

CROSBY HALL, CHEYNE WALK, CHELSEA SW3
Archaeological Field Evaluation

WESSEX ARCHAEOLOGY REPORT
No. W650

Prepared for

Carden and Godfrey
81 Blackfriars Road
LONDON
SE1 8HA

© Copyright Wessex Archaeology 1993, *all rights reserved*
The Trust for Wessex Archaeology is a Registered Charity, No 287786.

SUMMARY

An archaeological field evaluation was conducted at Crosby Hall, Cheyne Walk, in the Royal London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (TQ 2689 7754), by Wessex Archaeology in November/December of 1993. The site comprised the front garden of Crosby Hall, a late medieval building relocated from the City in the early years of this century by the University of London.

Late medieval/early post-medieval deposits associated with the postulated site of Thomas More's Chelsea estate were anticipated (Museum of London 1993). Two trenches were excavated, principally by hand after machine stripping, and a range of archaeological deposits recorded and investigated. As well as extensive structural remains of later post-medieval buildings and associated pits, drains etc., a number of non-structural features containing only late medieval materials were revealed. These comprised two broad, flat-bottomed depressions filled and a single posthole or small pit, with well-sorted sandy loam soils containing small quantities of Surrey whitewares, Coarse Border Wares and late London-type wares as well as animal bone and tile; distinguishable from the darker, more artefact-rich post-medieval layers sealing them.

The results suggest that the southern half of the site (across an E-W axis parallel to Cheyne Walk) has been disturbed extensively by later post-medieval and modern activities, to a level below the surface of natural. The northern half of the site appears to contain archaeological features of an indeterminate function and of late medieval/early post-medieval date, possibly part of or associated with Thomas More's estate, in a relatively good state of preservation.

The archive is presently stored at Wessex Archaeology's Old Sarum offices under the archive code **W650**, but will be deposited with the Museum of London under their code **CCW93** in due course.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work was commissioned by the present owner of Crosby Hall, Mr C. Moran, via the architects Carden & Godfrey, of whom Ms Annelise Troth provided much appreciated assistance. Wessex Archaeology are also grateful for the understanding and tolerance of the staff of Crosby Hall.

The work was carried out by Kenneth Browell and Susan Hucks under the supervision of Michael Heaton, and monitored by Susan Coles of English Heritage on behalf of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Plant was supplied by Hennesly's Plant Hire of Brentford.

This report was compiled by Michael Heaton with contributions from Lorraine Mepham (finds), Michael Allen (palaeoenvironmental) and Liz James (illustrations). The project was managed and co-ordinated by Kit Watson and monitored within Wessex Archaeology by Susan M. Davies..

CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
CONTENTS	3
1. INTRODUCTIONS	
1.1. Project background.....	4
1.2. The site, its situation and geology	4
1.3. Archaeological and historic setting	5
2. METHODOLOGIES	
2.1. The Planning Brief	6
2.2. Wessex Archaeology Specification.....	6
2.3. Wessex Archaeology field methodology	7
2.4. Wessex Archaeology post-field methodologies.....	7
3. RESULTS	
3.1. The excavated deposits	
3.1.1. Modern overburden and disturbances.	9
3.1.2. Later post medieval buildings.	10
3.1.3. Earlier post-medieval structures and features.	11
3.1.4. Later medieval deposits.....	11
3.1.5. Natural base.....	12
3.2. The Finds	
3.2.1. Ceramic Building Material.....	12
3.2.2. Clay Pipe	12
3.2.3. Pottery	13
3.2.4. Metalwork	13
3.2.5. Other Finds	13
3.3. Soil analysis	
3.3.1. Methodology	14
3.3.2. Soil description.....	14
3.3.3. Plant macrofossil assessment	14
3.3.4. Small fauna.....	15
3.3.5. Soil chemical potential	15
3.3.6. Pollen potential.....	15
4. CONCLUSIONS	
4.1. Demonstrated archaeological presence	16
4.2. Likely extent of archaeological deposits.....	16
4.3. Impact of proposed development	17
5. The Archive contents	18
6. References.....	18
7. Appendix 1: Catalogue of abbreviated context descriptions	19

Crosby Hall, Cheyne Walk, Chelsea SW3

Archaeological Field Evaluation

1. INTRODUCTIONS

1.1. Project background

- 1.1.1. On behalf of the owner, Mr C.J. Moran, the architects Carden & Godfrey have obtained Planning Approval for work at Crosby Hall, Cheyne Walk in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Due to the archaeological and historic potential of the site (see below, and MoLAS 1993), English Heritage London Division, acting as advisors to the Local Planning Authority (LPA), have requested that the impact of any demolition or construction works associated with the scheme be assessed by a programme of archaeological assessment and investigations, in accordance with a written scheme of works as approved by the LPA and its advisors.
- 1.1.2. As a first stage, Carden & Godfrey commissioned Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) to prepare a desk-top assessment of the archaeological and historic potential of the site and its immediate environs. That report (MoLAS 1993) outlined the legislative background to the work and the archaeological and historic setting of the site, and recommended that the limited documentary evidence available be augmented by field evaluation.
- 1.1.3. Carden & Godfrey invited Wessex Archaeology to submit a costed project design, or Specification, for a scheme of archaeological field evaluation. After consultation with English Heritage London Division, Wessex Archaeology was commissioned to carry out the work, reported here.
- 1.1.4. The work was carried out during November/December 1993.

