pond is most notable for being either side of the grade II listed Viaduct Bridge (**HEA 58**). This brick and stone construction of c 1845 carries the footpath over the pond. Viaduct Pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.2.13 The most obvious significant setting relationship in this area is that between Viaduct Pond and the Viaduct Bridge. The latter forms an integral part of the southern view of the pond and provides views of both halves of it itself. The interrelationship of the pond and bridge is a positive contributor to the pond's significance as a heritage asset. The pond has less of a setting relationship with the wider Heath as other ponds, being largely obscured from it by both foliage and the gradient of its banks, aside from its immediate surroundings.

### *Vale of Health Pond*

- 5.2.14 The northernmost pond of the functional Hampstead Chain has, as far as could be observed, all natural banking although its eastern bank is an earthen dam holding the pond back from the valley of the watercourse running downhill towards the other ponds. There have been some interventions into the pond's west bank in the form of two timber and earth fishing platforms of fairly modern appearance. Vale of Health Pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.2.15 The pond has a series of setting relationships with other assets that contribute positively to its heritage significance. The primary of these is with the buildings of Vale of Health itself (Fig 24), here discussed not individually but as a group that form an extension of the Hampstead Conservation Area (see section 5.4 below). To its south and west, the pond is generally visually separated from the wider Heath by foliage.

## **5.3 Highgate Chain**

- 5.3.1 The Highgate Chain of ponds (Fig 1b) carries water from Wood Pond to the north, within the grounds of Kenwood, south via a series of largely open ponds set within landscaped parkland. Whilst the parkland is overlooked by Highgate Village to the north, the ponds themselves, located at the valley bottom and obscure by buildings and vegetation, are not visible from the village itself.
- 5.3.2 As discussed in section 4.2, this chain of ponds was established in the 17th century as a continuation of the desire to secure a water source for London that was started here with the earlier creation of the Hampstead chain. The extent to which the current pond footprints resemble those of the original is not known, but it is likely that they changed little. As noted above, the ponds will have been cleared and cleaned at various times as part of their maintenance.
- 5.3.3 With the exception of Wood Pond and Thousand Pound Pond, all of the ponds in the Highgate chain have been afforded medium significance. This significance, although in some cases having individual nuances, is in large part due to the existence of the ponds as a group. They carry clear aesthetic and communal values for their very location as bodies of water within the Heath landscape, many of which are public amenities of long standing. Their historical and evidential values are derived from their long historical role as a solution to a water-management issue, both locally and city-wide.

*Wood Pond*

- 5.3.4 Set within the landscaped grounds of Kenwood, Wood Pond dates to the second half of the 18th century when it was formed through the amalgamation of a series of pre-existing smaller ponds. It is irregularly shaped and surrounded, as far as could be observed, by natural banks with a central island (Fig 25). To the pond's west, it can be crossed by a small brick bridge (Fig 26). The Kenwood side of the pond is marked by cast iron railings of early to mid 20th century date. For its connection to Kenwood House, a Grade II\* listed building of very high significance, the Wood Pond is of **high significance** as a heritage asset. It has aesthetic and communal values as a component of a designed landscape that is still popular in the present day and which is an integral part of the wider landscape of Kenwood. Its historical and evidential values also derive from its role in the history of local water management and landscape design.
- 5.3.5 As mentioned, the pond is set within the landscaped grounds of Kenwood House and it is an integral part of the view south from the house. The setting relationship between the two can therefore be said to contribute positively to the heritage significance of each asset. The setting of Kenwood House is discussed separately in section 5.4 below.

*Thousand Pound Pond*

- 5.3.6 Thousand Pound Pond is a sub-rectangular body of water with natural banks immediately to the east of Wood Pond and also within the grounds of Kenwood. On its east side is the Grade II\* listed Sham Bridge, a timber construction of 1767 with the distant appearance of a stone bridge (Fig 27). The pond is of **high significance** as a heritage asset for the same reasons as outlined above for Wood Pond.
- 5.3.7 As with its neighbour, Wood Pond, Thousand Pound Pond is an integral part of the landscaping around Kenwood, and the view south from the building itself, something made clear by the existence of the Sham Bridge. Thus, the setting relationship between Thousand Pound Pond and Kenwood, and between those two assets and Wood Pond as a group, must be said to contribute positively to each asset's heritage significance.

*Stock Pond*

- 5.3.8 Situated at the northern end of the Highgate Chain proper, Stock Pond is a relatively small pond with natural banking (Fig 28). Its southern bank, natural in appearance, is possibly a damming construction and it contains a brick sluice dating to the mid to late 20th century. The pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.3.9 Stock Pond is surrounded by dense foliage on all but its southern side and it does not have setting relationships with any individual assets which might contribute to its heritage significance. It does, of course, have the same general setting relationship with the wider Heath as the other ponds.

*Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond*

- 5.3.10 Kenwood Ladies Bathing Pond is a naturally-banked pond surrounded by dense foliage and accessible only to women. At its south end, it incorporates a concrete platform holding the pond's changing rooms, a complex of relatively modern timber and concrete buildings with single-pitch sloping roofs (Fig 29). The pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset and the changing room complex is of **negligible significance** as a heritage asset as it is a modern structure without historical, evidential, aesthetic and communal values.
- 5.3.11 Being surrounded by foliage, the pond's significant setting relationship is only with the wider Heath and not with any other individual assets. The setting relationship

between the pond and the changing room complex is of no significance, although the complex does not detract from the pond's individual significance as a heritage asset.

#### *Bird Sanctuary Pond*

- 5.3.12 The last of the more enclosed ponds in the Highgate Chain, Bird Sanctuary Pond is a dog-leg shaped body of water with natural banking on all sides (Fig 30). The pond is surrounded by a cast iron railing of probable late 19th century date, which restricts public access to the pond edges. It is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.3.13 The pond forms part of the view from the Merton Lane & Millfield Lane sub-area of the Highgate Conservation Area (Camden). The pond and its Heath surroundings are visible from Millfield Lane itself, generally seen from the southeast, and from the buildings along it. The setting relationship between the pond (as part of the wider Heath) and the Merton Lane & Millfield Lane sub-area could be said to make a positive contribution to the latter's significance as a heritage asset (see below), while Highgate works as a backdrop to the Heath although it does not make a distinctly positive contribution to the significance of Bird Sanctuary Pond as an asset in its own right.

#### *Model Boating Pond*

- 5.3.14 The Model Boating Pond is a large sub-rectangular pond with steel sheet banking with concrete capping on all sides (Fig 31). The watercourse can be seen to enter via a concrete outflow on the pond's north side and exit through a sluice built into the south bank. It is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.3.15 The most open of the ponds, the Model Boating Pond is clearly visible from all sides. To its west, the landscaped parkland rises to create an effective backdrop that clearly demonstrates the positive contribution of the wider Heath to the significance of this particular body of water. To the east, the pond is overlooked by Millfield Lane, the western edge of the Merton Lane & Millfield Lane sub-area of Highgate Conservation Area (Camden) where it forms an integral part of the latter's backdrop. It is at this point that the interrelation of Highgate Conservation Area (Camden) and Hampstead is most clear due to the relative paucity of foliage around this pond. The pond and its visibility can therefore be said to be a positive contributor to the setting relationship between those two assets.

#### *Highgate Men's Bathing Pond*

- 5.3.16 The last of the swimming ponds in the chain, the Highgate Men's Bathing Pond is obscured from view by foliage on its east and west banks, but open to the north and south. It appears to have a mixture of natural and steel sheet pile banking. On its east side it incorporates a complex of changing rooms, largely constructed from corrugated metal, set on a concrete platform (Fig 14, 33). To the south, the pond is held by a substantial earthen dam above Highgate No. 1 Pond (Fig 34). The pond was drained and cleaned out in the 1980s, though the exact date has not been ascertained. The pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset while the changing complex is of **negligible significance**.
- 5.3.17 Due to its being relative obscured, the pond does not have the same range of significant setting relationships as does the Model Boating Pond. As with the other ponds as a group however, the Highgate Men's Boating Pond does have a general setting relationship with the wider Heath that contributes positively to its significance as a heritage asset.

#### *Highgate No. 1 Pond*

- 5.3.18 The southernmost pond of the Highgate Chain, Highgate No. 1 Pond has a mixture

of natural banking and steel sheet piles with concrete capping. There have been some interventions on its western edge to incorporate platforms and a slipway and the southern bank of the pond has a 20th century brick sluice set into it (Fig 35). The pond is of **medium significance** as a heritage asset.

The pond is immediately adjacent to the southern part of Highgate Conservation Area (Camden) although it is generally obscured from it by foliage. The pond and its surrounding foliage act as backdrop to the conservation area that contributes positively to its significance as a heritage asset. The pond also has a positive setting relationship with the other ponds of the Highgate Chain and with the wider Heath.

## 5.4 The setting of heritage assets

- 5.4.1 As discussed above, a number of the ponds have significant setting relationships beyond that with just the wider Heath. There are also aspects of Hampstead Heath that contribute directly to its own significance as part of the setting of the ponds, most notably the history of the area's planting. This section briefly outlines the significance of those assets discussed above as they relate to the ponds of the Hampstead and Highgate Chains.

### *Hampstead Conservation Area*

- 5.4.2 Hampstead Conservation Area was originally designated in 1968 and is the only conservation area to properly take in parts of Hampstead Heath. The main aspect of its designation, and of its on-going significance, is the range of buildings it contains and its topography, which makes for both a unique urban experience at ground level, and an impressive skyline. The conservation area itself is of **high significance** as a heritage asset.
- 5.4.3 The eastern boundary of the Willoughby Road/Downshire Hill sub-area of the conservation area looks out onto Hampstead No. 1 Pond (although the water itself is largely obscured by foliage and topography. South End Road in particular has houses that look out onto the Heath and it must be assumed that their view of open space, in this case facilitated by the space created by Hampstead No. 1 Pond, contributes positively to the significance of this part of the conservation area as a heritage asset.
- 5.4.4 At the north of the Hampstead Chain, Vale of Health also exists as a sub-area of Hampstead Conservation Area. Although primarily a tight enclave of buildings, the views out onto the Heath and the Vale's proximity to Vale of Health Pond and important contributors to its significance as a heritage asset.

