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Introduction

This desk-based study is an assessment of the archaeological potential of a parcel of land covering 0.28 ha located on Church Street, Sunbury, Surrey (TQ 1052 6860) (Fig. 1). The project was commissioned by Mr Eamonn Haslam of Elysian Homes, 11 Mulberry Place, Pinnell Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6AJ, 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.

Planning permission is to be sought from Spelthorne Borough Council for the redevelopment of the site to include thirteen new homes with access, landscaping and parking.

Site description, location and geology

The site currently consists of a now vacant building, formerly in use as sheltered housing, composed of individual bedsit units, communal areas and a warden’s flat. The development area covers 0.28ha centred on NGR, TQ1052 6860. It is bounded to the north and east by Sunbury Park, to the west by Church Street and to the north-west by the Conservative Club. There are several large trees, which are protected by virtue of standing in a Conservation Area. The site is located on the River Thames floodplain gravel (BGS 1981a and b). The Thames flows east just 75m to the south of the site, and the north bank here is basically flat, while the south bank rises gently. This part of the Thames flows by two aits (islets), which are commonly findspots for prehistoric artefacts. It is at a height of approximately 10m above Ordnance Datum.

Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought from Spelthorne District Council for the demolition of existing buildings on the site and construction of thirteen houses, with associated access, parking and some landscaping. The proposal site is in an Area of Special Landscape Character, a Conservation Area, and an Area of High Archaeological Potential as shown on the local plan proposals map, and it is adjacent to Sunbury Park.

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.’
Spelthorn Borough Council’s Local Plan (April 2001) includes policies relevant to the archaeological and built heritage.

‘POLICY BE20 The Borough Council will seek to preserve its listed building heritage by:-
   ‘(a) negotiation with and advice to listed building owners, together with the use of available statutory powers and grants, and as appropriate application of the policies of this Plan in a more flexible way
   ‘(b) seeking to retain listed buildings in the use for which they were designed and built, and normally only allowing changes of use where necessary to achieve the restoration or preservation of a building and which will not detract from the character of the building or the amenities and character of the area
   ‘(c) requiring alterations and extensions to respect the host listed building in scale, design, the use of materials, and the retention of the external structure and any features of special historic or architectural importance
   ‘(d) requiring development proposals for any sites affecting the setting of a listed building to have special regard to the need to preserve its setting
   ‘(e) refusing consent for any alteration or extension to a listed building that will not preserve the building or its setting
   ‘(f) refusing consent for the demolition of a listed building unless it has been conclusively demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Borough Council that there is no acceptable alternative future for the building
   ‘(g) where consent is exceptionally granted for the demolition or, where appropriate, for the alteration of a listed building which would destroy features of historic or architectural importance, requiring an adequate record of existing character, to be funded by the developer.

Of particular relevance to this site: paragraph 4.49.

‘The character of historic buildings and their contribution to the townscape can be severely damaged by insensitive alteration, extension or adjoining development.
   ‘When considering proposals for work to, or adjoining a listed building, special regard shall be paid to the desirability of:-
   ‘a) preservation of existing features of architectural or historic interest
   ‘b) minimal disturbance of historic fabric
   ‘c) use of appropriate scale, materials and design
   ‘d) preservation of the setting of the historic building.’

‘POLICY BE22 The Borough Council will seek to preserve and enhance the character of conservation areas by:-
   ‘(a) requiring retention of buildings, trees and other features which are important to the character of the area...
   ‘(d) protecting and seeking to enhance important views and vistas within, from and towards conservation areas (e) maintaining open spaces in an appropriate manner…
   ‘(i) as appropriate, applying the policies of this Plan in a more flexible way.’

‘ARCHAEOLOGY, ANCIENT MONUMENTS AND HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

‘4.74. There are four Scheduled Ancient Monuments which are by definition of national importance within the Plan area (see Appendix 5)’ [in fact there is at least one more than listed, see below] ‘and which the Council will seek to preserve from any development adversely affecting site or setting. An application for Scheduled Monument Consent must be made to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions for any proposal affecting these sites. In addition to the scheduled sites and monuments, two others of special local importance have been identified on the basis of current information from the County Sites and Monuments Record which should also be preserved (see Appendix 5). The Council will encourage as appropriate the management and interpretation of these sites and monuments to develop their educational and recreational potential. These sites are identified on the basis of currently available information, and
during the currency of the plan, additional sites may be identified to be of national importance following archaeological evaluation, or reassessment of sites on the Sites and Monuments Record.

