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Summary

**Site name:** Lovell House, 610–624 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, London Borough of Hounslow

**Grid reference:** TQ 1969 7853

**Site activity:** Desk-based assessment

**Project manager:** Steve Ford

**Site supervisor:** Steve Preston

**Site code:** CHH07/78

**Area of site:** c. 0.25ha

**Summary of results:** The site lies in an area in which very little archaeological investigation has taken place. However, it is in a topographic setting likely to have attracted prehistoric settlement, and indeed the one significant investigation in the vicinity revealed a Bronze Age site very close by. Chiswick High Road is also on the line of a Roman road. The archaeological potential is therefore felt likely to be moderately high. It would be advisable to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to mitigate the impact on any below-ground archaeological deposits.

*This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder*
Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of a site at 610–624 Chiswick High Road, Chiswick, London Borough of Hounslow (TQ 1969 7853) (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Andrew Josephs of Andrew Josephs Ltd, 16 South Terrace, Sowerby, Thirsk, Yorkshire, YO7 1RH on behalf of HBG Properties and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area.

Site description, location and geology

The site consists of an area of approximately 0.25ha located on the north side of Chiswick High Road in Gunnersbury, Chiswick. The site is bounded to the south by Chiswick High Road (A315), to the west by Thorney Hedge Road, and by residential properties/gardens fronting Thorney Hedge Road and Silver Crescent on the other sides. The area in the loop formed by Thorney Hedge Road and Silver Crescent is primarily residential but is set within a larger industrial zone (mainly associated with a railway depot and former bus works). A number of railway lines converge in the surrounding area.

Commercial premises and garaging currently cover the front half of the site, the rear (north) of the site is mainly a car park, with access off Thorney Hedge Road, and takes in parts of the gardens of three properties on Silver Crescent (Fig. 2).

The development area is centred on NGR TQ 1969 7853 and is level at an elevation of c. 10m above Ordnance Datum. The site is mapped as lying on river brickearth (BGS 1981), with First Terrace gravels over London Clay in the vicinity.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought to redevelop the site. At the time of writing, no detailed proposals were available.

Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16 1990) provides guidance relating to archaeology within the planning process. It points out that where a desk-based assessment has shown that there is a strong possibility of
significant archaeological deposits in a development area it is reasonable to provide more detailed information from a field evaluation so that an appropriate strategy to mitigate the effects of development on archaeology can be devised:

Paragraph 21 states:

‘Where early discussions with local planning authorities or the developer’s own research indicate that important archaeological remains may exist, it is reasonable for the planning authority to request the prospective developer to arrange for an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out...’

Should the presence of archaeological deposits be confirmed further guidance is provided. *Archaeology and Planning* stresses preservation *in situ* of archaeological deposits as a first consideration as in paragraphs 8 and 18.

Paragraph 8 states:

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

Paragraph 18 states:

‘The desirability of preserving an ancient monument and its setting is a material consideration in determining planning applications whether that monument is scheduled or unscheduled...’

However, for archaeological deposits that are not of such significance it is appropriate for them to be ‘preserved by record’ (i.e., fully excavated and recorded by a competent archaeological contractor) prior to their destruction or damage.

Paragraph 25 states:

‘Where planning authorities decide that the physical preservation *in situ* of archaeological remains is not justified in the circumstances of the development and that development resulting in the destruction of the archaeological remains should proceed, it would be entirely reasonable for the planning authority to satisfy itself ... that the developer has made appropriate and satisfactory provision for the excavation and recording of remains.’

The London Borough of Hounslow’s Unitary Development Plan (LBH 2003) outlines similar policies. Policy ENV-B.3.1 Ancient Monuments:

‘In its role as the Local Planning Authority, the Council will enhance and preserve the scheduled ancient monuments and their settings in Hounslow and protect them from any developments which would adversely affect them.’