### *Highgate Conservation Area (Camden)*

- 5.4.5 Highgate Conservation Area was first designated in 1968 and covers an area as notable for its architecture and topography as Hampstead Conservation Area. In particular, the Merton Lane & Millfield Lane sub-area overlooks the central portion of the Highgate Chain of ponds and operates effectively as the barrier between Highgate Village and the Heath, with the landscape as a unifying factor tying together a disparate group of architectural styles. The visibility of the ponds and past them to the wider Heath, especially from Millfield Lane, is therefore an important aspect of the conservation area's significance as a heritage asset.

### *Kenwood*

- 5.4.6 Kenwood is a Grade II\* 17th to 18th century house set within a Grade II\* registered park and garden and associated with a number of other listed buildings. Wood Pond and Thousand Pound Pond as existing are important and historically significant aspects of the property and its garden. Kenwood and its grounds are of **very high**

significance and the interrelation of the house, grounds and ponds makes a positive contribution to the heritage significance of each of those assets independently.

### *Hampstead Heath*

- 5.4.7 Hampstead Heath as a whole demonstrates a wide variety of landscape types, historical features and views. For the purposes of this study, the most important aspect of the Heath is its existence as a designed landscape. For the most part, the planting in the vicinity of the ponds can be attributed to the planting schemes undertaken on the back of William Robinson's report in 1898 and which can be observed in early 20th century photographs of the Heath (Fig 11, 12). It has not been possible to determine exactly the full extent of the Robinson scheme planting, but where it can be shown to exist, it would be of **medium significance** as a heritage asset. Later planting would generally be of lesser individual significance, but remain an important contributor to the setting of each of the ponds and the Heath as a whole.
- 5.4.8 The Heath may incorporate older hedge lines (as shown on Fig 2), which would be of **medium significance** as heritage assets.

### *The Viaduct Bridge (HEA 58)*

- 5.4.9 Viaduct Bridge is a brick and stone structure dating to c. 1845 that carries one of the Heath's footpaths across Viaduct Pond. It is of **high significance** as a heritage asset, deriving its historical and evidential values from its place in the evolution of Hampstead Heath as a designed landscape and its aesthetic and communal values from its association with the pond and the way in which it facilitates public enjoyment of the landscape.
- 5.4.10 Were the pond to become disused (i.e. filled in) the bridge would lose much of its character and its historical and evidential values would be much less clear. It can therefore be said to have a significant setting relationship with Viaduct Pond that greatly enhances its significance as a heritage asset.

## 6 Statement of significance: buried heritage assets

### 6.1 Introduction

- 6.1.1 The following section discusses the types of past impacts which may have compromised the survival of archaeological remains within the area of the proposed pond improvement scheme. As the exact location, extent and nature of the proposals are not currently known, a more detailed assessment of past impacts in specific areas has not been possible, but could be undertaken at a later date once known.
- 6.1.2 In accordance with the NPPF, this is followed by a statement on the likely potential and significance of buried heritage assets within the site, derived from current understanding of the baseline conditions, past impacts, and professional judgement.

### 6.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival

- 6.2.1 Hampstead Heath has been largely undeveloped throughout its history, although it has been actively managed as wood and heath land. There is evidence for early prehistoric settlement in the area, although it appears to have been a peripheral area to settlement throughout the Roman, Saxon and medieval periods. The southern part of the Heath has been farmland in the past, and the ponds have supplied water to London since the late 16th century. The Heath remains predominantly open ground and woodland today. Archaeological potential will have been affected by quarrying and water management within the Heath and by the development of properties within the Heath in the post-medieval period, although both the remains of post-medieval water management systems, and medieval and post-medieval quarry pits are of some archaeological significance themselves.
- 6.2.2 *Water management:* the Highgate and Hampstead strings of ponds were established in the 16th and 17th century by damming the streams running from the many springs in the area. Creating the ponds required significant earthen banks to be created on the southern sides of several of the ponds (notable Hampstead no. 1 pond and the Highgate men's bathing pond) in order to create a flat terrace on the sloping valley bottom (Fig 34). Further terracing was also observed in other areas around the ponds, indicating significant earth moving in the post-medieval period. Creating these terraces will have used a combination of cutting into the ground surface and piling the spoil in other areas. Where the ground surface was cut into any archaeological remains would have been removed. Damming the streams would have had the effect of both drying out what had been a very marshy area, and of creating the ponds much as they are today. It is not clear how much excavation was necessary to create the ponds, but the removal of any material will have removed any archaeological remains within it. Additionally remains which would have been preserved anaerobically in wet conditions will have been dried out and potentially lost across the lower lying areas of the Heath. Since their creation there have been successive phases of management at the ponds. The current ponds frequently have edges reinforced by concrete or sheet piling. It is likely that later structures would have been built in front of earlier ones, potentially preserving them *in situ*, as removing previous walls would have been very difficult. The ponds themselves are likely to have been cleaned out a various times following the build-up of silt although details of these cleaning episodes are not currently known. Where extensive cleaning has taken place it will probably have removed any artefacts that might have been accidentally or deliberately deposited into the pond.
- 6.2.3 *Quarrying:* the quarrying of sand along the high sandy ridge which runs through the centre of the Heath will have had a major impact on potential archaeological survival across the area of the Bagshot Beds. Extensive quarrying of sand took place

between the medieval period as late as the Second World War, when large pits were opened to quarry sand for sand bags (VCH, *Middlesex ix*). The backfills of the quarry pits, particularly those of medieval or early post-medieval date would, however, be of some archaeological interest. To a lesser extent there is likely to have been an impact from clay pits in the area close to the Highgate and Hampstead ponds. A 19th century brickworks is known to have been located close to the Hampstead pond chain (**HEA 132**) and it is possible that this activity was more widespread.

- 6.2.4 *Development*: while much of Hampstead Heath is open land or woodland the areas which bound the roads which run through it have been built up, and other post-medieval buildings, such as those relating to Kenwood House have also been constructed. Construction will have had an effect on archaeological remains within the footprint of the building, although the depth of truncation will depend on the formation level and the nature of the foundations. The majority of the buildings within Hampstead Heath are some considerable distance from the ponds where the greatest impact on archaeological remains is likely to be. There are however bathing facilities at the no.3 Hampstead pond, which is the mixed bathing pond, and at the ladies and men's bathing ponds on the Highgate chains. The buildings at the mixed bathing pond (Fig 37) are light wooden buildings which are likely to have standard building foundations, typically no deeper than 1.5m below ground level. The construction of these buildings will have removed any archaeological remains to that depth but remains surviving below that level are likely to survive undamaged. Both the men's and ladies bathing pond facilities are on concrete rafts which extend over the ponds themselves, supported by piles (Fig 25 and Fig 33). The piles would have had a localised impact on any archaeological remains present, removing any remains within the footprint of the pile.

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

- 6.2.5 The depth of potential archaeological remains is likely to vary greatly, although most remains are likely to be found close to the ground surface as the Heath is a relatively undisturbed area. Remains may, however, be of considerable depth, particularly quarry pits and their backfills. Further investigation in areas of potential impact would be required to establish this.

### **6.3 Archaeological potential and significance**

- 6.3.1 Archaeological survival potential is high across Hampstead Heath as a result of the relative lack of development. However it is likely that later activity in some areas will have mostly removed evidence of earlier periods. Several broad zones of archaeological potential have been identified, where distinct types of archaeological feature are likely to survive. In the absence a significant amount of archaeological data, these are based primarily on topography, geology and past and current land use.
- 6.3.2 Fig 36 shows the zones of potential within Hampstead Heath. These are indicative only and are intended to show areas with the highest potential for features of particular date and are not exclusive. While remains of these periods may be found outside of the zone there is a higher potential in those areas. There are three main zones, which have been numbered 1 to 3 and the potential of each is described below.

#### *Zone 1: Areas around the Hampstead and Highgate pond chains*

- 6.3.3 This zone includes all four chains of ponds present within Hampstead Heath and the catchment area of springs and streams which feed into them.
- 6.3.4 *These areas have high potential for palaeoenvironmental remains.* There are

several springs on the Heath, located on the London Clay, which prior to the formation of the ponds would have been marshy. In these areas alluvial deposits and peats may have formed which have the potential for palaeoenvironmental remains such as microfossils (e.g. pollen) and floral and faunal macrofossils (such as seeds and plant fragments) which can be used to reconstruct past local environments. Cores taken during excavations in the West Heath provided a detailed pollen sequence which has greatly added to our understanding of the history of the area. If deposits of these kind survive in other areas of the Heath they would be of **low** significance unless extensive strata with layers of peat, or other organic material survive, which would be of **medium** significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value in providing evidence of past environments and human activity.

- 6.3.5 *Moderate potential for isolated early prehistoric flint artefacts.* It is possible that the area around the ponds would have been used for hunting and gathering food in the Mesolithic period. Isolated flint tools have been found during previous investigations within the Heath and may also be found in this area around the valley bottoms. Such finds would be of **medium** significance, based on their likely evidential and historical value in providing evidence of the past human exploitation of the area.
- 6.3.6 *These areas have a high potential for post-medieval remains.* In the post-medieval period Hampstead Heath became a significant source of clean water for London and the ponds which are so much a feature of the modern area were built. It is likely that post-medieval features dating as early as the late 17th century may survive that relate to the management of water in the area. This could include, but is not limited to, timber and later sheet piled pond walls and brick culverts. Remains of earlier pond structures would be heritage assets of **medium** significance, based on their likely evidential and historic value, providing evidence of the development of the ponds throughout the post-medieval period and potentially of aesthetic and communal value, depending on their nature, as the ponds are an important part of Hampstead Heath's environment.

### *Zone 2: Areas on the London Clay*

- 6.3.7 The Heath's geology and its archaeological potential are closely linked, as the different bedrock formations created different environments within the area throughout history. This area reflects the parts of Hampstead Heath located on the London Clay. Historically much of these areas were outside of the bounds of Hampstead Heath and would have been farm or woodland.
- 6.3.8 *The area has high potential for prehistoric remains.* There is a Bronze Age barrow located to the north-west of Parliament Hill (**HEA 25**). The mound itself is scheduled and is of **very high** significance and currently undiscovered associated features could be of **high** or **very high** significance as a result of their historical and evidential value. It also has some communal value as a well known local landmark, although it is traditionally identified with Boadicea. There is a low to moderate potential for other prehistoric remains in the area. The land would mostly have been quite marshy and the heavy clays unsuitable for early farmers but the marsh resources would have been an attractive resource for prehistoric people meaning there is the potential for small structures such as fish traps and isolated finds across the area. Isolated finds would be of **low** significance but more extensive remains could be of **medium** or **high** significance.
- 6.3.9 *The area has a low potential for Roman remains.* While there is some background potential that a previously unknown Roman site similar to the pottery manufacture site found c 1.8km to the north-east of the Heath at Highgate Woods, no significant evidence of Roman activity has been found in the area of the Heath. It is thought that it would have been a mostly wooded area beyond the outskirts of Roman settlement in the area, located at some distance to the nearest roads. A few isolated

Roman coins and pottery have been found within the study area, including a coin found in this area, but no significant, verifiable Roman evidence has been found. Isolated finds would be of **low** significance.