1.2. The site, its situation and geology

- 1.2.1. Crosby Hall and its grounds occupy an area of approximately 0.25ha at the junction of Danvers Street and Cheyne Walk on the Chelsea Embankment adjacent to the north end of Battersea Bridge, in the Royal London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (centred on TQ 2697 7754). The grounds are level at approximately 5.4mOD and bounded to the south and south-east by a cordon of maple trees currently screened by temporary site hoarding, to the north and north-east by the fabric of the building itself, and to the west by the boundaries and structures of the adjacent buildings known as More's Garden. With the exception of the buildings themselves, the grounds are laid to lawn with flagged paths and borders. The detail and scope of the proposed development is, as yet, not finalised.
- 1.2.2. The site is centred approximately 50m north of the mean high water mark, the inner edge of Chelsea Embankment. Although the Embankment itself is an artificial construction, the immediate area of the site rests on largely natural, if enhanced,

contours within the lower reaches of the Thames floodplain/estuary just north of the tributary Chelsea Creek.

- 1.2.3. The site rests on Terrace Gravels.

1.3. Archaeological and historic setting

- 1.3.1. The known archaeological and historic setting of the site have been summarised in the earlier desk-top assessment report (MoLAS 1993), which should be read in conjunction with this report. Information contained therein will not be repeated here, other than in brief reference. Although the fabric of Crosby Hall dates to 1466, the building was re-located to the present site in the early years of this century. It stands, therefore, in total isolation from any archaeological deposits that may exist here.
- 1.3.2. There is circumstantial evidence for later prehistoric, Roman and early medieval activity within the vicinity of the site, that might be expected to survive as interpretable archaeological deposits.
- 1.3.3. The site's principle importance lies in its connection with the Chelsea estate of Thomas More, Henry VIII's Chancellor (MoLAS *ibid*). Although Crosby Hall itself is an artificial implant of late medieval architecture, the present site and immediate environs were contained within - or were immediately adjacent to - Thomas More's garden (the approximate area now bounded by the Embankment, Beaufort Street, Danvers Street, Paulton Street, Church Street and the Kings Road). Late 16th century plans (MoLAS *ibid*) of More's Chelsea estate place the site at the south-east corner covering an area of small buildings and open spaces; the main body of the garden - particularly the more formal elements - lay further to the north and west. Nonetheless, unless disturbed significantly by later developments, the site could be expected to contain the archaeological remains of buildings and deposits associated with later medieval occupation by a named figure in English history.
- 1.3.4. The estate passed through the Cecils to the Beauforts, and by the middle of the 19th century supported a range of domestic and commercial buildings around a central N-S alley. By 1894 all but the north-east corner of the site had been cleared. In 1909 all pre-existing buildings were demolished prior to the re-location of Crosby Hall (MoLAS *ibid*).

2. METHODOLOGIES

2.1. The Planning Brief

2.1.1. All archaeological work conducted within the London Boroughs is planned and carried out in accordance with standing instructions contained in English Heritage's 'Standard Guidance Notes'. A requirement to investigate the archaeological content of the site by way of limited trench excavations - the only realistic approach - in accordance with English Heritage Guidance Notes 4, 5 and 6, constitutes the broad planning brief.

2.1.2. Carden & Godfrey, acting on behalf of the owner, were required to submit a written scheme of archaeological work to English Heritage London Division for approval prior to any work commencing. Wessex Archaeology were invited to submit a Specification for the investigation of the site by way of two machine excavated trenches, positions to be finalised in conjunction with English Heritage.

2.2. Wessex Archaeology Specification

2.2.1. The detailed Specification (ref. T1821) is deposited with English Heritage. It is, however, pertinent to provide a summary here where it has particular bearing on the subsequent results of the work and the manner in which it was carried out.

2.2.2. In agreement with English Heritage, Wessex Archaeology proposed to investigate the archaeological content of the site by way of two machine excavated trenches in the first instance, with provision for a third if required in the light of preliminary results. Both trenches to be approximately 10m x 3m in plan, located to investigate the both the extent of existing disturbances and undisturbed archaeological deposits. In close vicinity of standing buildings, trench locations were also to take account of likely hazards and disruptions to the normal operation of the site.

2.2.3. Modern overburden and disturbances were to be removed by mechanical excavator to the uppermost level of interpretable *in situ* archaeological deposits, irrespective of apparent age. Thereafter, all excavation was to be selective and by hand. All deposits were to be recorded in full detail using the standard Wessex Archaeology recording system of full written, photographic and drawn records (as approved for use in London by English Heritage London Division). Artefact recovery was to be selective on site-specific criteria, focused on establishing the broad date range of later disturbances, with full recovery only for potentially late medieval (or earlier) deposits. Bulk soil samples were to be retained only from potentially late medieval deposits.

2.2.4. Excavation was to establish the extent, nature, dates and range of archaeological deposits within the site, and the level at which naturally derived deposits occurred.

2.2.5. Following completion of excavation, trenches were to be backfilled with excavated material, consolidated, and re-turfed to leave as level a surface as possible.