Policy ENV-B.3.2 Sites of Archaeological Importance

‘The Council will promote the conservation, protection and enhancement of the archaeological heritage of the Borough and its interpretation and presentation to the public. Where development may affect land of archaeological significance or potential, the Council will expect applicants to have properly assessed and planned for the archaeological implications of their proposals. ‘Within the Council’s Archaeological Priority Areas (Map ENV-B3) and for other sites of archaeological potential (as identified by archaeological advisors to the Council):
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'(i) A written assessment of the likely archaeological impact of development (archaeological statement) will be required as part of the documentation needed to complete a planning application.

(ii) The Council may require that an on site assessment by trial work (archaeological field evaluation) is carried out before any decision on the planning application is taken.

The Council will seek to ensure that the most important archaeological remains and their settings are permanently preserved in situ and if unscheduled and of national importance are given statutory protection. In such cases, if preservation in situ is both desirable and feasible, the Council will require the development design to accommodate this objective.

Where the preservation of archaeological remains in situ is not appropriate, the Council will require that no development takes place on a site until archaeological investigations have been carried out by an investigating body to be nominated or approved by the Council and such investigations shall be in accordance with a detailed scheme to be approved in advance by the Council. Where feasible, the Council will negotiate the provision of facilities for public viewing during the period of excavation.'

Further policies cover Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and buildings of local townscape character, none of which applies specifically to this site.

The proposal site does not lie within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined on the proposals map; a zone along the Thames foreshore is defined as an Archaeological Priority Area but this is well to the south.

**Methodology**

This assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists paper ‘Standards in British Archaeology’ covering desk-based studies. These sources include historic and modern maps, the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

A site visit was also conducted, on 5 July 2007 in order to determine the current land use, topography and any obvious disturbance of the site (see above).

**Archaeological background**

*General background*

Archaeological finds and deposits of all periods on the brickearth and gravel deposits of west London are well known, having come to light during observations carried out over many years during gravel and brick clay extraction (MoLAS 2000), and via aerial photography (e.g., Longley 1976), although the modern urban setting of much of west London does restrict the latter technique.

The gravel terraces of the London area also have revealed a largely complete sequence of Pleistocene deposits which is in itself archaeologically significant due to their formation during the early period of human
settlement in the British Isles. As a result, some of these terraces contain Palaeolithic archaeological evidence (Wymer 1993). However, the first terrace (still sometimes referred to as Kempton Park gravel), present in the vicinity of the site, and the extensive brickearth deposits overlying it, have not historically been associated with finds of Palaeolithic date; it remains unclear if this is from a lack of quarrying of these deposits (the richest source of such finds) or because they are too recent (Wymer 1999).

In areas to both the east and west of suburban London the same gravel terraces have been extensively settled at many times in the past. Some examples of this are provided by large and important sites such as the Neolithic causewayed enclosures at Staines, Middlesex (Robertson-Mackay 1987) and Orsett, Essex (Hedges and Buckley 1978), rich Bronze Age sites such as at Runnymede Bridge, Egham, Surrey (Longley 1980) and Mucking North Rings, Essex (Bond 1988) and early/middle Saxon occupation at Harmondsworth (Andrews 1996) and a much larger site at Mucking (Hamerow 1993).

In the West London area, recent (and not so recent) large scale developments especially in the vicinity of Heathrow airport, to the west, have revealed extensive deposits of both the prehistoric and historic periods (e.g., Grimes and Close-Brooks 1993; Barrett et al. 2001; FA 2006).

More specifically within Chiswick, a recent overview of London’s archaeology (MoLAS 2000) shows few sites or findspots in the area for the earliest periods (Palaeolithic and Mesolithic). Although the Neolithic is better represented, this is mainly accounted for by individual stray finds, but an occupation site has been found at Pumping Station Road, and it is worth noting that a Neolithic gully at Corney Reach was covered by some 4m of alluvium and modern material (MoLAS 2000, 66; Lakin 1996).