- 6.3.10 *The area has a low potential for early medieval remains.* Hampstead Heath was mostly wooded during the early medieval period to the north of the small settlement at Hampstead. A few fragments of Anglo-Saxon pottery were found during an excavation in West Heath but no further evidence has been found of early medieval activity. The Heath does however straddle the parish boundary between the parishes of St Pancras and Hampstead, which would have grown out of earlier land divisions. Possible Saxon boundaries have been identified within the area (**HEA 133** Fig 2, City of London, 2008), and other boundaries of this date may also survive, although they might appear to be of later date. Isolated remains would be heritage assets of **low** significance, although land boundaries of this date would be assets of **medium** significance, based on their potential evidential and historic value.
- 6.3.11 *The area has a moderate potential for later medieval remains.* Hampstead Heath, while largely undeveloped, would have been extensively exploited during the medieval period. The woods would have been used for grazing and collecting firewood, and areas of the Heath, including Parliament Hill Fields and the north-west extension would have been farmland, mostly pasture, with fields divided by hedgerows. Land boundaries such as ditches and hedgerows would have run along the parish boundary and may still survive within later boundaries. A number of ancient hedgerows and lines of trees have been identified some of which may date to the later medieval period (Fig 2, City of London, 2008). Isolated finds may also be found. Such remains are likely to be of **medium** or **low** significance depending on survival and extent based on their potential evidential and historical value.
- 6.3.12 *The area has a high potential for post-medieval remains.* As well as an important source for clean water (see Zone 1) the Heath was also used for military training during the Napoleonic Wars. Finds relating to the military usage of the Heath are likely to survive as isolated finds, as will finds dropped by casual users of the Heath across the period. Isolated finds would be heritage assets of **low** significance based on their potential evidential value. A 19th century brickworks is known to have been located close to the Hampstead ponds, and remains of the clay pits there, and previously unknown potential pits in other areas, may still survive. Post-medieval clay pits would be of **low** significance. Hedgerows and lines of trees, such as avenues lining paths and roads, survive from this period.

### *Zone 3: Areas on the Bagshot Beds*

- 6.3.13 The high ridge which runs between Hampstead and Highgate through the centre of the Heath lies on a band of sand of the Bagshot Beds formation.
- 6.3.14 *The area has high potential for prehistoric remains.* Evidence of Mesolithic settlement and other activity has been found in this area during past investigations (**HEA 2** and **HEA 7**). While Mesolithic layers will, in many areas, have been truncated by medieval and later sand quarrying, *in situ* deposits may still be found on the sandy ridge. Redeposited artefacts would be of **low** significance but remains of settlement would be of **high** significance as a result of its potential historical and evidential value.
- 6.3.15 *The area has a low potential for early medieval remains.* Hampstead Heath was mostly wooded during the early medieval period to the north of the small settlement at Hampstead. A few fragments of Anglo-Saxon pottery were found during an excavation in West Heath but no further evidence has been found of early medieval activity. Isolated remains would be heritage assets of **low** significance based on their potential evidential and historic value.
- 6.3.16 *The area has a moderate potential for later medieval remains.* Hampstead Heath,

while largely undeveloped, would have been extensively exploited during the medieval period. The high ridge is known to have been quarried for sand. Later medieval remains are likely to comprise quarry pits and their backfills, although these are likely to have been truncated by post-medieval quarries. Isolated finds may also be found. Such remains are likely to be of **medium** or **low** significance depending on survival and extent based on their potential evidential and historical value.

- 6.3.17 *The area has a high potential for post-medieval remains.* In the post-medieval period Hampstead Heath continued to be used as a resource for quarrying sand. Post-medieval quarry pits and their backfills will survive across the sandy ridge. Isolated finds and quarry pits are heritage assets of **low** significance based on their evidential value.

## 7 Impact of proposals

### 7.1 Proposals

- 7.1.1 The works would be focused on two north-west to south-east aligned chains of ponds in the western (the Hampstead chain; Fig 1b) and eastern (the Highgate chain; Fig 1b) part of East Heath. It would include improvements to bathing and lifeguard facilities at the Ladies Bathing Pond at one of the more northern ponds of the Highgate chain. The proposed improvements would include alteration to some of the banking, dams and conduits.
- 7.1.2 The details of the proposals, including the exact location, extent and nature of the works, have yet to be established. The impact assessment below is intended to inform the design process and indicate the likely implications of different types of development .

### 7.2 Implications

#### *Above ground heritage assets*

- 7.2.1 Proposed works are likely to alter the banking of some of the ponds, with associated alteration of the foliage surrounding them. The heritage significance of the ponds comes from their very existence as bodies of water in the landscape and for their part in London's water management system and its history rather than from any fabric with which they are associated such as historic banking. It is unlikely therefore that any proposed works would alter the ponds' significance as long as they stop short of wholly removing them.
- 7.2.2 Some of the ponds have specific setting relationships with other assets that contribute to the heritage significance of both. Along the Hampstead chain, Viaduct Pond has a significant relationship with the Viaduct Bridge that crosses it and Vale of Health Pond is an integral part of Vale of Health, itself part of Hampstead Conservation Area. The interrelation of these assets contributes positively to the individual significance of each and would be adversely affected were proposed works to alter their respective intervisibility, although this is thought to be unlikely.
- 7.2.3 The ponds south of Kenwood, Wood Pond and Thousand Pound Pond are similarly integral to their surrounding landscape, and the interrelation between them, Kenwood and its grounds would be adversely affected were proposals to alter their visibility from the house.
- 7.2.4 Bird Sanctuary Pond and the Model Boating Pond are visible from the western boundary of Highgate Conservation Area (Camden) and form part of a view over the Heath which is a positive contributor to the conservation area's significance. As with the other examples, this would be adversely affected were the visibility of the ponds from Millfield Lane to be lessened.

#### *Buried heritage assets*

- 7.2.5 The works are likely to primarily have an impact on buried remains in the vicinity of the Hampstead and Highgate pond chains. These are located on the London Clay close to the springs within the areas of archaeological potential identified in section 6.3 as Zones 1 and 2 (i.e. potential for palaeoenvironmental remains, post-medieval water management features, and medieval and post-medieval finds and features).
- 7.2.6 *Excavation.* The details of the below ground implications of the proposed works are not currently known. However it can be said that any works requiring excavation, i.e. the removal of any ground, would involve the removal of any archaeological remains to the depth of the excavation. This would reduce the significance of any remains to

**negligible or nil.**

- 7.2.7 *Temporary works facilities:* Should any works compounds or other facilities be set up to support the development these may also have an effect on buried remains. Depending on location these may have an impact on remains other than those outlined in section 7.2.5 (see Fig 36). The removal of any ground during levelling or topsoil stripping would remove any archaeological remains within the ground removed, and remains surviving immediately below this could be removed as they are exposed to damage from rutting and compaction from works vehicles, and erosion. The significance of any remains removed in this way would be reduced to **negligible or nil**.
- 7.2.8 *Changes to water flow:* Changes to the management of water flow in the area of the ponds could result in the drying up of some areas and the saturation of areas previously dry, potentially causing an effect on below ground remains. Increased erosion or changes in erosive pattern would also have an effect. The removal of any archaeological remains would reduce their significance to **negligible or nil**.
- 7.2.9 *Removal or alteration of historic pond management features:* Many features of the water management in Hampstead Heath, such as pond walls, parts of the dams and culverts linking the system are historic assets in and of themselves. Works to the ponds and their surrounds, if involving the removal or exposure of such features, could lead to their significance being lost, reducing it to **negligible or nil** in the areas affected.
- 7.2.10 The setting of the scheduled barrow ('Bodicea's tumulus') is unlikely to be adversely affected provided the scale of the works is in keeping with the current environment. The monument is located at some distance to the ponds and the view is mostly screened by trees.
- 7.2.11 Archaeological remains in other areas of the Heath would not have their significance affected by the works.

## 8 Conclusion and recommendations

- 8.1.1 Archaeological survival potential within Hampstead Heath is likely to be high, given the undeveloped nature of most of the area. Medieval and post-medieval quarrying on the sandy ridge is likely to have had a significant impact on the survival of earlier remains, although the quarry pits themselves would be of some archaeological interest. The proposed works are focused on the Hampstead and Highgate chains of ponds in East Heath. Both chains are located directly on the London Clay and are likely to have been marshy areas for much of their history. Archaeological potential in the area of the ponds is therefore likely to be limited to palaeoenvironmental remains within alluvial deposits, and isolated medieval and post-medieval finds, as well as possible field and area boundaries. Any works involving excavation would have an impact on any remains present within their footprint, including site stripping and levelling carried out as part of temporary construction works. This would reduce the significance of any remains to negligible or nil.
- 8.1.2 In general, the heritage significance of the ponds lies in their existence as bodies of water, rather than in any details of their banking or the passage of water between them. This is also the case for the ponds settings; that those aspects of setting that contribute positively to their heritage significance lies not in the interrelationship of individual assets, but in a more general relationship to each other and the wider landscape of the Heath. It is unlikely that any improvement works which did not, in the long term, disrupt this wider landscape relationship would not incur any negative impact on the ponds' significance.
- 8.1.3 Table 1 summarises the known or likely assets within the site, their significance, and the possible implications of the proposed scheme in the absence of any detailed architectural or engineering information on the nature and extent of the proposed pond improvement works.