‘POLICY BE24
‘There will be a presumption against any development which would adversely affect a scheduled or other nationally important ancient monument or its setting. Development adversely affecting a site or monument of County archaeological importance will not normally be permitted.

‘4.75. In addition to the above sites and monuments, other areas exist where there is good evidence for the existence of archaeological remains based on previous finds, maps or aerial photographs. These individual sites and areas of high potential are shown on the Proposals Map and are listed in Appendix 5. Any development proposal affecting such an area should include an initial assessment by a qualified archaeologist of its archaeological potential and what, if any, further field evaluation is required. An evaluation should assess the impact of the development upon the preservation of any archaeological remains. Where possible, remains should be left in situ. Proposals for development should wherever possible avoid damage to or disturbance of the archaeological remains. The Council will encourage the local display of archaeological finds, where appropriate, at the Spelthorne Museum or other suitable location. Developers are advised to refer to the British Archaeologists and Developers Code of Practice, and to Supplementary Planning Guidance produced by Surrey County Council entitled "Archaeology and Historic Landscapes" which gives a fuller explanation of Areas of High Archaeological Importance.

‘POLICY BE25
‘In considering proposals for development within areas of high archaeological potential, the Borough Council will:-

‘(a) require an initial assessment of the archaeological value of the site to be submitted as part of any planning application

‘(b) expect the applicant to arrange an archaeological field evaluation to be carried out prior to the determination of the planning application, where, as a result of the initial assessment, important archaeological remains are considered to exist

‘(c) have a preference for preservation in situ, and in such circumstances will impose conditions or seek a legal agreement, where appropriate, to ensure that damage to the remains is minimal or will be avoided

‘(d) require by planning condition or seek a legal agreement to secure a full archaeological investigation and recording of the site and subsequent publication of results in accordance with a scheme of work to be agreed in writing with the Council prior to the commencement of the proposed development, where important archaeological remains are known or considered likely to exist but their preservation in situ is not justified.

‘4.76. Work in recent years has resulted in sites of major archaeological importance being discovered in the course of gravel extraction, where no previous specific evidence existed for them. In view of Spelthorne's river gravel base, it is reasonable to assume that any large scale development is likely to affect features of archaeological interest and that discoveries could be made in any size of new development site. Any new development proposal for sites larger than 0.4 hectares and smaller sites where requested should include agreed arrangements for archaeological assessment or evaluation, and where appropriate investigation, and allow for future preservation of remains as deemed appropriate.

‘POLICY BE26
‘Outside the defined areas of high archaeological potential, the Borough Council will require an agreed scheme of archaeological assessment or evaluation appropriate for the site concerned to be submitted with any new development proposal for a site larger than 0.4 ha, and for smaller sites if deemed necessary. Where evidence of significant archaeological remains is found then the requirements set out in policy BE25 will apply.

‘4.77. Where other land is identified as of historic interest but is not covered by historic building, conservation area or archaeological protection policies, the Council will nonetheless seek to preserve the historic and amenity value of such land. This may include landscaped gardens and open landscapes. Where such areas are affected by development proposals it is important to record their historic details. The extent of such areas is to be further investigated by Surrey County
Council for the County as a whole but in Spelthorne currently known sites are Sunbury Park and Laleham Park.

‘POLICY BE27

‘The Council will seek to ensure that any proposed development within or adjacent to an area of historic landscape value, or garden of special historic interest, does not detract from its character or appearance. An adequate record will be required where development affecting such an area is permitted. Where necessary the Council will encourage the sensitive restoration of gardens of special historic interest within the Borough.

Under the local plan review, policies BE 24, BE25 and BE 26 are ‘saved’ and will be included unaltered in the new policy round. The proposal site is in an Area of Special Landscape Character, a Conservation Area, and an Area of High Archaeological Potential as shown on the local plan proposals map, and it is adjacent to Sunbury Park. The landscape is characterized as ‘settlement related’.