The Bronze Age is represented by a site at the former Bus Works on Chiswick High Road itself (with some finds of other periods, see below), but otherwise, again only by stray finds, mostly from the Thames, while the Iron Age is entirely absent from Chiswick apart from some early Iron Age pottery at the Bus Works site. The evidence for the Roman period is little better, with only a coin hoard (mentioned by Stukeley; misidentified in the MoLAS 2000 gazetteer), while Saxon evidence is all from the riverbanks. Only from the Medieval period onwards is there more substantial evidence for settlement in Chiswick. Within the parish, areas of the London Clay and brickearth are known to have been extensively quarried from early post-medieval times onwards, although it is thought this might not be so severe as in some parts of west London (VCH 1982, 82).
Greater London Sites and Monuments Record

A search was made of the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record (GLSMR) on the 28th June 2007 for an area of 500m surrounding the proposal site. There are just twelve records in close proximity to the site, but in effect relating to just three positions. The locations of these records are illustrated in Figure 1 and the entries are summarized in Appendix 1.

Prehistoric
The most significant of the SMR results relate to an excavation carried out in 1989 (unpublished) at the former bus works site just to the north-east of the proposal area [Fig. 1: 1]. This revealed what appears to be the northern end of a late Bronze Age settlement, represented by ditches, pits and post holes, which appeared to continue southwards. A Neolithic flint transverse arrowhead was also recovered, and a number of undated features are also probably prehistoric. Although the SMR does not mention it, early Iron Age pottery is also reported from this site (MoLAS 2000, 97; gazetteer HO13).

Roman, Saxon
No entries relate to these periods within the 500m search radius. Chiswick High Road is, however, on the line of a Roman road which probably continued in use into Saxon times (see below).

Medieval
Some medieval pottery was present on the former bus works site [1]. The GLSMR also contains a record for various documentary and cartographic references to a medieval and post-medieval settlement at Little Sutton (or Sutton Beauregard) from the mid 15th century onwards, which may have included a mill [2].

Post-medieval, modern
Evaluation to the south-east of the proposal site produced only bedding features and pits of 18th-century and later dates [3]. The former bus works site [1] also produced 17th-century and later features, and a Victorian quarry.
Negative
Other information from Chiswick slightly further afield than the 500m search radius has rarely provided evidence for any activity pre-dating the late post-medieval or modern periods (information from ‘London Fieldwork and Publication Roundups’, *London Archaeologist, passim*).

**Cartographic and documentary sources**

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at Hounslow Local Studies and Archives and the Duke’s Library, Chiswick, in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site’s later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (Appendix 2).

The earliest map consulted was that of Norden (1572) (not illustrated). This map is at a small scale and shows the little in vicinity of the proposal site detail. Chiswick is marked as *Cheswyk*, on the river bank; the main road runs through Turnham (*Terneham*) Green well to the north. Saxton’s map of 1575 shows similarly little detail (Fig. 3).

Ogilby’s map of 1672 (Fig. 4) shows very little detail; the location of the site can only be approximately located by reference to surrounding place names; the area is shown blank apart from the road. Warburton’s map of 1749 (Fig. 5) shows a little more, but mainly only schematic, detail. The turnpike road is marked, there is no settlement along it in the vicinity of the site. Rocque’s survey of London published in 1769 (Fig. 6) appears to show more detail (e.g., field boundaries) but these too are more schematic than accurate. There is still no depiction of any development in the area of the site which is shown as arable land. The High Road is named as Brentford Road on this map, and much of the modern main road pattern is already established.

Neither tithe nor enclosure maps were available to view. The First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1865 shows the site before Thorney Hedge Road and Silver Crescent were laid out (Fig. 7). Although two short terraces from the road as in later maps (below), the site at this time appears to lie wholly within the grounds of a large villa. These grounds have been formally laid out with a circular drive, trees, lawns and paths, and presumably landscaped; what may be a pavilion or summer house occupies part of the site; the main house itself would appear to be further west, and what look like stables also off site to the north, although a precise boundary is difficult to determine. Similarly, it is possible the endmost terraced house may be on the site, but more probably it is just to the east. A composite map of 1882/1894 shows the outline of the new development along Thorney Hedge Road and Silver Crescent projected, but no other change (not illustrated).
The Second Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1894–6 (Fig. 8) shows the site occupying four plots of land fronting the High Road. A pair of semi-detached houses are set slightly back from the street front in the SW of the site, each with flanking outbuilding and what might be conservatories to rear; the next plot east has only a smaller building right next to the street, and the final plot is occupied by a large greenhouse at the front, with several small buildings in the rear. The site might also extend into the westernmost of a small terrace of houses. Large areas within the site are gardens. By the time of the Third Edition (1915), the central portion of the site has been subdivided and three new houses erected (Fig. 9). The eastern of the semi-detached pair has lost its attached outbuilding. A further large greenhouse has been added in the eastern plot.