2.3. Wessex Archaeology field methodology

- 2.3.1. Two trenches were located by taped measurements from existing structures, dimensions scaled from the 1:400 Specification drawing deposited with English Heritage (base plan supplied by Carden & Godfrey). Minor adjustments were made to avoid fixed items not shown on that drawing. Final trench locations and dimensions are shown on Figures 1, 2 and 3.
- 2.3.2. Turf was removed by hand, followed by topsoil and overburden removal by mechanical excavator equipped with a toothed bucket. Deeper pockets of compacted brick rubble were removed using a narrower, toothed bucket. All machine work was conducted under constant archaeological supervision and halted at the uppermost level of interpretable archaeological deposits.
- 2.3.3. The machine cleared surfaces and sections were then hand cleaned *in toto* and all visible deposits recorded in full.
- 2.3.4. Test-pits measuring approximately 2m x 1m were hand excavated in each trench to selectively investigate the lowest deposits visible. Hand excavation was pursued to the surface of naturally derived deposits. Test-pit positions (i-iv) are illustrated on Figures 2 and 3.
- 2.3.5. Combined, the excavation techniques were able to establish:
 - the nature and level of naturally derived deposits,
 - the extent, nature and depth of later disturbances relative to the level of naturally derived deposits,
 - the extent, nature, depth and date of undisturbed archaeological deposits of later medieval date.

2.4. Wessex Archaeology post-field methodologies

- 2.4.1. All field records were cross-referenced and compiled into a fully indexed archive in accordance with Appendix 6 of *The Management of Archaeological Projects* (English Heritage 1992).
- 2.4.2. All artefacts were cleaned, catalogued and boxed in accordance with UKIC and Museums Association guidelines. There were no materials requiring conservation; a single copper alloy artefact was cleaned and boxed in acid-free tissue with silica gel. All artefact assemblages were scanned and recorded by competent Wessex Archaeology personnel.
- 2.4.3. A single bulk soil sample was sub-sampled and processed for basic soil structure analysis and palynological assessment, in accordance with Wessex Archaeology Environmental Sample processing guidelines.
- 2.4.4. All artefacts, ecofacts and accompanying records are labelled with the Wessex Archaeology site **W650** and the Museum of London site code **CCW93**.

3. RESULTS

3.1. The excavated deposits

Abbreviated detailed context descriptions are presented in Appendix 1 at the end of this report, the following is a summary of the more pertinent information grouped by site-specific criteria. Reference should be made to Figures 2 and 3. Reference is made, where relevant, to artefactual components, but detailed descriptions of the retained artefact assemblages are presented in Section 3.2 of this report.

3.1.1. Modern overburden and disturbances.

3.1.1.1. Both trenches supported a shallow impoverished turf above a 0.10m thick sand loam topsoil.

3.1.1.2. Modern disturbances were relatively rare, comprising a pair of deep N-S drains or sewers, and the rubble layers resulting from the demolition of 17th-19th century buildings. Drain **53** ran across the east end of **Trench B** cutting through all other deposits except topsoil, to the base of the investigations at *c* 3.00mOD. Deeper investigation was not possible without damage to the pipe itself. The feature effectively destroyed all possible archaeological deposits within the western 1.5m of the trench. In **Trench A**, drain **2** was less destructive, being only 1.0m deep and 0.80m wide, but it did remove entirely the relationships between the suite of post-medieval walls occupying the southern half of the trench (see below).

3.1.1.3. Both trenches revealed deep deposits of demolition rubble cut by the drains, and sealing all other deposits. Although potentially the remnants of 17th and 18th century buildings, mid-19th century dated stoneware bottles noted throughout the rubble layer indicate a demolition date compatible with that recorded during the earlier desk-top assessment (MoLAS *ibid*). In the northern half of **Trench A**, layers **5** and **21** amounted to approximately 0.85m of interleaving level layers of brick/mortar rubble, gravel and loam lying against and over earlier walls and surfaces. In **Trench B**, layers **51**, **59**, **63** and **64** formed a similarly deep sandwich of interleaving rubbles and loam deposits, particularly at the eastern end of the trench. The centre of this trench, over earlier flagged surfaces (see below), was dominated by a 0.23m thick compacted layer of mortar and plaster rubble **52**. This layer, however, did not extend to the northern section and is not, therefore, shown in Figure 3.

3.1.2. *Later post medieval buildings.*

- 3.1.2.1. Substantial building remains were revealed in both trenches, but were not investigated in detail beyond simple recording of the visible traits. Their plans are presented on Figures 2 and 3.
- 3.1.2.2. **Trench A** was occupied almost entirely by a substantial set-stone yard surface **7** bounded to the north by wall **6**. The return of this wall to form the eastern boundary of the yard was removed by drain **2**. Walls **8** and **11** adjoining to the north-west and east suggest adjoining buildings; wall **8** abutted the north face of **6** so although later, it is clearly the remnant of an associated structure to the north-west of the trench. The relationship of wall **11**, and the probable brick-lined pit indicated by wall **15**, to the yard **7** had been removed by drain **2**, but given their proximity and similarity in fabric it is likely that they are contemporaneous in use, if not construction. Similarly, the relationships of the drains **9** and **10** could not be established.
- 3.1.2.3. **Trench B** revealed a correspondingly robust set of structures dominated by flagged surface **55** set between walls **77**, **57** and **58**. Of these **77** was observed to a depth of almost 2.0m below present ground levels in the side of drain cut **53**. The walls, which survived to heights of approximately 3 courses above the surface of the flagged floor, were constructed of large fired-clay blocks set in pale grey lime mortars. As such they differ from the simple brick walls revealed in Trench A and elsewhere in Trench B. Voids apparent in wall **57** and the northern edge of **55**, and subsidence visible generally across the surface of the flags suggests that **55** rests on either a supporting structure or unconsolidated pit fills. A definite terminal at the southern end of wall **58** suggests an entrance to the slightly lower floor **61**. It is not apparent whether either was an internal or external surface, how far to the east **61** extended, or whether it was originally contained within wall **62**. Apparently unassociated walls were revealed at the western and northern ends of the trench; of these, **67** at the eastern end was by far the more robust, but lay beyond the edge of the investigated area. However, its foundations were observed to extend below the base of the trench into naturally derived deposits in a broad rubble-filled construction trench.
- 3.1.2.4. A capped well **66** protruded from the south edge of the trench towards the eastern end. Although it was not possible to investigate the feature in detail, it appeared to have been constructed from a level comparable with that of the flagged building, though all relationships had been removed by the insertion of a later brick and concrete capping. The well was constructed within a clearly defined circular shaft which had cut through all adjacent deposits, backfilled with loose unconsolidated, though relatively brick-free, rubble.