*Table 1: Impact upon heritage assets (prior to mitigation)*

<b>Asset</b>	<b>Asset Significance</b>	<b>Possible implications of proposed scheme, depending on the nature and extent of the works</b>
Ponds in the Hampstead Chain	<b>Medium</b>	Possible alteration of banking, water access and watercourse management systems.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected</b>
Wood Pond and Thousand Pound Pond	<b>High</b>	Possible alteration of banking, water access and watercourse management systems.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected</b>
Ponds in the Highgate Chain	<b>Medium</b>	Possible alteration of banking, water access and watercourse management systems.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected</b>
Hampstead Conservation Area (Vale of Health)	<b>High</b>	Possible alteration of appearance of Vale of Health Pond within immediate setting of conservation area.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected</b>

<b>Asset</b>	<b>Asset Significance</b>	<b>Possible implications of proposed scheme, depending on the nature and extent of the works</b>
Highgate Conservation Areas (Camden)	<b>High</b>	Possible alteration of appearance of ponds within immediate setting of conservation area.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected</b>
Kenwood and grounds	<b>Very High/High</b>	Possible alteration of Wood Pond and Thousand Pound Pond within setting of asset.  <b>Significance of asset likely to be unaffected although potential for reduction in significance of ponds contribution to asset's significance</b>
Hampstead Heath historic planting	<b>Medium</b>	Possible alteration of historic planting near ponds  <b>Overall contribution of historic planting to the setting of the wider Heath likely to be unaffected.</b>
Viaduct Bridge	<b>High</b>	Possible alteration of significant setting relationship with Viaduct Pond  <b>Significance of asset unlikely to be affected, but setting would cease to be a positive contributor to it if affected</b>
Prehistoric remains including features or finds relating to the exploitation of marsh resources (close to ponds), Bronze Age remains related to the scheduled monument and Mesolithic remains (on the sandy ridge) <i>High potential</i>	<b>High</b>	Remains close to the ponds may be removed during any excavations, removal of topsoil, rutting and compaction. Mesolithic remains on the sandy ridge unlikely to be adversely affected. The setting of the Bronze Age barrow is unlikely to be adversely affected.  <b>Significance of asset reduced to negligible where affected</b>
Palaeoenvironmental remains (close to springs) <i>High potential</i>	<b>Medium to Low</b> (depending on extent)	Excavation, removal of topsoil during site strip, rutting and compaction. Localised impact on asset  <b>Significance of asset reduced to negligible where affected</b>
Medieval remains including quarry pits, field and parish boundaries <i>Moderate potential</i>	<b>Medium to Low</b>	Remains close to the ponds may be removed during any excavations, removal of topsoil, rutting and compaction. Remains on the sandy ridge unlikely to be adversely affected.  <b>Significance of asset reduced to negligible where affected</b>
Post-medieval remains including quarry pits across area, Napoleonic military finds, and field boundaries). Water	<b>Medium (water management features) to</b>	Remains close to the ponds may be removed during any excavations, removal of topsoil, rutting and compaction. Remains on the sandy

Asset	Asset Significance	Possible implications of proposed scheme, depending on the nature and extent of the works
management features such as historic pond walls/dams (behind existing), sheet piles and culverts. <i>High potential</i>	<b>Low</b>	ridge unlikely to be adversely affected  <b>Significance of asset reduced to negligible where affected</b>
Previously unknown buried heritage assets of other periods <i>Low potential</i>	<b>Unknown</b>	Remains in the area of the ponds would be removed by excavation and site stripping/levelling.  <b>Significance of asset reduced to negligible where affected</b>

- 8.1.4 It is recommended that the final proposal architectural and engineering drawings, when they are available, are appraised by a relevant heritage professional to determine whether the proposed works are likely to impact on the setting relationship between the ponds and the wider Heath landscape, preferably at a stage where design mitigation could be enacted against any negative impacts.
- 8.1.5 Given the likely presence of deposits with potential for palaeoenvironmental remains it is considered that a geoarchaeological evaluation consisting of boreholes in the affected areas of Hampstead Heath might be suited to the initial stages of site-based investigation. This could be combined with a geotechnical survey carried out for engineering purposes. Based on the results of the geotechnical survey, it is possible that further site-specific archaeological investigation would be required, such as archaeological trial trenches/pits, in order to clarify the nature, extent and significance of any remains in the areas of proposed impact. This would allow the LPA to make an informed decision regarding the mitigation of any significant archaeological remains affected. It is possible that the preliminary investigations indicate that no further work is necessary, or that targeted archaeological excavation, and/or an archaeological watching brief for remains of lesser significance is carried out to achieve preservation by record.
- 8.1.6 Works which would have an impact on the historic fabric in and around the ponds should be preceded by recording. Due to the relatively homogenous nature of the heritage significance of the ponds and their construction, it is recommended that where future proposed works will alter their current appearance, that they be subject to archaeological built heritage recording to an appropriate level in the English Heritage guidelines (EH, 2006a).

## 9 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets

- 9.1.1 The table below represents a gazetteer of known historic environment sites and finds within Hampstead Heath and the 500m study area around it. The gazetteer should be read in conjunction with Fig 2.
- 9.1.2 The GLHER data contained within this gazetteer was obtained on 14/05/2013 and is the copyright of English Heritage 2013.

### Abbreviations

AOC – AOC Archaeology Group

DGLA - Department of Greater London Archaeology

HER – Historic Environment Record

IA – Isambard Archaeology

ILAU – Inner London Archaeology Unit

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

OA – Oxford Archaeology

PCA – Pre-Construct Archaeology

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
1	<b>Kenwood House</b> Watching brief carried out by OA in 2009. Made ground deposits were exposed consisting of demolition material and the base of a late 18th century wall running parallel to the west wall of the house.	KDO09
2	<b>West Heath: leg of mutton pond and spring (spa) site</b> Excavation carried out by Hendon and District Archaeology Society between 1976–1981. Substantial Early Mesolithic occupation site excavated. Over 61,000 flint artefacts recovered including tools, cores and flakes indicating that knapping was taking place on site. Burnt material, pits and stake holes were also recorded. Palaeoenvironmental study was also carried out.	WHS76
3	<b>Inverforth Close</b> Site code assigned to OAU, but watching brief undertaken by R Hughes for International Heritage Conservation and Management in 1995. Observations only noted 19th century and 20th century garden soils, foundations and quarry pits.	INV95
4	<b>4 North End</b> Watching brief carried out by PCA in 2012. Natural sand was found to have been truncated across the area of investigation. No features or artefacts of archaeological significance were recorded during the fieldwork.	NTE12
5	<b>Kenwood House (south-west of Farm House)</b> Archaeological evaluation carried out by PCA in 1994. A fragment of external farm yard was revealed at the base of two spoil heaps to the south-west of the Farm House, within a former quarry which had been dug before the farm's erection after 1794. The heaps were of 20th century date, comprising bands of coking ash and sand, with frequent occurrences of ceramics and glass utilitarian wares of the Express Dairy (which had tenure of the farm for several years).	HAD94
6	<b>Kenwood House, Wood Pond</b> Watching brief carried out by MoLAs in 2006. Some timbers were found by contractors working to strengthen the ponds. They comprise elements of a substantial double-truss structure extending from under the bank into Wood Pond, the precise date and function of which are currently uncertain, but which are probably of 17th or 18th century in date. Part of the timber structure remains in situ. In addition, an elm water pipe formed part of a system constructed in the late 18th century, connecting the two ponds.	KHT06

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
7	<p><b>British Gas Pipeline</b> Watching brief carried out by MoLAS in 1992. Field walking and metal detecting along a north-south pipeline across Hampstead Heath revealed mesolithic flints, Roman coins, medieval artefacts and much post-medieval material. Post-medieval ditches, land drains and dykes were also recorded in the sections.</p>	BGP92
8	<p><b>Klippan House, Well Walk</b> Evaluation carried out by PCA in 2009. Natural clay was cut by a 17th to 19th century north-east to south-west gully and sealed by a sequence of 19th century ground-raising deposits. Topsoil and demolition rubble overlay the later deposit.</p>	KLI09
9	<p><b>110 West Heath Road</b> Archaeological evaluation carried out by MoLAS in 1995. Natural sands were sealed by sub- and topsoils.</p>	WHA95
10	<p><b>2 Millfield Place</b> Watching brief carried out by Nick Holder in 2010. As a result of sudden subsidence of topsoil in the garden of 2 Millfield Place, part of a brick-lined well was exposed. The well was cut through the subsoil and natural gravel and sand. It was difficult to observe the brick lining of the well, but the brick and concrete capping was clearly 19th century. The well itself may well have supplied water to a 17th or 18th century house here, perhaps built by the aristocratic Fitzroy family who owned the estate. The base of the well was recorded (using drain inspection equipment) at approximately 14m below garden level; the internal diameter is c 0.7 to 0.9m</p>	MLJ10
11	<p><b>Keat's House, Keat's Grove</b> Archaeological evaluation carried out by Lesley Howe, an independent archaeologist, in 2001. No further information was available.</p>	KEA01
12	<p><b>Athlone House (formerly Caen Wood towers)</b> Evaluation and standing structure recording carried out by MoLAS in 2005. Three trenches were excavated within the existing landscaped gardens. A brick foundation of probable 18th–19th century date was observed in one trench: it may have been related to water supply. A subterranean, conical brick-built structure was recorded in another trench. Other features observed appeared to be natural or redeposited material indicative of landscaping.</p>	HPH05
13	<p><b>Flask Public House</b> Excavation carried out by the DGLA in 1990. 18th century walls were found, apparently part of a rear cellar of the earlier Flask.</p>	FLK90
14	<p><b>21 Pond Street</b> Evaluation carried out by AOC in 2000. A number of cellars and drainage systems dating to the late 17th - early 18th century were recorded above the natural brickearth.</p>	POD00
15	<p><b>New End Hospital</b> Archaeological evaluation carried out by OA in 1995. Two areas were excavated: area 1 was a former car park fronting Heath Street and area 2 comprised an upper and lower terrace immediately south of Kendalls Hall. Dumped deposits with concentrations of red brick hard-core, concrete and late 18th- and 19th- century pottery within a sandy clay loam matrix, were found in trench 1, Area 1. Excavation continued to a depth of 3.9 m below ground surface. Dumped deposits continued to this depth and pottery recovered from the earliest deposit identified in the sequence suggests a late 18th- to 19th- century date. The first 2m of excavation on the top terrace in Area 2 revealed clayey-sand dumped deposits, which sloped gradually towards the enclosing terrace wall to the south. A natural light yellow sand was identified at a depth of 4.1 m below ground surface. The dumped deposit represents the in-filling of the terrace put in place during the construction of the hospital. A red brick structure, possibly an</p>	NES95