Methodology

The 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 Surrey Sites and Monuments Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

Archaeological background

General background

Sunbury has little history of archaeological investigation, in common with much of southern Spelthorne; accounts of the area are dominated by finds from the river Thames. Unpublished excavation at Vicarage Road, Sunbury, however, has provided evidence of land clearance and a field boundary from the Bronze Age (Bird et al. 1996, 201).

More broadly, the Thames Valley gravels are prolific in sites and finds of all periods. The floodplain gravels have been less so, partly because so much of this area is under modern development or has seen extensive gravel extraction over several centuries, partly because much of it is under alluvium, and for the very earliest periods, because this lowest ‘terrace’ did not yet exist.
Surrey Sites and Monuments Record

A search was made on the Surrey Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) on 18th March 2008 for a radius of 1km around the proposal site. This revealed 134 entries within the search radius, the vast majority of which are listed buildings. Only fifteen of the entries related to other types of evidence. These are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1: listed buildings have been omitted from Figure 1 for clarity.

Prehistoric
Seven SMR entries within the 1km search radius relate to finds of prehistoric artefacts, spanning a range of dates. These are almost all finds from the River Thames, so that their value for reconstructing the prehistory of the area is very limited, as they could have arrived from anywhere upstream. The earliest find is a Mesolithic flint axe, from Sunbury Lock, donated to Kingston Museum in 1908 [Fig. 1: 1]. Another flint axe from the same location or nearby, can be dated to the Neolithic [1]. There is a record for a find of human and animal bones, ‘20 feet below the surface’ at near the same spot [2], presumably on the riverbank. These are purported to be Neolithic or Bronze Age, but no dating evidence is reported. Initial reports of the find (in 1926) noted that some antler appeared to have been utilized as picks, and perhaps this was the basis for the dating offered; recent re-examination of the finds suggests the antler is unworked. A Middle Bronze Age dagger came from the river at Sunbury Lock Island [3]. A Bronze Age rapier came from the river but is no more closely located than ‘at Sunbury’ [4]. Two Bronze Age bronze finds, also from the river, at the weir [5], include a socketed side-looped spearhead and a flat axe.

Roman
Just one entry relates to this period: again, a river find of a spearhead [6]. As with the prehistoric finds, this can have been washed down from anywhere upstream and is not necessarily indicative of Roman occupation at Sunbury.

Saxon
Three entries relate to this period. Two are for more river finds, a 9th-century T-shaped axe [4], and a ‘Viking’ spearhead [6], for which the caveats sounded for earlier finds equally apply. The third is more problematical. To the north-west of the proposal site [7] is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, consisting of a low bowl-shaped mound. Its significance, however, is doubtful, and its date even more so: see Scheduled Ancient Monument below.

Medieval
Somewhat surprisingly, there are no SMR records for this period within 1km of the proposal site. It is known, however, the current church stands on the site of a medieval predecessor, and the area is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential (a41 in the Local Plan), at the core of the medieval village.
Post-medieval
The vast majority of the entries relate to 17-, 18th- and 19th-century Listed Buildings, of which Sunbury has an abundance. Most important for the current site are the buildings on Church Street, starting with the church itself, and Green Street. For discussion of these, see Listed Buildings, below

Undated, negative
Undated features probably of archaeological significance have been recorded from aerial photographic evidence, on the outer limits of the 1km search radius. These include both linear ditches and ring ditches to the north-west [8], and a possible barrow to the east, on the south bank of the Thames [10] The SMR records the latter as visible as a crop circle, citing Longley (1976); in fact Longley does not state what cropmark is visible here: there is a mound at this location on Ordnance Survey maps and possibly this is what is intended. A report on the structure of the weir [9] revealed ‘earlier phases’, whose date is not specified; these are presumably of no great antiquity as they include metal sheet piles. (It is assumed here that the weir is in the river, not at the location given by the SMR entry, which is well inland). A watching brief in the churchyard [12] recorded graves and disarticulated human bone; no dating is offered for these, again they are unlikely to be of great antiquity. A recent watching brief during construction of terraced housing just opposite the site [13] revealed only modern finds and features. Observation of gravel extraction revealed a buried former river channel, well south of the Thames [11] but no archaeological finds or features; geophysical survey at the same location was ‘without positive result’ (it is not mentioned whether this picked up the palaeochannel). Finally there is an entry for an unreferenced source mentioning an unspecified house and garden as being very beautiful at an unspecified date, although at least a grid reference is supplied and we learn that it has or had some of the first heated horticultural buildings in the world [14].