3.1.3. *Earlier post-medieval structures and features.*

3.1.3.1. Definite evidence of an earlier post-medieval phase was recovered only in **Trench B**. Subsidence visible within the surface of flagged floor **55** suggest that the building was constructed over earlier, unconsolidated pit fills. Hand excavation of **Test-pit iii** at the eastern edge of wall **58** revealed it and the floor **61** to be set into a 0.30m thick deposit of dark grey-brown artefact-rich rubblely loam **68/65** which extended across the full width of the trench between wall **58** and **67**. This sealed a brick path **69** running NW-SE across the trench which, although not pursued, must pre-date the construction of the flagged surface **55** and its supporting walls. It is possible that the path and the well **66** (above) are related, in which case the latter would pre-date the flagged building. Path **69** rested on the upper surface of a deep deposit of dark grey-brown rubblely loam **70** observed to fill a broad sub-circular cut **71** into natural sand and gravel. This deposit was investigated in the hand-excavated test pit to a depth of 1.75m below present ground levels, a level of approximately 4.0mOD, where an opposing and near vertical edge for **71** was revealed in the south-west corner of the test-pit. The fill displayed little variation in texture, inclination or artefact content within that depth, appearing to be the upper fill of a larger area of pitting that must pre-date the construction of the flagged building and path **69**. Large quantities of clay-pipe, stoneware, porcelain, animal bone, glass etc. were observed but not recovered. A similar, though smaller, feature apparently intercutting with **71** adjacent to well **66**, suggests that an area of intense pitting extends southwards beyond the boundaries of the trench towards the Cheyne Walk.

At the west end of Trench B, drain **53** cut through similarly unconsolidated material visible in section at the west end of the trench, suggesting that intense pitting extends over much of the southern periphery of the site.

3.1.4. *Later medieval deposits.*

3.1.4.1. A range of deposits and features were revealed in the base of both trenches distinguished from the overlying post-medieval deposits both by their nature and their artefactual content.

3.1.4.2. In **Trench A**, the lowest ashy layers of the rubble deposits **21** and **5** lay on a clearly defined subsoil **23/18**. This layer, containing only flecks of charcoal and small fragments of tile, extended across the entire trench with only minor variations in texture and level, cut by the insertion of walls **6** and **11**, at a level of approximately 4.5mOD. Subsoil **23/18** sealed two clearly defined features **12** and **28**, revealed in **Test-pits i and ii**. Both displayed broad flat-bottomed profiles, approximately 0.40m-0.50m deep, aligned roughly N-S, though their full dimensions lay outside the investigated areas. Both were filled with yellowish-brown, relatively artefact-free sandy loams **27** and **19**. The pottery contained within **19** was exclusively late medieval in date (see Section 3.2.3 below), **27** did not contain dateable material.

3.1.4.3. **Trench B** revealed relatively little undisturbed ground. Remnants of a possible original soil level were visible in section on the eastern edge of pit **71**, but otherwise all original levels had been truncated. A single posthole **75** situated in the north-east corner of the trench, below wall **67** and pit **71**, contained an artefact free sandy loam fill reminiscent of **19** and **27**. Although undated, such lack of artefacts within an

otherwise disturbed area suggests that this feature is likely to pre-date the other, post-medieval deposits.

3.1.5. *Natural base.*

- 3.1.5.1. A bright yellow, sterile, sand and gravel was revealed in the base of both trenches at approximately 4.0mOD-4.2mOD. This is presumed to be the surviving upper surface of natural drift geology.

3.2. **The Finds**

Finds recovery was selective, designed specifically to establish the date range of the lowest archaeological deposits encountered. The artefactual character of other deposits, principally the deep rubble layers and upper pit fills, was established by recorded observations in the field. These details are available in archive, and summarised in Appendix 1 at the end of this report. This section of the report deals with materials recovered during hand excavation. Finds were retained from three contexts. All finds recovered have been cleaned and catalogued, and a brief scanning exercise has been undertaken to provide information regarding the nature and date range of the finds. This information is presented by finds category below. Total quantities of finds recovered are presented in Table 1.

3.2.1. *Ceramic Building Material*

- 3.2.1.1. Ceramic building material recovered comprised one roof tile fragment, and one glazed wall or floor tile, both probably modern.

3.2.2. *Clay Pipe*

- 3.2.2.1. Five clay pipe bowls were recovered: one of early 17th-century type from Context 5, and the remaining four of early 18th-century type from Context 70.

3.2.3. Pottery

3.2.3.1. The pottery ranges in date from late medieval to modern. The three sherds from Context 19 (Trench A) represent the earliest element within this small collection. These include one sherd of a coarse Surrey whiteware, probably Coarse Border Ware, one sherd of a wheel thrown, splash-glazed vessel, possibly Late London-type ware, and one glazed sherd in an overfired, fine oxidised fabric, of uncertain source. These sherds have a probable date range of late 14th/15th century.