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	outhouse, was located in the centre of trench 3 in Area 2. A hard-core rubble fill overlay natural sand to the W, and a light brown garden soil which contained late 17th- century pottery overlay the clayey silt to the west. A single 16th- century sherd was thought to be residual.	
16	<b>1 Frogna Gardens</b> Archaeological watching brief undertaken by MOLA in 2011 exposing truncated natural consisting of sandy clay overlain by made ground probably associated with the original buildings construction in 1898. This was visible across the exposed western end of the site, where a preliminary piling trench was excavated to 1.2m beneath ground level.	FRG11
17	<b>The ABC Cinema</b> Archaeological evaluation carried out by AOC in 2003. The site had apparently been levelled in the past, resulting in the truncation of the natural brickearth. Evidence was found for 19th century construction, possibly associated with the known Hereford House, and also for the 20th century construction of the cinema itself.	ACM03
18	<b>Maryan Mews</b> Evaluation carried out by MoLAS in 1994. Natural brickearth had been truncated in 20th century.	MYM94
19	<b>Mount Vernon Hospital</b> Evaluation and excavation carried out by MoLAS in 1995 and 1996. Natural sands and clays sloped down from east to west. At the eastern end of the site two sherds of Roman pottery were recovered from the fills of post-medieval features. At the western end of the site and bottom of the slope, the natural was overlaid by hillwash deposits containing pottery dating from mid-13th to 14th century. They were cut by a vaulted brick drain and a possible robbed-out wall of 17th to early 18th-century date. To the north of these a large pit contained 17th-century pottery. Later dumping and levelling appeared to be 19th-century in date and associated with the Victorian hospital. On the western side of the site, at the bottom of the slope, a platform was terraced into the hillside and a structure, initially of timber and later of brick, was built c late 15th - early 16th century. A cesspit was associated with the earlier structure; above it were the remains of a semi-cellar floor, the steps leading to it and walls. The structure was repaired and renewed several times, probably continuing in use throughout the 17th, 18th and well into the 19th century.	MTV95
20	<b>86 West Heath Road</b> Evaluation carried out by M Webber in 1995. Three flint blades of possible Mesolithic/Neolithic date were recovered. Believed to be redeposited. Pottery sherds of post-medieval date (from 16th to 20th century) were recovered.	WHB95
21	<b>Witanhurst House</b> Watching brief carried out by MOLA in 2009. Natural sands and brickearth truncated by 20th century deposits.	HWT09
22	<b>46 Hampstead High Street</b> Evaluation and watching brief carried out by MoLAS in 1992. A range of post-medieval features associated with the house, including drains and a cesspit, were revealed in excavations in the rear garden.	HHS92
23	<b>22 Christchurch Hill</b> Watching brief carried out by IA archaeology in 2007. Monitoring was carried out on two foundation trenches which formed the rear and front basements respectively and excavation under the house. Natural gravel and subsoil were overlain by topsoil.	CTU07
24	<b>32 New Court</b> Watching brief carried out by Compass Archaeology in 2008. Made-ground and makeup for the existing surface overlay heavily truncated natural sands and clays. A part-collapsed 19th-century brick arched drain was exposed; it was probably associated with earlier 19th-century	NCU08

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	buildings which stood on the site until the present houses were constructed in 1871.	
25	<p><b>Bell Barrow called Boadicea's Grave, 650m west of Millfield Cottage</b> Scheduled Ancient Monument</p> <p>The monument includes a bell barrow situated near the summit of Parliament Hill, south of Highgate Ponds at Hampstead Heath. It survives as a roughly circular-shaped mound, 36m in diameter and up to 3m high. Around the barrow is a berm or platform varying between 3.5m and 4.5m wide. Surrounding this is a quarry ditch, varying between 4.8m and 6m wide, from which material to construct the barrow was derived. The barrow was partially excavated by Charles Read in 1894 but only pieces of charcoal were recovered. Read concluded that the burial may have completely decomposed given the acidity of the soil. The barrow is shown in a drawing of 1725 by the antiquarian William Stukeley. The name of the barrow is derived from a local tradition stating it was the site of Boadicea's (or Boudica's) grave. Boadicea was the queen of the Iceni tribe who led an uprising against the occupying Roman forces in about AD 60. The monument excludes the modern path which impinges on the monument, all marker posts, modern fences and fence posts, gates and gate posts but the ground beneath all these features is included.</p>	1002059 DLO13212
26	<p><b>32 Maryon Mews</b> Watching brief carried out by MoLAS in 1994. An inspection of three engineers' trial pits prior to development revealed no features of archaeological interest. No cultural material or inclusions were noted within the truncated London Clay deposits.</p>	MYM94 082700/00/00
27	<p><b>North villa and south villa and attached railings and gates</b> Listed Grade II Semi-detached pair of houses with main frontage on west side. Early 19th century</p>	1379079
28	<p><b>Villas on the Heath numbers 3–6 and attached railings</b> Listed Grade II 2 pairs of semi-detached villas, c 1863.</p>	1379088
29	<p><b>Vale House and Vale Cottage</b> Listed Grade II Originally a symmetrical group of 3 cottages, but centre and right hand cottage now form Vale House, Vale Cottage the left hand cottage. Early 19th century.</p>	1379082
30	<p><b>Villas on the Heath Numbers 1 and 2</b> Listed Grade II Pair of semi-detached villas, c 1863.</p>	1379086
31	<p><b>Chestnut Cottage</b> Listed Grade II Detached cottage, c 1812 with later additions on north and west sides.</p>	1379078
32	<p><b>Byrons Villas numbers 1 and 2</b> Listed Grade II Semi-detached house, c 1903. Home of DH Lawrence, writer, in 1915 (GLC plaque). Included for historical associations.</p>	1379077
33	<p><b>Vale Lodge</b> Listed Grade II Detached house. Early 19th century, altered. Home of Edgar Wallace, writer, and probably also the residence of Leigh Hunt, poet.</p>	1379083
34	<p><b>Rose Cottage</b> Listed Grade II 2 cottages, now one dwelling. Early 19th century. Hunt Cottage was the early home (1870–3) of Alfred and Harold Harmsworth, newspaper tycoons. Woodbine Cottage was the home of Compton Mackenzie.</p>	1379081
35	<p><b>Old Cottage</b> Listed Grade II</p>	1379080

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	Formerly 2 cottages, now one dwelling. Early 19th century.	
36	<b>Vivary Cottage and Lavendar Cottage</b> Listed Grade II Pair of semi-detached cottages. Mid 19th century	1379090
37	<b>1 and 3 North End</b> Listed Grade II Pair of terraced houses. Early 18th century.	1113175
38	<b>The Hill Garden Central Temple Summerhouse</b> Listed Grade II* Temple summerhouse, aligned westwards on Inverforth House, linking Western Pergola and Bridge, c 1912. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a continued garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1113199
39	<b>The Hill Garden Southern Pergola and Terrace</b> Listed Grade II* Colonnaded pergola, aligned westwards on Inverforth House, running south from the wider Cruciform Pergola, a section turning eastwards for 35m and then further southwards for approximately 80m including a belvedere, as the central feature the Southern Summerhouse and terminating in a belvedere. c1906-10. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1322065
40	<b>The Hill Garden Southern Summerhouse</b> Listed Grade II* Summerhouse, aligned south-west of Inverforth House, forming the central feature of the Southern Pergola, c 1906–10. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1322067
41	<b>Formal pond surround, fountain and pedestals in Inverforth House Garden</b> Listed Grade II Formal pond surround, fountain and pedestals on a wide terrace, aligned westwards on Inverforth House, running east-west from Terrace Steps to Cruciform Pergola, c 1906–10. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1113187
42	<b>The Hill Garden Bridge</b> Listed Grade II* Bridge over public footpath from Inverforth Close to Hampstead West Heath and linking Central Temple Summerhouse with western arm of Cruciform Pergola, c 1912. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a continued garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House)	1113195
43	<b>Inverforth House</b> Listed Grade II Formerly known as: The Hill North End Way. Substantial house, now a convalescent home. Original house 1807, rebuilt c 1895 and successively modified by WH Lever, Viscount Leverhulme, who owned the house from 1904 until his death in 1925.	1113185
44	<b>The Hill Garden Curciform Pergola</b> Listed Grade II* 4 colonnaded pergolas, aligned westwards on Inverforth House, and forming a cross plan on the central axis. Western arm leads to the Bridge, short eastern stub to the Formal Pond and southern arm links to Southern Pergola, c 1906–10. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1113202
45	<b>Garden terrace steps at Inverforth House</b> Listed Grade II Terrace steps, aligned westwards on Inverforth house, leading down to the Formal Pond and forming part of the upper terrace layout, c 1906–10. By J Lomax Simpson as part of a garden scheme by Thomas H Mawson	1113188

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	
46	<b>Old Court House</b> Listed Grade II Detached house, now converted to retirement home flatlets. Early 18th century with late 18th and early 19th century alterations and additions.	1113192
47	<b>Wildwood Lodge</b> Listed Grade II Cottage ornee. Mid 19th century.	1113176
48	<b>Gates House</b> Listed Grade II House. Designed in 1915 by T. Laurence Dale; altered by T. S. Tait -of the important firm Burnet, Tait and Lorne -for himself in 1930.	1259434
49	<b>Wall to southeast of terrace house (terrace house not included)</b> Listed Grade II Wall. Mid 18th century. Red brick. This wall formerly formed part of the boundary to Inverforth House	1113180
50	<b>East lodge to Kenwood House and gateways attached to east lodge</b> Listed Grade II Probably built circa 1795 when wings were added to Kenwood itself	1079225
51	<b>Toll Gate House</b> Listed Grade II Toll gate house. 18th century, restored 1967.	1378793
52	<b>The Old Bull and Bush Public House</b> Listed Grade II Public house. Reputedly built as a farm c 1645, licenced 1721, rebuilt with modern extensions 1923–24 in similar style to the old.	1322071
53	<b>Park Flats</b> Listed Grade II Originally a second stable block at a distance from the house and main stables. Probably circa 1795, and now converted to flats.	1358866
54	<b>Garden wall and gateway with overthrow to Wildwood Lodge</b> Listed Grade II Garden wall & gateway with overthrow. Mid 19th century.	1113177
55	<b>K6 Telephone Kiosk</b> Listed Grade II Telephone kiosk, type K6. 1935. Designed by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott. Made by W MacFarlane of Glasgow.	1378709
56	<b>Sham Bridge to south of Kenwood House</b> Listed Grade II* Sham bridge, c 1767 by Robert Adam for the 1st Earl of Mansfield; restored late 20th century. Timber 3-span facade with balustrade over ornamental water.	1379245
57	<b>The Hill Garden Western Pergola</b> Listed Grade II* Colonnaded pergola, aligned westwards on Inverforth House, running east-west for approx 100m and linking the Western Summerhouse and Central Temple Summerhouse. c1912. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a continued garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House).	1322069
58	<b>Viaduct Bridge at TQ 2692 8652</b> Listed Grade II Viaduct bridge. c1845. By Joseph Gwilt.	1378678
59	<b>Parliament Hill Fields Lido</b> Listed Grade II Open air swimming baths. 1937-8. By Harry Arnold Rowbotham.	1113025
60	<b>Pinfold on the Heath approximately 5 metres east of the road and 5 metres north of Whitestone Lane</b>	1113194

