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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The site known as Plots 5&6, Acklam Road has been assessed for its below ground archaeological potential.
- The proposed development will not impact on any nationally significant designated archaeological assets.
- This assessment has identified a generally low archaeological potential at the study site for all past periods of human activity. In addition, the site is not located within a locally defined Archaeological Priority Area.
- Modern development impacts are likely to have been severe within the study site, with large depths of made ground anticipated to be present and directly overlying the London Clay bedrock.
- Due to the site’s limited archaeological potential, combined with past ground disturbance, it is considered most unlikely that the proposed development would have either a significant or widespread archaeological impact.
- Therefore, it is considered that this assessment is sufficient to support a planning application at the site, and no further archaeological works are anticipated in this particular instance.
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INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

1.1 This below ground archaeological desk-based assessment has been researched by Alex Slater and prepared by James Archer of RPS Heritage on behalf of PRP Architects.

1.2 The subject of this assessment, also known as the study site, is a site known as Plots 5&6, Acklam Road. The site is approximately 0.14ha in extent and is centred at TQ 24701 81796 (Fig. 1) within the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.

1.3 PRP Architects has commissioned RPS Heritage to establish the archaeological potential of the site and to provide guidance on ways to address any archaeological constraints identified.

1.4 In accordance with relevant policy and guidance on archaeology and planning, and in accordance with the ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments’ (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists January 2017), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the site.

1.5 This desk-based assessment comprises an examination of evidence on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER), and other sources, and includes the results of a comprehensive map regression exercise.

1.6 This assessment thus enables relevant parties to assess the archaeological potential of various parts of the site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and archaeological solutions to the archaeological potential identified.
2 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

2.1 National legislation regarding archaeology, including scheduled monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002, and updated in April 2014.

2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was later revised in June 2019. The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which was published online 6th March 2014 and has since been periodically updated.

2.3 The NPPF and NPPG are additionally supported by three Good Practice Advice (GPA) documents published by Historic England: GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans; GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (both published March 2015). The second edition of GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets was published in December 2017.

National Planning Policy

2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF, entitled ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’ provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:

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

2.5 Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 189 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.

2.6 Heritage Assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

2.7 Annex 2 also defines Archaeological Interest as a heritage asset which holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.

2.8 A Nationally Important Designated Heritage Asset comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.

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

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

2.11 In short, government policy provides a framework which:
- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets;
- Protects the settings of such designations;
- In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions;
- Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit in-situ preservation.

2.12 The NPPG reiterates that the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. Furthermore, it highlights that neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Importantly, the guidance states that if complete, or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim should then be to capture and record the evidence of the asset’s significance and make the interpretation publicly available. Key elements of the guidance relate to assessing harm. An important consideration should be whether the proposed works adversely affect a key element of the heritage asset’s special architectural or historic interest. Additionally, it is the degree of harm, rather than the scale of development, that is to be assessed. The level of ‘substantial harm’ is considered to be a high bar that may not arise in many cases. Essentially, whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the NPPF. Importantly, harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. Setting is defined as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and may be more extensive than the curtilage. A thorough assessment of the impact of proposals upon setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

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

Local Planning Policy

London Plan

2.14 The relevant Strategic Development Plan framework is provided by the London Plan - the Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (March 2016). There were no changes to Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology; slight amendments were made to the wording of Policy 7.10 World Heritage Study sites, cross referencing this policy with the Supplementary Planning Guidance document for the setting of World Heritage Study sites prepared in 2012. Minor Alterations to the London Plan (MALP), published 14 March 2016, which was consolidated with the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP adopted March 2015), concern housing standards and parking, with no alteration to heritage policies. The MALP is hereafter referred to as the ‘London Plan’.

2.15 Policy in the London Plan relevant to archaeology at the study site includes the following:

Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Strategic
A. London’s heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, Registered Battlefields, Scheduled Monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.

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

Planning Decisions

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

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

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

LDF Preparation

F. Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London’s environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London’s ability to accommodate change and regeneration.

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.

Policy 7.9 Heritage-led Regeneration

Strategic

A. Regeneration schemes should identify and make use of heritage assets and reinforce the qualities that make them significant so they can help stimulate environmental, economic and community regeneration. This includes buildings, landscape features, views, blue ribbon network and public realm.