3.2.3.2. The five sherds from Context 70 (Trench B) are later in date. These comprise three sherds of glazed Border Ware, including one bowl rim, and one rim from a pipkin or chamber pot; and two sherds of tin-glazed earthenware, one with an external lead glaze. A date range of late 17th/early 18th century may be suggested for these sherds.

3.2.3.3. Sherds from Context 5 (Trench A) form the latest element. These include one sherd of glazed redware, one sherd of English salt-glazed stoneware, and one fine white ware sherd, all of modern (19th/20th century) date. Also found in this context were five complete stoneware bottles and two stoneware jars, all of modern date.

3.2.4. Metalwork

3.2.4.1. Metalwork recovered comprised four iron objects (three nails and one strip fragment), and three copper alloy objects (one probable buckle, one fitting and one unidentified object). None of these objects are closely datable.

3.2.5. Other Finds

3.2.5.1. Other finds include two small modern glass bottles, one worked bone lid, and five pieces of slag.

Table 1: Total quantities of finds recovered.

Quantities are presented by number/weight in grammes, except for metalwork, where numbers only are given.

Finds category	Context 5	Context 19	Context 70
Animal Bone	1/8	1/22	
Ceramic Building Material	2/55		
Clay Pipe	1/9		4/75
Glass	2/108		
Pottery	10/3088	3/38	5/106
Slag	5/297		
Copper Alloy	1	1	1
Iron	2	2	

3.3. Soil analysis

3.3.1. A bulk sample of the putative garden soil (Context 19) from Trench A was described in the laboratory. This description provides basic information about the soil colour, texture and components but usually lacks information about *structure*. However a description is pertinent to the interpretation of a worm-worked cultivated garden soil. In this case some basic pedological structure (i.e. ped formation) could be seen but basic soil formation and macro structure could not be commented upon. The description follows Hodgson (1976).

3.3.2 *Soil description*

3.3.2.1 Dark brown (10YR 3/3) moist silty sand loam; stone-free; medium granular peds. Some medium macropores noted.

3.3.2.2 The soil is well worm worked and evidence of both macropores, and worm pellets (excreted soil) were noted within the sample. The description and loamy nature of the soil indicates increased organic content (manuring) and a well mixed (cultivated) soil typical of garden soils (cf. Murphy and Scaife 1991).

3.3.2.3 No evidence of anthropogenically improved soils or imported material was noted from either bulk sample described soil or the processed sample residues with the exception of small fragments of ceramic etc.

3.3.3 *Plant macrofossil assessment*

3.3.3.1 A bulk sample (1000) was processed by standard flotation methods and the flot assessed using stereo-binocular microscope (x10 - x30).

3.3.3.2 Examination for non-carbonised preserved material was made during the processing, and no non-carbonised material was present the flots.

sample	Flot				
	flot size ml.	grain	chaff	seeds	charcoal >5.6mm
1000	50	-	-	B	A

A =>10 items, B = 5 - 10 items; - = nil observed

3.3.3.3 The flot (c. 50ml) was scanned under a stereo-binocular microscope and small fragmentary, but identifiable charcoal fragments were abundant. A number of seeds were recognised (but not identified). The larger seeds may be pea/beans, and others more typical of non-cereal seeds. These may represent cultivated plants or weeds

3.3.4 *Small fauna*

3.3.4.1 One long bone of a small mammal was noted in the flot. No other faunal elements were noted.

3.3.5 *Soil chemical potential*

3.3.5.1 The homogenous nature of the soil is typical of garden tilth. The potential of a single chemical assay is low without a larger suite of samples from other contexts from the same location to provide comparative data.

3.3.6 *Pollen potential*

3.3.6.1 A subsample was taken to assess the soil's potential for containing archaeological pollen. The silty sand loam is likely to contain pollen and the potential for this from this well aerated and non-calcareous soil is good (Murphy and Scaife 1991; Scaife pers. comm.). It is likely that pollen is preserved, albeit poorly. The sample has been stored suitably but has not been submitted for formal pollen assessment.

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1. Demonstrated archaeological presence

- 4.1.1. Archaeological site investigations conducted by way of two machine and hand excavated trenches have demonstrated that the grounds of Crosby Hall contain a range of archaeological deposits spanning the last 400-500 years.
- 4.1.2. These comprise the substantial brick foundations, flagged floors, set-stone yard surfaces and attendant drains and sumps of the 17th and 18th century buildings recorded as having been demolished during the middle of the 19th century. These structures are lying within 0.25m of the present ground level, principally towards the southern boundary of the site. Although extensive the construction and demolition of these buildings have not completely destroyed earlier deposits.
- 4.1.3. Those structural remains overlie a palimpsest of brick paths, sleeper walls and deep pits spanning the 16th/17th centuries. The pits, which in places have truncated all lower deposits to below the level of natural, are filled with loose, unconsolidated and artefact rich fills which have subsided below the floors and walls of the overlying buildings. The pits, however, appear to be clustered and although resulting in intense disturbance to underlying deposits in places, there are areas of undisturbed earlier levels.
- 4.1.4. Expanses of undisturbed naturally-derived soil horizons survive, principally in the western area of the site investigated in Trench A, at levels of approximately 4.5mOD. These soils contain few artefacts, and seal a range of broad, flat-bottomed features filled with sorted 'garden' soils containing only 14th/15th century materials, and at least one posthole or smaller pit in Trench B. The flat-bottomed features, though observed in relatively small areas, are similar in form to horticultural features recorded in 'garden' excavations at Windsor (Hawkes and Heaton 1993). At Windsor, large areas of a site known to have supported orchards and kitchen gardens during the early post-medieval period were covered in arrays of parallel flat-bottomed linear troughs, interpreted as the results of triple-digging. Not features in the traditional sense of the word, i.e. they were cut and filled in a continuous cycle, they appeared as slightly less consolidated areas of the buried soils into which they were cut.
- 4.1.5. Sterile sand and gravel forming the natural base to the site occurs at approximately 4.0mOD-4.2mOD, though the areas investigated were too small for any meaningful conclusions on natural topography to be arrived at.