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	Listed Grade II Pinfold, now disused. Reputedly c 1787	
61	<b>K6 Telephone Kiosk outside Kenwood House</b> Listed Grade II Telephone kiosk. Type K6. Designed 1935 by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott. Made by various contractors.	1249693
62	<b>Sewer vent pipe approximately 45 metres south east of Parliament Fields Lido</b> Listed Grade II Sewer ventilation pipe. 19th century.	1113026
63	<b>Milestone at Junction of Lower Terrace and Hampstead Grove</b> Listed Grade II Milestone. 18th century. Portland stone rectangular pillar inscribed "IV miles from St. Giles's Pound" on the south face and "4 1/2 miles .... yds from Holborn Bars" on the east face.	1379358
64	<b>The Lodge House to Kenwood House and adjoining garden wall</b> Listed Grade II Lodge house. c1795. Possibly by George Saunders	1379246
65	<b>Jack Straws Castle Public House</b> Listed Grade II Public house. 1962–64. By Raymond Erith, built by GE Wallis and Sons; on the site of a previous public house of the same name.	1113189
66	<b>Toll Gate House</b> Listed Grade II Mid C18, opposite Spaniards Inn. Originally the Toll House at entrance to the Bishop of London's estate which stretched east as far as Highgate	1286717
67	<b>Drinking trough approximately 140m north east of junction with Downshire hill</b> Listed Grade II Animal drinking trough. 19th century, stone.	1078271
68	<b>St Columbas Hospital</b> Listed Grade II Formerly known as: The Elms Spaniard Road. Detached house. c1875, probably enclosing an earlier building on the site itself of two periods but of which no trace is now visible internally	1378794
69	<b>East Lodge to Kenwood House and attached gateways</b> Listed Grade II Lodge to Kenwood House, Kenwood, flanked by gate piers, c 1795. By George Saunders.	1378705
70	<b>Service wing and outbuildings to Kenwood House</b> Listed Grade II* Service wing & outbuildings, now partly converted to a restaurant. 1793–1795. By George Saunders, restored 1959.	1379244
71	<b>Kenwood West Lodge with flanking gates and gate piers</b> Listed Grade II Western of two lodges to Kenwood House, Kenwood, flanked by gates and gate piers. c1795. By George Saunders	1378708
72	<b>Wylde's Close Corner and Motor House</b> Listed Grade II House, formerly called Boundary House because of its position close to the boundary with Hendon. 1912, Parker and Unwin.	1259436
73	<b>Gang Moor</b> Listed Grade II Detached house. Early 18th century, refronted early 19th century with later alterations. red Home of George du Maurier, writer and artist, from 1869.	1379189
74	<b>Former Dairy buildings to the west of Kenwood House</b> Listed Grade II	1379243

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	Group of 3 linked cottages forming a courtyard, formerly dairy buildings. c 1795. Possibly by George Saunders. Altered.	
75	<b>Kenwood House (Iveagh Bequest)</b> Listed Grade I Detached villa. Original house c 1616, renovated c 1749 and forming the core of the present house, including the orangery with boudoir on the west. In c 1767–68 Robert Adam added the library with anteroom on the east and the north entrance portico, together with an additional 2nd floor on the south front which he remodelled. In c 1795 George Saunders added the projecting north wings, west veranda; also the Service wing and kitchens. Restored 1955–9.	1379242
76	<b>Wylde's Farm</b> Listed Grade II* 17th century or earlier timber framed 3 bay, lobby entry house (a rare survival on the fringes of London). William Blake was a frequent visitor to the house when it was occupied by John Linnell. In the 20th century it was occupied by Sir Raymond Unwin who converted the adjoining barn into part of the dwelling. He lived here while supervising the laying out of Hampstead Garden Suburb. Roof reconstructed 1981 following a fire.	1191239
77	<b>Far End</b> Listed Grade II House. 1911, to the designs of Evelyn Simmons for himself.	1259433
78	<b>Park Flats</b> Listed Grade II Originally a second stable block to Kenwood House, Kenwood, at a distance from the house and main stables; now converted to flats, c 1795.	1378711
79	<b>The Hill Inverforth House</b> Grade II* on the Register of Parks and Gardens An early 19th century garden, redesigned by Thomas H Mawson in early 20th century with colonnaded pergolas extending over two further gardens.	1000244
80	<b>Kenwood</b> Grade II* on the Register of Parks and Gardens Mid 18th century landscape park, lakes and woodland, further developed late 18th century by Humphry Repton, William Marshall, William Emes and others. Now a public park.	1000142
81	<b>Ken Wood</b> Ancient Woodland – area of Ancient and Semi-Natural woodland.	
82	<b>Bishops Wood</b> Ancient Woodland – area of Ancient and Semi-Natural woodland.	
83	<b>Hamstead Heath Woods</b> Site of Special Scientific Interest	
84	<b>Walter Field Memorial Drinking Fountain</b> Listed Grade II Stone drinking fountain, approximately one hundred metres north northeast of junction of Wildwood Road and Hampstead Way.	1259682
85	<b>Keepers Box at TQ 2661 8657 and attached wall to southeast</b> Listed Grade II Keepers' box and approximately 270m of sunken wall running south-east from the box. c 1840s.	1378676
86	<b>Wildwood and Lesser Wildwood</b> Listed Grade II Farmhouse, now 2 residences. Mid 18th century.	1113178
87	<b>Garden wall and railings to Heath House</b> Listed Grade II Garden wall and railings. 18th century.	1113184
88	<b>Former coach house to Wildwood</b> Listed Grade II	1113179

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
	Coach house, now in domestic use. Mid 19th century.	
89	<b>Public conveniences at TQ 2669 8662.</b> Listed Grade II Public conveniences, c 1889–94.	1378677
90	<b>Archway to former Pitt House Garden in woodland approximately 5m east of the road</b> Listed Grade II Archway to former Pitt House. Mid 18th century.	1113181
91	<b>Monolith (empyrean) sculpture in grounds of Kenwood</b> Listed Grade II Vertical abstract sculpture. 1953 by Barbara Hepworth for the London County Council, originally situated on the South Bank and moved to Kenwood in 1963.	1378710
92	<b>Wyldes, Hampstead Way</b> Listed Grade II* Brick and weatherboarded barn with tiled roof and casement windows	1359046
93	<b>Heath House</b> Listed Grade II* Substantial detached house. Early 18th century with early 19th century extension to right. Later addition to the rear.	1113183
94	<b>Kenwood Farm</b> Listed Grade II Circa 1795, by George Saunders	1064862
95	<b>The Hill Garden, Western Summerhouse</b> Listed Grade II* Summerhouse forming belvedere to west of, and closing western vista of, Western Pergola, built c1912. By Thomas H Mawson as part of a continued garden scheme for Lord Leverhulme at The Hill (now Inverforth House)	1322070
96	<b>Gate piers at Kenwood House</b> Listed Grade II Pair of gate piers. Late 18th century.	1378706
97	<b>Findspot</b> Sherd of Roman pottery found in 1964. Flanged rim in yellow white fabric.	081780/00/00
98	<b>8 Holly Lodge Gardens. Possible Roman pavement</b> An alleged Roman paving found in 1947–9, reported to RCHM in June 1981. It was made of bricks laid in a herringbone pattern and was found where the stables formerly stood.	082049/00/00
99	<b>Findspot</b> Coin of Victorinus (AD 268–70), found in 1978. Also that year 2 possibly struck flints were found amongst tree roots on the path above Vale of Health. In 1940, possibly during sand quarrying for sand bags, prehistoric potsherds and flints were found in the Vale of Health. Hawkes and Grimes examined the site.	081787/00/00 081727/00/00 081728/00/00
100	<b>Findspot</b> 2 Roman glass beads, found c 1881. A palaeolithic pointed handaxe was also discovered close by in 1897.	081784/00/00 MLO17761
101	<b>Findspot (rumoured)</b> A rumour is reported that a 4th century hoard was found, but no part of it was seen.	081768/00/00
102	<b>10 The Grove</b> Watching brief carried out by ILAU, year and site code unknown. Medieval patterned floor in 17th century hose. Number 10 of cottages opposite Fenton House.	082028/00/00