The Ordnance Survey of 1935 (Fig. 10), the western part of the site is unchanged but the rear of the eastern part of the site has seen considerable change, and is now almost wholly built over with quite large structures; these are probably industrial rather than residential, although not annotated as such (while several other buildings in the vicinity are). Of note on this map, the benchmark on the wall just across the High Road is now 33.70 (feet), having been 34.9 on all previous maps; this reflects the adoption of a new definition of Ordnance Datum (mean sea level at Newlyn between 1915 and 1921) in the 1920s, replacing an 1844 calculation of mean sea level at Liverpool).

The available mapping from 1948 is a little unclear; the buildings on the site appear to be similar to those on the 1936 map, although it is possible they are already those shown in the 1960s, but with gardens persisting in the north-west corner of the site (not illustrated). The rear eastern part of the site is shown almost fully built over; but this might still be greenhouses, and garden sheds, differently depicted. The 1962/66 Ordnance Survey (Fig. 11) shows a single block of buildings occupying the whole frontage between Silver Crescent and Thorney Hedge Street; however it seems most likely that these are in fact the current buildings on the site. What had been three gardens to the west-rear have now been combined into two. The rear eastern part of the site is now more clearly built upon, and accessed off Silver Crescent. The Ordnance Survey of 1974 (Fig. 2) shows broadly the same outline of buildings at the High Road frontage, but these are now clearly those on the site today; the 1991 edition is identical (not illustrated). The area at the north (rear of the site) is carparking. It is not clear if the schematic depiction of the 1940s and 1960s maps has disguised the nature of the buildings present, or if the 1970s map is showing a new development; the latter seems more likely.

The proposal site is located within the Parish of Chiswick. Most of the parish lies within a broad bend of the River Thames, which was historically prone to flooding and thus not extensively settled until the 20th century.
The High Road, however, is in an area slightly raised above the lower-lying peninsula, and attracted settlement much earlier.

Chiswick is an Old English (Anglo-Saxon) place name meaning ‘cheese farm’, and is first attested as Ceswican around AD 1000 (Mills 1998, 84). At the time of Domesday Book it was a separate parish included in Fulham, and the entire parish was one manor held by the canons of St Paul’s (as it had been before the Conquest)(Williams and Martin 2002, 1038). It was assessed at five hides, and there was arable land for five ploughs. There were 32 taxable villagers and two slaves, a small amount of meadow and a large area of woodland. The manor was worth £8. The five hides were later subdivided into estates, Sutton (later Sutton Court) and Chiswick, of three and two hides respectively, but, at least up to AD1222, regarded still as a single manor. A church is first mentioned in 1181, and will have been the focus of the medieval village. It received its dedication to St Nicholas (patron of fishermen) in 1458 (VCH 1984, 54). There is little of note in the history of the manor until 1642, when a ‘battle’ at Turnham Green (barely a skirmish in reality) involving the London Trained Bands persuaded the King against advancing on the capital, a decision which some claim cost him any chance of a swift victory over Parliament (VCH 1982, 60).

The history of the parish is dominated by the river and the main road (Chiswick High Road), one of the three major routes from London to the west. Chiswick High Road follows the line of a Roman road, Akeman Street; Margary’s (1955) route 40, which joins the chief route (4a) to the west at the end of Chiswick High Road. It seems probable that route 40 predates route 4a, and may follow a pre-Roman route; it seems to have continued in use in Saxon times (Margary 1955, 48–51). By the 17th century it had become the main road to the west, and in the early 19th century was referred to as ‘the great western road’ (VCH 1982, 51).