4.2. Likely extent of archaeological deposits

- 4.2.1. The substantial 17th/18th century buildings - and attendant disturbances to lower deposits - appear to be restricted to the southern half of the site, presumably fronting onto older street frontages along Cheyne Walk. As buildings are known to have fronted Danvers Street and (what is now) Cheyne Walk it seems reasonable to conclude therefore, that the outer 18m or so of the site along Danvers Street and Cheyne Walk contain well preserved later post-medieval and early modern building

remains, but little else. Linear disturbances from boundary walls and drains also extend further into the interior of the site, almost certainly as far as the present building itself.

- 4.2.2. Earlier post-medieval deposits - principally pits, wells, paths and less substantial building remains of a suggested 16th/17th century date- survive beneath and between the later buildings. These are likely to be related to earlier buildings occupying the same plots and can be expected to appear in linear clusters to the rear of the Danvers Street and Cheyne Walk frontages. The pits in Trench B were approximately 16m-18m to the rear of Cheyne Walk so there is no reason not to expect a similar distribution to the rear of Danvers Street. Although the extent of these features into the interior of the site is not yet known, their absence in Trench A would suggest they are restricted to a cordon less than 24m deep.
- 4.2.3. Late medieval deposits, possibly related to Thomas More's garden and its associated buildings, survive only in the interior of the site. Isolated pockets of naturally derived soil horizons and sealed features were present in Trench B, but these appeared to have been so truncated and dissected by later features as to make their intelligible interpretation unfeasible. It seems reasonable to conclude that these deposits do not survive within 20m of present street frontages. Their extent into the interior of the site is not yet known.

4.3. Impact of proposed development

- 4.3.1. Neither the detail or final outline of the proposed development are known to Wessex Archaeology. However, broad conclusions can be reached on the sensitivity of the archaeological deposits to development on the site.
- 4.3.2. Any groundworks within 20m of the present street frontages will disturb substantial post-medieval and early modern structures and deposits. Foundation work within that area will require the disturbance of existing substantial walls and floor surfaces, but is unlikely to threaten any interpretable medieval deposits.
- 4.3.3. Groundworks deeper than 1.0m below present ground levels within the interior of the site, i.e. beyond 18m-20m of the present street frontages, are likely to disturb *in situ* later medieval deposits. Foundation work here would not be likely encounter extensive existing structures.

5. THE ARCHIVE CONTENTS

5.1. The archive comprises a single A4 ring binder of written and drawn records, a wallet file of photographic materials, a single standard box of artefacts and palaeoenvironmental materials, and a wallet file of administrative materials. The written and drawn records comprise the following:

File 1	Archive index This report Record number allocations Day book (p/copies) Graphics register All site graphics Level readings (p/copies) Photographic register Context records Environmental sample record Object record Context finds records
File 2	Monochrome contact prints Monochrome negatives Colour transparencies
File 3	Admin. materials (various)

The archive is currently held by Wessex Archaeology at Old Sarum under the archive code **W650**, but will be deposited with the Museum of London under the site code **CCW93** in due course.

6. REFERENCES

Hawkes, J. W., and Heaton, M. J., 1993 *Jennings Yard, Windsor: A closed-shaft garderobe and associated medieval structures*, Wessex Archaeology Report No. 3.

MoLAS 1993, "*An archaeological assessment of Crosby Hall, Chelsea, SW3, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea*", Museum of London Archaeology Service.

Murphy, P. and Scaife, R.G. 1991, The environmental archaeology of gardens, in *A.E. Brown (ed) Garden Archaeology CBA Research Report No 78, 83-99*

Wessex Archaeology 1993, "*Crosby Hall, Cheyne Walk, SW3: Proposed Archaeological Evaluation (T1821)*".

7. APPENDIX 1: CATALOGUE OF ABBREVIATED CONTEXT DESCRIPTIONS

Trench and context positions and stratigraphic relationships are illustrated on Figures 2 and 3, detailed descriptions of retained artefacts are given in the appropriate sections of this report. Here reference is made to observed artefact contents as part of the abbreviated context description.