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
103	<b>Gordon House Road, Lissenden Gardens, Thames Water Site</b> A watching brief was carried out at the junction between Gordon House Road and Lissenden Gardens by PCA in 2008 and 2009. A dump layer dating from the late 19th or early 20th century was found along with a cast iron pipe of the same date. These were covered by modern made ground and the area of investigation had been severely truncated by modern services. Natural deposits of London Clay were observed at 40.60m OD.	LSG09
104	<b>Findspot</b> Large Roman urn with a stone on top containing an urn and pitcher with burnt bones, 4 vessels and 2 lamps. Found in 1774. Several coins of Marcus Aurelius (161–180AD) and Victorinus (268–270AD) found close by in 1882.	081788/00/00 081789/00/00
105	<b>Findspot</b> Worked flint bade that is possibly a Neolithic fabricator.	081937/00/00
106	<b>Findspot</b> Tin halfpenny of William and Mary found on Hampstead Heath found using a metal detector. Date: from Circa 1687 AD (Certain) to 1695 AD	MLO103271
107	<b>Medieval road</b> Ancient highway running from Highgate along Highgate road, Millfield Lane and Hampstead Lane down to Kentish Town.	082004/00/00
108	<b>Medieval road</b> Millfield Lane was one of the oldest routes up Highgate Hill. When the Laterwest Hill route was built, the longer Millfield Lane rout was far less used and eventually blocked at the top end.	082032/00/00
109	<b>Medieval road</b> Belsize St (also Belsize Lane) ran from the corner of Pond Street to West End Lane.	082034/00/00
110	<b>Medieval road</b> Road from Highgate to Hampstead	082039/00/00
111	<b>Medieval footpath</b> A medieval footpath leading across the fields from Highgate to Hampstead. In Rocque the path is shown leading from hills just west of Highgate hamlet. A fragment remains in Merton Lane.	082041/00/00
112	<b>Medieval road and approximate location of hamlet</b> Green Street was the name of the road now called Highgate Hill. However, it also appears to be the name of a small hamlet on the road a few miles north of Kentish Town, beyond the Vine Inn.	082045/00/00
113	<b>Medieval road</b> Possibly medieval path/road across from church to Hampstead Lane, not shown clearly as a road on Rocque.	082042/00/00
114	<b>Possible course of Roman road</b> One of two possible continuations of a known Roman road. This route went from Holcombe Hill to Milespit Hill to Copthall Fields to Hendon.	081961/00/00
115	<b>Findspot</b> Numerous Mesolithic blades and cores and flakes found sporadically in Golders Hill Park.	081935/00/00
116	<b>Findspot</b> Mesolithic axe found on Hampstead Heath, near the viaduct. Reported to the Guildhall Museum in 1959.	081717/00/00
117	<b>Findspot</b> 3 flint flakes, 1 blade-lie with secondary working and a burnt flint, all found in 1962.	081722/00/00

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
118	<b>Findspot</b> 12 scrapers found on Hampstead Heath in 1918 along with 2 scraper cores and a flint hammerstone. A fragment of a polished stone axe was also found.	081723/00/00 081721/00/00
119	<b>Pits observed during quarrying</b> Possible pits were observed during sand quarrying in the 1940s. Fills contained layers of ash.	081729/00/00
120	<b>Findspot</b> Struck flints found in 1978 by the fence at Kenwood.	081730/00/00
121	<b>Findspot</b> Extensive scatter of flints found in 1978.	081731/00/00
122	<b>Findspot</b> Heavily iron stained Mesolithic axe found in a garden.	081761/00/00
123	<b>Findspot</b> Lead medieval seal (a bulla – seal to a Papal Bull) from a document of Pope Innocent IV found in 1869.	082002/00/00
124	<b>Findspot</b> Medieval costrel found in 1876.	082030/00/00
125	<b>Earthworks (possibly prehistoric)</b> Jack Straw's castle had earlier earthworks on the site according to the GLHER, which may have been of prehistoric date.	081725/00/00
126	<b>61 West Heath Drive</b> Watching brief carried out by HADAS in 1992 recovered a number of small flint flakes, probably Mesolithic at the bottom of the garden by the boundary fence.	082364/00/00
127	<b>Post-medieval well</b> 17th century red brick well discovered in 1949 under pavement of stable house of Royal Soldiers Daughters School.	082349/01/00
128	<b>Anti-Aircraft Battery</b> The site was an HAA (heavy anti-aircraft) artillery site in the London IAZ GDA. The earliest date upon which the site is listed as present within the sources is 22 Jan 1940 and the latest 2 Nov 1944. Equipment: 4.5in and from 22 Jun 1942 5.25in AA guns and GL Mk II fire-control radar. Manning: Regiment 52, Battery 313 and 154.	300012/00/00
129	<b>Anti-Aircraft Battery</b> The site was an HAA (heavy anti-aircraft) artillery site in the London IAZ GDA. The earliest date upon which the site is listed as present within the sources is 21 May 1940 and the latest 9 Dec 1943. Equipment: unarmed on 31 May 1940; 3.7in (static) AA guns and GL Mk fire-control radar. Manning: Regiment 156 (mixed), Battery 530 on 30 Jul 1942; Regiment 137 (mixed), Battery 476 on 9 Dec 1943.	300022/00/00
130	<b>Anti-Aircraft Battery</b> The site was a ZAA (Rocket AA artillery) site in the London IAZ GDA. The earliest date upon which the site is listed as present within the sources is 30 Jul 1942 and the latest 9 Dec 1943.	300072/00/00
131	<b>Air Raid Shelter</b> Location of air raid shelter included in the GLHER. No further information available.	084328/00/00

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
132	<b>Brickworks</b> Brickworks shown on 1st edition Ordnance Survey map	
133	<b>Saxon or Later Medieval boundary</b> Several possible Saxon or later Medieval boundaries identified in City of London, 2008.	

## 10 Planning framework

### 10.1 Statutory protection

#### *Scheduled Monuments*

- 10.1.1 Nationally important archaeological sites (both above and below-ground remains) may be identified and protected under the *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979*. An application to the Secretary of State is required for any works affecting a Scheduled Monument or its setting.

#### *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*

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

#### *Human remains*

- 10.1.3 Development affecting any former burial ground is regulated by statute, principally the *Burial Act 1857*, the *Disused Burial Grounds Act 1884* and 1981, and the *Pastoral Measure 1983*. The prior exhumation and re-interment of human remains is required and must be carried out under the terms of a Burial Licence, to be obtained from the Ministry of Justice.
- 10.1.4 Where likely survival of human burials in ground consecrated under the rites of the Church of England has been identified in a Historic Environment Assessment it is possible that a 'Faculty' may need to be sought by the developer in addition to Planning Consent. Faculty is issued by the office of the Chancellor of the Diocesan authorities in accordance with the provision of the *Faculty Jurisdiction Measure 1964* (as amended by the *Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991*). Separately, exhumation of any human remains should be notified to the Ministry of Justice who may also need to issue a Burial Licence. A Burial Licence is required from the Ministry of Justice if the remains are not intended for reburial in consecrated ground (or if this is to be delayed - for example where archaeological or scientific analysis takes place first).
- 10.1.5 Under the *Town and Country Planning (Churches, Places of Religious Worship and Burial Grounds) Regulations 1930*, the removal and re-interment of human remains should be in accordance with the direction of the local Environmental Health Officer.

### 10.2 National Planning Policy Framework

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

community (para 188).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Para 132:** When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

**Para 133.** Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Para 140.** Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

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

### 10.3 Greater London regional policy

#### *The London Plan*

- 10.3.1 The overarching strategies and policies for the whole of the Greater London area are contained within the London Plan of the Greater London Authority (GLA July 2011). Policy 7.8 relates to Heritage Assets and Archaeology:
- A. London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.
  - B. Development should incorporate measures that identify, record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.
  - C. Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.
  - D. Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
  - E. New development should make provision for the protection of archaeological resources, landscapes and significant memorials. The physical assets should, where possible, be made available to the public on-site. Where the archaeological asset or memorial cannot be preserved or managed on-site, provision must be made for the investigation, understanding, recording, dissemination and archiving of that asset.
  - F. Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London's environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London's ability to accommodate change and regeneration.
  - G. Boroughs, in consultation with English Heritage, Natural England and other relevant statutory organisations, should include appropriate policies in their LDFs for identifying, protecting, enhancing and improving access to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings where appropriate, and to archaeological assets, memorials and historic and natural landscape character within their area.

### 10.4 Local planning policy

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

#### *London Borough of Camden*

- 10.4.2 Camden's Local Development Framework (LDF) replaced its Unitary Development Plan (UDP) in November 2010. At the centre of the LDF is the Core Strategy (Greater London Borough of Camden, 2010a) which sets out the key elements of the Council's planning vision and strategy for the borough.
- 10.4.3 Policy CS14 *Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage* adheres broadly to the principles of the NPPF (see above).
- The Council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;
- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible;
- e) protecting important views of St Paul's Cathedral and the Palace of Westminster from sites inside and outside the borough and protecting important local views (Greater London Borough of Camden, 2010a, 89–90).

10.4.4 Development Policy 25, *Conserving Camden's heritage*, states:

**Conservation areas**

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will:

- a) take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas;
- b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;
- c) prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area where this harms the character or appearance of the conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- d) not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area; and
- e) preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character of a conservation area and which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.

**Listed buildings**

To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

- e) prevent the total or substantial demolition of a listed building unless exceptional circumstances are shown that outweigh the case for retention;
- f) only grant consent for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and
- g) not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.

**Archaeology**

The Council will protect remains of archaeological importance by ensuring acceptable measures are taken to preserve them and their setting, including physical preservation, where appropriate.

**Other heritage assets**

The Council will seek to protect other heritage assets including Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and London Squares (Greater London Borough of Camden, 2010b, 117).

## 11 Determining significance

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

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

11.1.2 Table 2 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

*Table 2: Significance of heritage assets*

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

11.1.3 Unless the nature and exact extent of buried archaeological remains within any

given area has been determined through prior investigation, significance of is often uncertain.

- 11.1.4 Built heritage and above ground archaeological remains (e.g. earthworks and landscapes) are visible and tangible and, where appropriate, significance is considered in more detail. 'Built heritage' refers to those aspects of the buildings visible on the site that possess noteworthy architectural or historic interest. These aspects of the buildings have been identified and their interest has been rated very broadly, using the published criteria for statutory listing of buildings for their special architectural or historic interest, in English Heritage 'conservation principles' (EH 2008) and applicable guidance published by English Heritage on selecting buildings for listing (or designation as heritage assets) (2007) and on investigating and recording buildings archaeologically (2006). Criteria for listing includes:
- 'architectural interest:... of importance to the nation for... their architectural design, decoration and craftsmanship; ...important examples of particular building types and techniques... and significant plan forms;
  - 'historic interest: ... illustrate important aspects of the nation's social, economic, cultural or military history;
  - 'close historical association with nationally important people or events;
  - 'group value, especially where buildings comprise an important architectural or historic unity or a fine example of planning...'
- 11.1.5 Evidential and aesthetic values correspond most closely to architectural interest, in terms of the published criteria for listing, while historical and communal values correspond to historic interest. These values emphasise national importance as being necessary for statutory listing, but are also useful in considering the particular architectural or historic interest of any building or structure.

## 12 Non-archaeological constraints

- 12.1.1 It is anticipated that live services will be present on the site, the locations of which have not been identified by this archaeological report. Other than this, no other non-archaeological constraints to any archaeological fieldwork have been identified within the site.
- 12.1.2 Note: the purpose of this section is to highlight to decision makers any relevant non-archaeological constraints identified during the study, that might affect future archaeological field investigation on the site (should this be recommended). The information has been assembled using only those sources as identified in section 2 and section 14.4, in order to assist forward planning for the project designs, working schemes of investigation and risk assessments that would be needed prior to any such field work. MOLA has used its best endeavours to ensure that the sources used are appropriate for this task but has not independently verified any details. Under the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974 and subsequent regulations, all organisations are required to protect their employees as far as is reasonably practicable by addressing health and safety risks. The contents of this section are intended only to support organisations operating on this site in fulfilling this obligation and do not comprise a comprehensive risk assessment.