From the 17th century onwards, the rich and powerful were building grand mansions in Chiswick, either on the main road or by the riverfront, as retreats from London (e.g., Chiswick House, Syon, Osterley, Boston Manor, Gunnersbury). Industry and more widespread settlement were perhaps a little slow to follow, probably because so much land was included in these great estates, and thus not available, but as the metropolis expanded, Chiswick gradually fell under its influence. Early industry in the area included brewing (attested from 1222), fisheries and shipbuilding. In the 18th and 19th centuries much of the land was given over to market gardening, but by the 1890s the pressure on land meant there was almost no room left for this (VCH 1982, 67–8).

Chiswick was transformed from a village to a London suburb over the course of the second half of the 19th century, population growing steadily from 3,235 in 1801 to 6,303 in 1851 then exploding to 29,801 by 1901 and 42,207 in 1951 (Cherry and Pevsner 1991, 389; VCH 1982, 55; 68). For Pevsner, Chiswick survived this
incorporation into the metropolis better than neighbouring boroughs: ‘of its independence from London much more survives and what survives is of a high quality, aesthetically, historically and picturesquely’ (Cherry and Pevsner 1991, 389). By the late 19th century, the grand estates were becoming less attractive to their titled owners, as railways brought their provincial estates within reach, and rocketing prices for land close to London meant large areas were sold piecemeal for housing. By the end of the First World War, the parish had been almost fully developed and there was little land left for expansion, except on the flood-prone marshes. Much of this area has been retained as parks and playing fields. Shipbuilding in the area ceased when Thornycrofts moved to Southampton in 1909, but this firm had until then been a major employer in the area, and a notable innovator, building amongst other craft, torpedo launchers (some 222 launched between 1874 and 1891) and destroyers (VCH 1982, 56–7; 84).

Listed buildings

Chiswick contains a large number of notable buildings, although the best of these (e.g., Chiswick House itself) are not close to the proposal site. The High Road contains few buildings of note other than a number of 18th- and (mainly) 19th-century inns and pubs. There are no Listed Buildings (or locally listed buildings) close enough to be affected by development on the proposal site.

Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields

There are no registered parks, gardens or battlefields close to the proposal area.

Discussion

There are two issues that need consideration in recommending a suitable course of action for this proposal: the likelihood of the original presence of archaeological deposits on the proposal site and whether they have survived later disturbance; and the impact of the proposed new development on relevant archaeological levels.

It is axiomatic of archaeological distribution maps that absence of evidence cannot be taken as evidence of absence. That is to say, the absence of archaeological evidence from an area is often a reflection of a lack of systematic investigation and not an indication that the area contains nothing of archaeological interest. In this instance, there is only a single archaeologically significant record in the GLSMR within 500m of the proposal site. However, it is equally significant that there have only been two recorded investigations in this area, and only one of those provided negative evidence. In this case, the negative evidence is of much less significance.
than the positive results obtained from excavations at the nearby Bus Works site, where significant prehistoric remains were revealed, and it was suggested, should originally have continued to the south, and with hints of several phases of activity. Moreover, Chiswick High Road is itself a Roman road, probably an early and major route.

It can therefore be predicted that there is high potential for the proposal site to have witnessed prehistoric and Roman activity, and it remains to examine whether any archaeological traces of this might survive, or if it can be demonstrated that they have already been lost through later truncation. The site was in use as several houses in the late 19th and early 20th century, but most of the area was in use as gardens during this period; it is likely that little truncation would have been caused by this usage. Although also gardens, the use of the site earlier in the 19th century (as shown on the 1866 map) may have had more impact, with formal landscaping in the grounds of a large house; however, there is nothing obvious to suggest significant truncation in this period. The 1935 mapping of the area shows larger structures over the eastern part of the site, probably warehouses or workshops, but although extensive in area these may have had only superficial foundations and again might not have caused extensive truncation. The modern buildings on the site do not appear to date from much before 1974, in which case at least two or three phases of re-development happened on the site, but within largely the same footprints, between 1915 and 1966.