Trench A

Context No.	Description
1	topsoil; dark yellowish brown, humic sandy loam containing mixed modern building debris and small rounded pebbles, approx. 0.15m thick, extends across entire trench supporting a poor turf sward.
2	drain cut: 0.55m wide x 0.80m deep runs N-S across centre of trench cutting all other deposits, filled with unglazed ceramic pipe beneath brick rubble backfill (3). Appears to have destroyed, entirely, the presumed return of wall (6).
3	backfill; light yellowish brown loamy rubble backfill of drain (2) contains large mortared segments of brick walling, tile frags, and pieces of glass.
4	backfill; yellowish brown, vacuous loamy brick rubble backfill of feature (20), sealed by topsoil (1).
5	demolition rubble; interleaving bands of crushed brick rubble, ash, and loam lying against the northern edge of walls (6), (8) and (11) in depths of upto 0.85m., presumably derived from demolition of those walls. Occupied the greater part of the trench and sealed only by topsoil (1).
6	wall foundation; substantial brick wall aligned E-W at W end of trench, 6 courses survived above base of trench, 3 stretchers thick in alternating h/s courses. Unfrogged bricks (22x7x11) in pale grey slaked lime mortar. Construction trench not visible, but wall extends below base of trench, sealed by topsoil (1) and rubble (5).
7	yard surface; undressed lozenge-shaped sandstone sets (typically 5x20x15cm) tight against wall (6), with shallow slab (typically 0.3mx0.9m in plan) conduit running parallel to wall (6) draining into grate (17). Although not investigated further, at least 3 separate builds visible suggesting phases of construction, robbing or repair, sealed by topsoil (1).
8	wall foundation or toe; single course of headers (22x7x11) with remnant of tile course (above) in pale grey slaked lime mortar, aligned N-S under W end of trench, abuts N face of wall (6) but is not bonded to it, sealed below rubbles (21) and (5).
9	drain?; single line of unmortared stretchers running slightly acute to and beneath wall (8) at W end of trench, full dimensions lay outside area of investigations, but appeared to be cut/disturbed by wall (6) and sealed by subsoil (23).
10	drain; narrow brick drain formed of two close parallel lines of 2 courses of stretchers, enclosing a single course of stretchers as base, total width 0.32m, bricks 22x11x6, ran WNW-ESE towards NW corner of trench, apparently cut by wall (8) although this relationship not investigatable. Set into subsoil (23) and sealed by rubble (21)/(5).
11	wall; substantial wall foundation E-W at E end of trench, of uncertain relationship to (6) but almost parallel to it. Comprises alternating h/s courses of unfrogged bricks (22x7x11) in pale grey slaked lime mortar, 0.40m wide with additional 0.15m wide toe visible at base on N face. Sealed by rubble (5) to north, and cut by drain (2) which also removed relationship to wall (6).

Trench A cont.

12	garden feature?; broad flat-bottomed depression revealed in hand-dug test-pit at E end of trench, appears to be aligned NW-SE but full dimensions lay outside test-pit, 0.50m deep filled with (19) and sealed below subsoil (23).
13	fill; light pinkish grey crushed mortar and brick/tile rubble, 0.30m thick, filling shallow depression (14) at E end of trench, above 'garden feature' (12).
14	depression; shallow amorphous depression or subsidence hollow above 'garden feature' (12) at E end of trench, full dimensions lay outside trench but was > 1.6m in diameter and approx. 0.30m deep.
15	wall; remnant of brick pit lining abutting N face of wall (11). Pit apparently c 1.0m square and 0.40m deep with single skin brick lining (stretchers) and base, filled with ash etc. Only remnant survived drain (2) and machine clearance of this end of trench. Very poor wall construction of small unfrogged bricks (21x10x6) in loose pale buff mortar. Sealed ash layers at base of rubble (5), was cut by drain (2) and sealed by rubble layers (5).
16	yard make-up; yellowish brown sand and gravel revealed in gap in yard (7), appears to be bedding material for yard, not investigated further.
17	grate; cut limestone surround to cast-iron grate, 0.50m square, set into E end of yard (7) at end of stone conduit. Possibly issued in pit formed by wall remnant (15).
18	subsoil; 0.40m thick light yellowish brown sandy silt loam with occasional small rounded pebbles and charcoal flecks in surface, forms base of trench W of drain (2) and may be original naturally-derived soil horizon here. Cut by 'garden feature' (28) and lies directly on natural (22).
19	fill; 0.30m thick, mid greyish brown sandy loam fill of 'garden feature' (12) at E end of trench. Virtually stone-free and contained small amounts of animal bone, late medieval pottery and Cu alloy object (2000). Sealed by subsoil (23) and lies directly on natural (22).
20	dump; dump of loose vacuous brick rubble (4) visible in N edge of trench, maybe subsided feature cut through or within rubble layer (5), or dump on subsoil (18) sealed by subsoil (23).
21	demolition rubble; upper levels of brick rubble layer (5) at NW end of trench.
22	natural; bright yellow, sterile sand and gravel visible in base of all hand excavated features at approx. 3.72mOD.
23	subsoil; 0.25m thick, mid greyish-brown sandy loam, probably upper horizon of (18) or separate remnant of original topsoil, lies beneath rubble layer (5) and above subsoil (18), visible in section only.
24	dump; 0.10m thick layer or crushed chalk/plaster lying on subsoil (18) and below subsoil (23)/(25), visible in only the W section of trench.
25	subsoil; 0.20m thick. mid greyish brown sandy loam subsoil visible only in W section of trench, beneath wall(8), probably corresponds to (23) elsewhere.
26	demolition/construction layer: 0.10m thick layer of compacted crushed mortar and brick debris resting on surface of wall (8), seen only in W section of trench.
27	fill; 0.45m thick, greyish brown sandy loam with concentration of tile frags towards base, filling 'garden feature' (28), sealed by subsoil (23) and resting directly on natural (22).
28	'garden feature'; broad flat-bottomed cut into subsoil (18) at W end of trench. Full dimension lay outside area of investigation, but appeared to be c 0.45m deep and aligned N-S.