## 13 Glossary

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

<i>Holocene</i>	The most recent epoch (part) of the Quaternary, covering the past 10,000 years during which time a warm interglacial climate has existed. Also referred to as the 'Postglacial' and (in Britain) as the 'Flandrian'.
<i>Iron Age</i>	600 BC – AD 43
<i>Later medieval</i>	AD 1066 – 1500
<i>Last Glacial Maximum</i>	Characterised by the expansion of the last ice sheet to affect the British Isles (around 18,000 years ago), which at its maximum extent covered over two-thirds of the present land area of the country.
<i>Locally listed building</i>	A structure of local architectural and/or historical interest. These are structures that are not included in the Secretary of State's Listing but are considered by the local authority to have architectural and/or historical merit
<i>Listed building</i>	A structure of architectural and/or historical interest. These are included on the Secretary of State's list, which affords statutory protection. These are subdivided into Grades I, II* and II (in descending importance).
<i>Made Ground</i>	Artificial deposit. An archaeologist would differentiate between modern made ground, containing identifiably modern inclusion such as concrete (but not brick or tile), and undated made ground, which may potentially contain deposits of archaeological interest.
<i>Mesolithic</i>	12,000 – 4,000 BC
<i>National Monuments Record (NMR)</i>	National database of archaeological sites, finds and events as maintained by English Heritage in Swindon. Generally not as comprehensive as the country SMR/HER.
<i>Neolithic</i>	4,000 – 2,000 BC
<i>Ordnance Datum (OD)</i>	A vertical datum used by Ordnance Survey as the basis for deriving altitudes on maps.
<i>Palaeo-environmental</i>	Related to past environments, i.e. during the prehistoric and later periods. Such remains can be of archaeological interest, and often consist of organic remains such as pollen and plant macro fossils which can be used to reconstruct the past environment.
<i>Palaeolithic</i>	700,000–12,000 BC
<i>Palaeochannel</i>	A former/ancient watercourse
<i>Peat</i>	A build up of organic material in waterlogged areas, producing marshes, fens, mires, blanket and raised bogs. Accumulation is due to inhibited decay in anaerobic conditions.
<i>Pleistocene</i>	Geological period pre-dating the Holocene.
<i>Post-medieval</i>	AD 1500 – present
<i>Preservation by record</i>	Archaeological mitigation strategy where archaeological remains are fully excavated and recorded archaeologically and the results published. For remains of lesser significance, preservation by record might comprise an archaeological watching brief.
<i>Preservation in situ</i>	Archaeological mitigation strategy where nationally important (whether Scheduled or not) archaeological remains are preserved <i>in situ</i> for future generations, typically through modifications to design proposals to avoid damage or destruction of such remains.
<i>Registered Historic Parks and Gardens</i>	A site may lie within or contain a registered historic park or garden. The register of these in England is compiled and maintained by English Heritage.
<i>Residual</i>	When used to describe archaeological artefacts, this means not <i>in situ</i> , ie Found outside the context in which it was originally deposited.
<i>Roman</i>	AD 43 – 410
<i>Scheduled Monument</i>	An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and protected under the Ancient Monuments Act.
<i>Site</i>	The area of proposed development
<i>Site codes</i>	Unique identifying codes allocated to archaeological fieldwork sites, eg evaluation, excavation, or watching brief sites.
<i>Study area</i>	Defined area surrounding the proposed development in which archaeological data is collected and analysed in order to set the site into its archaeological and historical context.
<i>Solifluction, Soliflucted</i>	Creeping of soil down a slope during periods of freeze and thaw in periglacial environments. Such material can seal and protect earlier landsurfaces and archaeological deposits which might otherwise not survive later erosion.
<i>Stratigraphy</i>	A term used to define a sequence of visually distinct horizontal layers (strata), one above another, which form the material remains of past cultures.
<i>Truncate</i>	Partially or wholly remove. In archaeological terms remains may have been truncated by previous construction activity.

<i>Watching brief (archaeological)</i>	An archaeological watching brief is 'a formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons.'
--	--

## 14 Bibliography

### 14.1 Published and documentary sources

- Baker and Elrington (eds.), 1980. *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 6: Friern Barnet, Finchley, Hornsey with Highgate*
- Barton, 1992. *The Lost Rivers of London*, London.
- Brown, A.E and Sheldon, H.L. 1974, 'Highgate Wood: the Pottery and its Production', *London Archaeologist* 2.9, 222–231.
- City of London, 2007. *Hampstead Heath Management Plan Part 1. Towards a Plan for the Heath, 2007–2017*.
- Cleaver, R. 1981 *The History of Hampstead Heath*, Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre.
- Collins, D. and Lorimer, D. (eds). 1989, *Excavations at the Mesolithic Site on West Heath, Hampstead, 1979–1981*, BAR British Series 217, Oxford.
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*.
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], EH [English Heritage] & DCMS [Department for Culture, Media and Sport], March 2010 *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide*.
- DCLG [Department for Communities and Local Government] & DCMS [Department for Culture, Media and Sport], 2007 'Revisions to principles of selection for listed buildings' (March 2007) [supersedes corresponding sections of PPG15, DoE 1994]
- EH [English Heritage], 2005 *Guidance on conservation area appraisals* (Swindon: English Heritage)
- EH [English Heritage], 2006a *Understanding historic buildings: a guide to good recording practice*. Swindon.
- EH [English Heritage], 2006b *Guidance on the management of conservation areas* (1st edition 1995)
- EH [English Heritage], 2006c *Guidance on conservation area appraisals*
- EH [English Heritage], 2007 *Principles of selection for designating buildings: education buildings selection guide* (Swindon: English Heritage, Heritage Protection Department)
- EH [English Heritage], 2008 *Conservation principles, policies and guidance* (Swindon: English Heritage)
- EH [English Heritage], 2011, *The setting of heritage assets*.
- Elrington (ed), 1989, *A History of the County of Middlesex: Volume 9: Hampstead, Paddington*
- GLA [Greater London Authority], July 2011 *The London Plan. Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London*.
- Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service, 2009: *Standards for Archaeological Work London Region, External Consultation*.
- Greater London Borough of Camden, 2006. *Replacement Unitary Development Plan*, Adopted June 2006
- Greater London Borough of Camden, 2010a. *Camden Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2010–2025*. Adoption version 2010
- Greater London Borough of Camden, 2010b. *Camden Development Policies 2010–2025*. Published November 2010
- IfA [Institute for Archaeologists] Nov 2012, *By-laws, standards and policy statements of the Institute for Archaeologists, standard and guidance: historic environment desk-based assessments*, rev, Reading
- IfA [Institute for Archaeologists] Oct 2012, *Standards and guidance for archaeological advice*, Reading.
- IFA [Institute for Archaeologists], 2001 *Standard and guidance for archaeological investigation of standing buildings or structures* (1st edition 1996)

- Lakin, D. Seeley, F. Bird, J. Reilly, K. Ainsley, C. 2002. *The Roman Tower at Shadwell, London: A reappraisal*. MoLAS and English Heritage.
- Land Use Consultants, 2006. *Hampstead Heath. Historic Background and Features Strategic Paper*, Appendix III of Atkins, 2013, *Hampstead Heath Flood and Water Quality Management Works: Brief for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment*.
- Lovell and Marcham, (eds)1936. *Survey of London: volume 17: The parish of St Pancras part 1: The village of Highgate*
- Margary, I. D. 1967. *Roman Roads in Britain* London: John Baker
- MoLAS, 1992. Watching brief report for British Gas Pipeline, Hampstead Heath.
- MoLAS [Museum of London Archaeology Service], 2000 *The archaeology of Greater London: an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area covered by modern Greater London*. London
- Richardson, J. 2004. *Highgate Past*. Historical Publications
- Symonds, R. P. and Tomber, R. S. 1991. 'Late Roman London: an assessment of the ceramic evidence from the City of London' *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc* 42, 59–99.
- Weinreb B and Hibbert C (eds), 1995 *The London encyclopaedia*. Macmillan. London
- Willey, R. 2006. *London Gazetteer*.
- Williams, A. and Martin, G. H. 2002. *Domesday Book*. Penguin

## 14.2 Other Sources

- Atkins, 2013. *Hampstead Heath. Flood and Water Quality Management Works. Brief for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*, February 2013.
- British Geological Survey online geology borehole data
- City of London – historic mapping.
- English Heritage website: Monuments Protection Programme, Monument class description: Bell Barrows: <http://www.eng-h.gov.uk/mpp/mcd/bell.htm>
- Greater London Historic Environment Record
- Internet – web-published sources
- London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre
- MOLA Deposit Survival Archive
- Camden Local Studies and Archives Centre
- English Heritage website: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/daysout/properties/kenwood-house/garden>

## 14.3 Cartographic sources

- Rocque, 1754 'A topographical map of the county of Middlesex'
- Newton, J and W. 1814. 'Map of the Parish of Hampstead'
- Ordnance Survey Surveyors drawings, 1807–1808 '2":mile map of Hampstead'.
- Stanford, 1862 'Stanford's Library Map of London', reproduced in Margary, H, 1980, 'Stanford's Library Map of London' 1862, Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent
- Map of the Parish of St Pancras, 1849

### *Ordnance Survey maps*

- Ordnance Survey mapping supplied by the Corporation of London: © Crown Copyright and database right [2013]. Ordnance Survey licence number 100023243 City of London Corporation
- Ordnance Survey 1st edition 6" map (1880s).

### *Geology map*

- British Geological Survey map sheet 256 (North London)

#### 14.4 Available site survey information checklist

<b>Information from client</b>	<b>Available</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Obtained</b>
Plan of existing site services (overhead/buried)	N	NA	N
Levelled site survey as existing (ground and buildings)	N	NA	N
Contamination survey data ground and buildings (inc. asbestos)	N	NA	N
Geotechnical report	N	NA	N
Envirocheck report	N	NA	N
<b>Information obtained from non-client source</b>	<b>Carried out</b>		<b>Internal inspection of buildings</b>
Site inspection	Y		NA