Planning Decisions

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

2.16 The emerging draft new London Plan is at an advanced stage with the Examination in Public complete, the Inspector’s report issued on behalf of the Secretary of State and the Mayor’s response
to that with the publication of The London Plan Intend to Publish (December 2019) version issued to the Secretary of State. Chapter 7 ‘Heritage and Culture’ contains relevant draft policies HC1 to HC7. Of particular relevance to archaeological sites within Greater London are draft policies HC1 and HC2 as follows:

**Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth**

A. Boroughs should, in consultation with Historic England, local communities and other statutory and relevant organisations, develop evidence that demonstrates a clear understanding of London’s historic environment. This evidence should be used for identifying, understanding, conserving, and enhancing the historic environment and heritage assets, and improving access to, and interpretation of, the heritage assets, landscapes and archaeology within their area.

B. Development Plans and strategies should demonstrate a clear understanding of the historic environment and the heritage values of sites or areas and their relationship with their surroundings. This knowledge should be used to inform the effective integration of London’s heritage in regenerative change by:

1. setting out a clear vision that recognises and embeds the role of heritage in place-making
2. utilising the heritage significance of a site or area in the planning and design process
3. integrating the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with innovative and creative contextual architectural responses that contribute to their significance and sense of place
4. delivering positive benefits that conserve and enhance the historic environment, as well as contributing to the economic viability, accessibility and environmental quality of a place, and to social wellbeing.

C. Development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets’ significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.

D. Development proposals should identify assets of archaeological significance and use this information to avoid harm or minimise it through design and appropriate mitigation. Where applicable, development should make provision for the protection of significant archaeological assets and landscapes. The protection of undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest equivalent to a scheduled monument should be given equivalent weight to designated heritage assets.

E. Where heritage assets have been identified as being At Risk, boroughs should identify specific opportunities for them to contribute to regeneration and place-making, and they should set out strategies for their repair and re-use.

**Policy HC2 World Heritage Sites**

A. Boroughs with World Heritage Sites, and those that are neighbours to authorities with World Heritage Sites, should include policies in their Development Plans that conserve, promote, actively protect and interpret the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Sites, which includes the authenticity and integrity of their attributes and their management.
B. Development proposals in World Heritage Sites and their settings, including any buffer zones, should conserve, promote and enhance their Outstanding Universal Value, including the authenticity, integrity and significance of their attributes, and support their management and protection. In particular, they should not compromise the ability to appreciate their Outstanding Universal Value, or the authenticity and integrity of their attributes.

C. Development Proposals with the potential to affect World Heritage Sites or their settings should be supported by Heritage Impact Assessments. Where development proposals may contribute to a cumulative impact on a World Heritage Site or its setting, this should be clearly illustrated and assessed in the Heritage Impact Assessment.

D. Up-to-date World Heritage Site Management Plans should be used to inform the plan-making process, and when considering planning applications, appropriate weight should be given to implementing the provisions of the World Heritage Site Management Plan.

Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea

The site is located within the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea which adopted its Local Plan in September 2019. The Local Plan contains the following policy relevant to archaeology within the Borough:

Policy CL4 Heritage Assets - Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

The Council will require development to protect the heritage significance of listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and Archaeological Priority Areas. To deliver this the Council will:

a. require all development and any works for alterations or extensions related to listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and Archaeological Priority Areas, to preserve the heritage significance of the building, monument or site or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest;

b. resist the demolition of listed buildings in whole or in part, or the removal or modification of features of architectural importance, both internal and external;

c. require the preservation of original architectural features, and later features of interest, both internal and external;

d. take opportunities to:

i. reinstate internal and external features of special architectural or historic significance, commensurate with the extent of proposed development;

ii. take opportunities to remove internal and external features that harm the architectural or historic significance of the asset, commensurate with the extent of proposed development;

iii. better reveal or reinterpret archaeological remains and discoveries for the local community;

e. resist the change of use of a listed building that would materially harm its character;

f. require any work to a listed building to sustain the significance of the heritage asset and as such strongly encourage any works to a listed building to be carried out in a correct, scholarly manner by appropriate specialists;
g. require desk based assessments and where necessary field evaluation for major developments proposed in Archaeological Priority Areas;

h. require desk based archaeological assessments and where necessary field evaluation for small developments within Archaeological Priority Areas and major developments outside of Archaeological Priority Areas unless pre-application advice has been obtained from the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service that this is not necessary.

2.18 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no designated World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield sites or Historic Wreck sites lie within the vicinity of the study site.

2.19 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site does not lie within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.