Trench B

Context No.	Description
50	topsoil; 0.10m thick, dark yellowish brown modern topsoil containing brick debris and occasional small rounded pebbles, covering entire trench.
51	dump; 0.15m thick layer of redeposited natural extending as discrete patches in hollows across full length and breadth of trench.
52	dump; 0.23m thick compacted layer of pale grey mortar, brick and plaster debris containing porcelain and willow pattern ceramics. Has a well-defined level upper surface reminiscent of yard surfaces. Extends across full breadth of trench, principally over the central 2/3 of trench, but extends to each end as discontinuous patches.
53	drain cut; approx. 2.5m deep x 1.0, wide trench containing glazed (disused) sewer pipe, backfilled with loose loamy brick rubble (76) and lean-mix concrete (54). Sewer runs N-S, presumably from house to river/roadside. Sealed by modern topsoil, but cuts through all other deposits at W end of trench.
54	concrete dump; dump of lean mix concrete filling top of sewer trench (53) at NW corner of trench. Not investigated further.
55	flag surface; regular rectangular smooth sandstone flags contained within walls (58), (57) and (77) and sealed by mortar rubble (52). Two levels present with individual flags raised above their neighbours by one thickness. Pronounced subsidence visible at N edge where flags and wall (57) have fallen into a void, voids also visible beneath flags along S edge of trench. Joints between flags contain porcelain and willow pattern pieces, but otherwise the surface of the flags was sterile. Not investigated further.
56	wall; N-S across W end of trench cut by drain trench (53), 3 alternate courses of headers and stretchers (22x10x6) in pale grey slaked lime mortar. The wall rested on flag surface (55) and was sealed by mortar rubble (52), but is not structurally associated with either.
57	wall; E-W beneath N edge of trench, forming and butted by the north edge of flag surface (55) and subsiding noticeably. 2 courses of large bricks (30x22x7) in pale grey slaked lime mortar survive.
58	wall; N-S forming and butted by the E edge of flagged surface (55). Not investigated in detail. Comprised of single thickness of large bricks (30x22x7) in pale grey slaked lime mortar, with a definite terminal or opening at S end a specially shaped flag protrudes (externally?) E.
59	dump; 0.15m thick lens of brick and mortar rubble extending in patches across the E end of trench below redeposited natural (51) and above topsoil pocket (60).
60	topsoil; pocket of dark greyish brown silt loam topsoil trapped between walls (58) and (62), resting on pemment floor (61) and below brick rubble (59).
61	pemment floor; floor made of 3 rows of pemments (30x30x0.05) in light greyish brown grout/mortar, bedded on thin layer of sand. Butted against E edge of wall (58) and S edge of wall (62). Definite end at S adjacent to putative entrance through wall (58), but extent to E did not survive machine clearance.
62	wall; short stub of wall aligned E-W, sticking out slightly into trench from N edge. Same construction as wall (56).
63	topsoil; 0.20m thick band of buried topsoil beneath rubble (59) and to the E of wall (62). Contains large quantities of coal, chalk and mortar fragments and lumps of clean grey clay.
64	dump; 0.12m thick, level band of crushed mortar and plaster debris at the E end of trench only, sealed below 'topsoil' (63) and cut by wall (67), rests on pit fills (70).
65/68	dumps; 0.40m thick sandwich of mixed loamy brick and tile rubbles at E end of trench, sealed by pemment floor (61) and lies above brick path (69).

Trench B cont.

66	well; round well protruding slightly from S edge of trench at E end, set in well-defined circular cut filled with loose grey rubbly loam. Not investigated further, but is capped with modern bricks and concrete forming a rigid collar approx. 1.5m in diameter.
67	wall; substantial brick wall foundation running N-S under the E end of trench, not accessible for investigation. Chalk tempered bricks (<i>London Stocks?</i>) 22x7x12 bonded with pale buff mortar, set in broad deep construction trench sealed by rubble (59) and cutting into natural for at least a further 0.30m below base of trench.
69	brick path?; single course of headers edged with single row of bats, forming a path or structural base 0.45m wide, aligned NW-SE across the E half of the trench. Observed only in hand-dug test pit 1.0m wide. Bricks quite thin @ 23x11x5cm, unbonded, unfrogged.
70	pit fills; deep undifferentiated deposit of dark greyish brown sandy loams containing a wide variety of post-medieval materials including brick, tile, c-pipe, oyster shells, animal bone, coal, ash, porcelain, salt glazed wares etc. The material is generally unconsolidated and loose, and appears to be the upper fills of a large pit, sealed by path (69). Potentially fill of pit (71).
71	pit or pits; clear rounded edge of large feature cut into natural (73) at base of trench at E end, potentially returning as vertical-sided rounded pit observed in W section of test-pit. At least 3.0m in diameter, but may be result of more than one intercutting pit. Not investigated below surface of natural.
72	subsoil; small patch of yellowish brown sandy loam , 0.05m thick, visible in N section resting above natural between intercutting features at NE end of trench. Does not contain any artefacts or cultural introductions, and is potentially the naturally derived subsoil here.
73	natural; bright yellow, sterile sand and gravel natural appearing in base of trench between intercutting features at E end, apparently level and resting at approximately 4.26mOD.
74	fill; yellowish brown, sterile sandy loam with frequent small rounded pebbles, visible as rounded patch in surface of natural at NE corner of trench. Fill of (75)
75	posthole?; small pit or posthole at NE corner of trench, cut from above subsoil (72) in section.
76	backfill; loose, dark brown loamy rubble backfill of drain trench 53, contains large blocks of mortared brickwork and other post-medieval/modern materials.
77	wall; brick wall foundation observed only in drain trench (53), running N-S across trench below wall (56) base of investigations (c 3.0mOD). Appears to support W limit of flagged surface (55). Not investigated further.