The foundations of the existing buildings on the site (Fig. 11) consist of small close set piles. The proposed foundation scheme (indicative only at this stage) uses larger piles set further apart, and covers much the same area as the existing foundations, but extending the building’s footprint to both the front and the rear. The existing piles will have resulted in loss of archaeology within the building’s footprint, but this need not be assumed to have been total. However the sequence of redevelopments all in the same spot argues that there is little chance of intact archaeology surviving in the current building footprints. Even where potential archaeological deposits might have survived intact between the foundations, archaeological legibility (i.e., the ability to interpret them) will have been compromised. The new scheme might thus do relatively little new damage to any archaeology present within the existing footprint, but will include truncation in previously undisturbed areas (i.e where the new footprint is larger than the existing one). Further disturbance for services, access, etc., in the area currently under carpark would be likely to encounter intact stratigraphy (if any archaeological deposits were ever present here).

It will be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to mitigate the impact on any below-ground archaeological deposits. A scheme for this evaluation will
need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological adviser to the Borough (Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service) and carried out by a competent archaeological contractor, such as an Institute of Field Archaeologists Registered Organisation. Such a scheme, and any subsequent follow-up fieldwork to mitigate the effects of development, could be implemented as a condition attached to any planning consent gained or could be conducted in advance of any application for consent.
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**APPENDIX 1: Sites and Monuments Records within a 500m search radius of the development site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SMR Ref</th>
<th>Grid Ref (TQ)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ELO3938</td>
<td>MLO22185</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Former bus works site (LRT89), excavated 1989. Transverse type Neolithic arrowhead as stray find. Late Bronze Age settlement represented by ditches, pits and post holes: probably continues to the south. Some medieval pottery. Some pits undated thought to be prehistoric, some 17th century and later. Victorian gravel quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO22186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO22187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO22188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO22189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MLO68842</td>
<td>2018 7817</td>
<td>Documentary Cartographic</td>
<td>Medieval Post-medieval</td>
<td>Sources for settlement at Little Sutton, called Sutton Beauregard in 1450s. Possible watermill in Elmwood Road at this date. Also later references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ELO4356</td>
<td>MLO73418</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Evaluation (PCW98); 18th- and 19th-century bedding trenches and pits, brick-lined soakaway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO73419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLO73420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

1572  Norden’s map of the County of Middlesex
1575  Saxton’s map of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex (Fig. 3)
1672  Ogilby’s map of the County of Middlesex (Fig. 4)
1749  Warburton’s map of the County of Middlesex (Fig. 5)
1769  Rocque’s Survey of London (Fig. 6)
1866  Ordnance Survey, Second Edition (Fig. 7)
1882/94  Composite of Ordnance Survey revisions
1894-6  Ordnance Survey, Second Edition (Fig. 8)
1915  Ordnance Survey, Third Edition (Fig. 9)
1935  Ordnance Survey, Revision (Fig. 10)
1948  Ordnance Survey
1962/6  Ordnance Survey (Fig. 11)
1974  Ordnance Survey (Fig. 2)
1991  Ordnance Survey
1998  Ordnance Survey, Sheet TQ 1998 NE (Fig. 1)
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Figure 1. Location of site within Hounslow and Greater London, showing locations of SMR entries.

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Pathfinder 1174 TQ07/17 and 1175 TQ27/37 at 1:2500
Ordnance Survey Licence 108825880
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Figure 2. Current site configuration.
Reproduced from Landmark Historical mapping under licence; Copyright reserved.
Based on Ordnance Survey 1974. Not to scale
Approximate location of site
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Figure 3. Saxton 1575.
Approximate location of site

Figure 4. Ogilby 1672.
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Figure 5. Warburton 1749.
Approximate location of site
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Figure 6. Rocque 1769
Site (boundary approximate)
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Figure 7. First Edition Ordnance Survey 1866.
Not to scale.
Figure 8. Ordnance Survey Second Edition (1894-6) (not to scale).
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Figure 9. Ordnance Survey Third Edition (1915)
(not to scale).
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Figure 10. Ordnance Survey Revision (1935) (not to scale).
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Figure 11. Ordnance Survey 1962. (not to scale).
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Figure 12. Proposed and existing foundations (not to scale).