2.20 In line with relevant planning policy and guidance, this desk based assessment seeks to clarify the site’s archaeological potential and the need or otherwise for additional mitigation measures.
3 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

Geology

3.1 The solid geology of the London area is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences (IGS 1979) as London Clay deposits forming the London Basin. Overlying the London Clay is a series of gravel terraces deposited during periods of glacial and inter-glacial conditions (Bridgland 1996).

3.2 Further detail is provided by the British Geological Survey (BGS Online 2019), which shows the underlying geology at the study site as London Clay Formation (Clay, Silt & Sand), with no overlying superficial deposits.

3.3 Whilst no site specific borehole data is currently available for the study site, geotechnical boreholes recorded by the British Geological Survey (BGS Online 2019) along St Ervans Road to the west of the site noted large depths of made ground of at least 1.2m, overlying further possible made ground and then the London Clay bedrock. A similar sequence of made ground, associated with extensive late 19th century development (see Figures 8 onwards), overlying the London Clay can therefore be anticipated at the study site.

Topography

3.4 The natural topography of the study site would have been a gentle south facing slope at circa 25m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). It is likely that the site has been artificially levelled during various phases of modern development.

3.5 Whilst there are no natural watercourses within close proximity to the study site, the course of the River Westbourne would have once been located c.1.1km east of the study site and was dammed in the 1830s to create The Longwater and The Serpentine lakes in Hyde Park. The site is located c.4km to the north east of the River Thames at its closest point at Hammersmith. The artificial Grand Union Canal is located c.200m to the north.
4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Timescales used in this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>End Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaeolithic</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze Age (including Chalcolithic)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>AD 43</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon/Early Medieval</td>
<td>AD 410</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1066</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval</td>
<td>AD 1486</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1800</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

4.1 This chapter reviews the available archaeological evidence for the study site and the archaeological/historical background of the study site and surrounding area, and, in accordance with NPPF, considers the potential for any as yet to be discovered archaeological evidence on the study site prior to any assessment of any later development or below ground impacts.

4.2 What follows comprises a review of known archaeological assets within a 1km radius of the study site (Fig. 2), also referred to as the study area, held on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (HER), together with a historic map regression exercise charting the development of the study area from the 18th century onwards until the present day.

4.3 In general, the majority of HER records within the study area comprise evidence for the Post Medieval and Modern development of the surrounding area. The sole evidence for pre-Post Medieval archaeological remains is recorded at the far southern extent of the 1km study area and comprises a collection of Roman burials. It is likely that the study area comprised part of a heavily forested landscape associated with the Forest of Middlesex which would explain the lack of archaeological remains. The map regression exercise has demonstrated that the study site comprised open land from the mid-18th century until the late 19th century when the site was developed with railway sidings.

4.4 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the site conditions, later development and below ground impacts, and whether the proposed development is likely to impact archaeological assets and potential archaeological assets identified below.
Early Prehistoric – Palaeolithic & Mesolithic

4.5 No evidence for Palaeolithic or Mesolithic archaeological remains is recorded within the 1km study area on the GLHER. The presence of Palaeolithic material can be notoriously difficult to predict and is typically dependent upon the presence of an appropriate underlying geology sequence (such as terrace gravels or brickearth), as well as suitable topography and access to nearby resources and water. Given the lack of suitable superficial deposits which could be considered conducive to the survival of Early Prehistoric artefactual material, combined with the lack of any evidence from the surrounding area, it is considered that a low archaeological potential can be suggested for the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic periods at the study site.

Later Prehistoric – Neolithic, Bronze Age & Iron Age

4.6 No evidence for Later Prehistoric activity is recorded within the 1km study area on the GLHER. It is likely that the site was located within a heavily forested area during these periods, which would later become known as the Forest of Middlesex. The underlying heavy clay soils would have been unsuitable for agricultural activity during this period and the forest would have been subject to only limited activity more likely located nearby to river water sources at the Thames to the south or the Westbourne to the east.

4.7 Therefore, a low archaeological potential can be identified at the study site for the Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age periods.

Roman

4.8 Evidence for Roman activity within the nearby area is limited to a collection of burials which were discovered in wooden coffins in 1941 at Notting Hill at the far southern extent of the 1km study area (HER Refs: MLO39219-221, TQ 248 809). Bone or ivory pins were discovered in association with these burials (HER Ref: MLO39974, TQ 248 809).

4.9 The study site is located c.1.5km west of the north-south Watling Street, the Roman road from London to the north of England that follows the course of the Edgware Road, and c.1.5km north of the east-west Roman road between London and Staines, along the course of Notting Hill Gate (Margary 1955).

4.10 The site likely remained within a heavily forested area during the Roman period, with any activity more likely focused to the east and to the south along the course of the known Roman roads. Therefore, a generally low archaeological potential is suggested at the study site for evidence of Roman remains.

Anglo-Saxon/Early Medieval & Medieval

4.11 No finds of Anglo-Saxon or Medieval date have been recorded within the vicinity of the study site.

4.12 The first documentary evidence for settlement at Kensington is in the Domesday Survey of 1086 (Domesday Online 2019), which records the estate of Kensington as relatively large at 26 households, which would have been focused at the historic core of Kensington c.2km south of the study site.

4.13 It is likely that the surrounding area would have been subject to increasing levels of deforestation during the Saxon and Medieval periods, and that the site would have been cleared of woodland during these periods, after which it would have comprised open land away from areas of Saxon or Medieval settlement. Therefore, a low archaeological potential is suggested at the site for evidence of Saxon or Medieval period activity.
Post Medieval & Modern (including map regression exercise)

4.14 The vast majority of the HER records within the study area refer to Post Medieval and Modern archaeological remains which are not discussed in detail here unless relevant to the study site.

4.15 During the later Post Medieval and Modern periods, our understanding of settlement, land-use and the utilisation of the landscape is enhanced by cartographic and documentary sources, which can give additional detail to data contained within the HER.

4.16 The earliest such cartographic source is the 1746 Rocque Map of London (Fig. 3) which records the study site within open pastoral land to the west of a small area of settlement at Westbourne Green. The route of the former Roman road between London and Staines (now Notting Hill) is shown to the south.

4.17 A similar situation is shown on the 1807 Ordnance Survey Drawing (Fig. 4). Portobello House is shown within an area likely c.300m west of the study site. An estate known as ‘Notting Barnes’ is recorded on the GLHER circa 1km west of the study site and appears to have originated as an early Post Medieval estate (HER Ref: MLO16934, TQ 2380 8150). The estate is shown on the 1807 map, to the west of the site. The Grand Union Canal is shown to the north of the study site and was constructed in the late 18th century opening in two phases in 1800 and 1801.

4.18 The study site was located within Kensington Parish, and a combined figure showing the 1822 Starling Map of Kensington Parish and the 1824 Gutch Map of Paddington Parish is shown as Figure 5. The site remains located in open land to the east of Portobello Farm.

4.19 The 1843 Kensington Tithe Map and 1844 Paddington Tithe Map are similarly combined as Figure 6, with the site shown entirely within a large field parcel labelled ‘33’ within Kensington Parish. The associated Kensington Parish Tithe Award describes this field parcel as a ‘Grass Field’. The railway is shown to the north of the study site on the tithe mapping. Minor internal field boundary additions are shown on the 1881 Ordnance Survey plan (Fig. 7).

4.20 By the 1896 Ordnance Survey plan (Fig. 8), the surrounding area has been subject to extensive residential development. The study site is located within an area utilised for railway sidings.

4.21 No bomb damage is recorded within the study site by the London County Council Bomb Damage map for 1939-45 (LCC 2005; not reproduced here). The nearest bomb strikes to the site are recorded along the railway to the north on the National Archives bomb records (Bombsight Online 2019).

4.22 By a 1945 aerial photograph (Fig. 9), a number of small structures had been constructed in the southern area of the site, whilst the remainder of the site appears to have undergone an undetermined level of groundworks possibly associated with the railway or a former saw mill to the east (shown on Figure 7). This appears to be shown further on a 1955 Ordnance Survey plan (Fig. 10) which seems to show that the study site was connected to St Ervan’s Road to the south via an area of presumed hardstanding.

4.23 A number of the small structures in the southern area of the site had been removed by 1972 (Fig. 11), by which point it does not appear that the study site is surfaced with hardstanding, possibly as a result of the construction of the Westway overhead road to the immediate south east which appears to have cut the study site off from St Ervan’s Road.

4.24 The site is shown as entirely cleared by the 1991 Ordnance survey plan (Fig. 12). Acklam Road was laid out to form the northern site boundary by 1999 (Fig. 13), when the study site appears to comprise an area of disused scrubland across its eastern half, and hardstanding car park across its western half. Whilst an existing site plan (Fig. 14) shows no clear changes within the site, the western half of...
the site is now an area of overgrown scrubland whilst the eastern half of the site comprises a community garden (2019 Google Earth Image not reproduced here).

4.25 The study site most likely comprised open land throughout the Post Medieval and Modern periods until the late 19th century when the site was part developed with railway sidings in association with the railway to the north. Therefore, aside from remains associated with known modern development, a low archaeological potential is considered at the study site for the Post Medieval and Modern periods. Modern building foundations of negligible significance are likely to be present.

Assessment of Significance

4.26 Existing national policy guidance for archaeology (the NPPF as referenced in section 2) enshrines the concept of the ‘significance’ of heritage assets. Significance as defined in the NPPF centres on the value of an archaeological or historic asset for its ‘heritage interest’ to this or future generations.

4.27 No relevant nationally significant designated heritage assets as defined in the NPPF are recorded within, or within the vicinity of, the study site.

4.28 The site is not located within a locally defined Archaeological Priority Area. Additionally, there are no non-designated archaeological assets recorded on the study site on the GLHER.

4.29 Based on current evidence, a low archaeological potential has been identified for all past periods of human activity within the study site. This is largely due to the heavy underlying clay soils and likely heavily wooded landscape in which the study site would have been situated, making the site an unattractive location for settlement or occupation.

4.30 On this basis, any remains, should they occur on the study site, would in the context of the Secretary of State’s non-statutory criteria for Scheduled Monuments (DCMS 2013) most likely be of local significance.

4.31 As identified by desk based work, archaeological potential by period and the likely significance of any archaeological remains which may be present within the study site is summarised in table form below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
<th>Identified Archaeological Potential and Likely Significance (if present):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Prehistoric</td>
<td>Low potential, Low (Local) Significance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Prehistoric</td>
<td>Low potential, Low (Local) Significance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Low potential, Low (Local) Significance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Low potential, Low (Local) Significance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>Low potential, Low (Local) Significance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Medieval &amp; Modern</td>
<td>Low potential (likely to be entirely invested in evidence of ground consolidation and surviving traces of late 19th and 20th century development), likely to be of Negligible to Low (None/Local) Significance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS

Site Conditions

5.1 The study site currently comprises open scrub and small planters in the eastern part of the site, whilst the western part of the site is generally overgrown with trees and scrub (Fig. 14 and 2019 Google Earth Image: not reproduced here).

5.2 Modern phases of development, demolition and redevelopment on the site since the late 19th century are likely to have had a cumulative negative archaeological impact. The British Geological Survey (BGS Online 2019) records large depths of made ground of at least 1.2m along St Ervan’s Road to the west. It is likely that the underlying sequence at the site similarly comprises made ground directly overlying the London Clay bedrock geology.

5.3 Past agricultural/horticultural land use will have had a moderate but widespread archaeological impact as a result of past ploughing.

Proposed Development

5.4 The study site is proposed for a mixed residential and non-residential development with associated areas of landscaping and hardstanding (Fig. 15).

Review of Potential Development Impacts on Archaeological Assets

5.5 The proposed development will not impact on any nationally significant designated archaeological assets.

5.6 This assessment has identified a generally low archaeological potential at the study site for all past periods of human activity. In addition, the site is not located within a locally defined Archaeological Priority Area.

5.7 Modern development impacts are likely to have been severe within the study site, with large depths of made ground anticipated to be present and directly overlying the London Clay bedrock.

5.8 Due to the site’s limited archaeological potential, combined with past ground disturbance, it is considered most unlikely that the proposed development would have either a significant or widespread archaeological impact.
6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The site known as Plots 5&6, Acklam Road is under consideration for redevelopment. Therefore, in accordance with relevant government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the below ground archaeological potential of the study area.

6.2 In terms of relevant nationally designated archaeological assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield sites or Historic Wreck sites lie within the vicinity of the study site.

6.3 In terms of relevant local designations, the study site not located within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea.

6.4 Based on current evidence, a low archaeological potential has been identified for all past periods of human activity within the study site.

6.5 However, modern development impacts are likely to have been severe within the study site, with large depths of made ground anticipated to be present and directly overlying the London Clay bedrock.

6.6 Due to the site’s limited archaeological potential, combined with past ground disturbance, it is considered most unlikely that the proposed development would have either a significant or widespread archaeological impact.

6.7 Therefore, it is considered that this assessment is sufficient to support a planning application at the site, and no further archaeological works are anticipated in this particular instance.
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Figure 14
Site as Existing
Figure 15
Proposed Development Ground Plan