Scheduled Ancient Monuments
Well to the north-west of the proposal site is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM31384), consisting of a low bowl-shaped mound 14–15m in diameter and 2.5m high. English Heritage’s Scheduling record states that it is Late Neolithic or Bronze Age, and notes the existence of an infilled ditch, although no evidence is adduced in support of the date, other than that most bowl barrows are of this age. The Surrey SMR lists it as Saxon, on the grounds that a ‘cloven barrow’ (Clofenan Beorh according to EH; clorthan beorh in the SMR) is listed in a Saxon land charter of c. AD962. As the mound is still visible, if it was prehistoric, it would of course have been a feature in the Saxon landscape too, but this does not make it a Saxon barrow. Moreover, the original attempt to trace the lines of the Saxon boundaries was based on an unreliable transcript of the charter (VCH 1962, 53 fn 56) and any equation with any modern feature would be tentative even with an accurate text. Complicating matters
further, it is recorded that ‘several barrows’ were removed during construction of ‘The Avenue’ and that ‘a Danish resident states that these were of Danish origin’ (which would translate as a Saxon date). No corroboration for this suggestion is forthcoming, but The Avenue is nowhere near the Scheduled Area. Saxon barrows are not unknown. Recent (limited and unscientific) excavation of the mound has shown that not far from its surface is a deposit of broken brick and burnt clay, and although this could be a recent capping over an ancient mound, it is just as likely that the whole mound is a modern or late post-medieval dump of waste from a brick kiln. If so, this leaves the location of the ‘clofenan beorh’ unknown. No trace of a ditch is now thought to be visible at the SAM. The extant mound is not cloven, unless the modern capping was filling in such a cleft, yet another possibility that cannot be ruled out. A ‘cleft’ mound could be the result of ancient robbing of a barrow, while reuse of such a mound as an ornamental garden feature, any time from the 17th century onwards, might have required sculpting it back into more regular shape before the planting of two yew trees, known to have stood on it since at least 1872. All in all it is a peculiar feature that deserves proper exploration, if only to establish whether it actually deserves its Scheduling. The Spelthorne Local Plan does not include this monument among its most up-to-date list of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, although it is listed as a Site/Area of High Archaeological Potential and shown as such on the Proposals Map (SBC 2001, Appendix 5; and Proposals map online). In any case, this is well away from the proposal site and development on the site under consideration here cannot possibly affect the SAM, whatever it is.

**Cartographic and documentary sources**

Sunbury is an old English (Anglo-Saxon) place name first recorded around AD 960 as *Sunnanbyrg*. It derives from the elements *Senna* (a man’s name) and *byrig* (dative of *burh*, fort) and so means ‘Senna’s fort’. Sunna is otherwise recorded only in the similar placenames, Sunninghill (Berk) and Sunningwell (Oxon). It is tempting to portray this Sunna, therefore as a very important leader, but there is no reason to believe the same man is meant at each place. If the lands of one ruler really extended from Surrey to Oxfordshire, he would surely have come to the notice of the Anglo-Saxon chroniclers. (Sunningdale, also apparently cognate, was a 19th-century invention.) (Mills 1998,333–4).

At the time of Domesday Book (AD 1086), Sunbury (*Sunneburie* or *Sunenberie*), in the Hundred of Spelthorne in Middlesex, was a moderate sized manor, belonging to the Abbot of St Peter’s at Westminster, as it had done before the Conquest (Williams and Martin 2002, 361). It was assessed at 7 hides, with arable land for 6 ploughs, the same amount of meadow, and the unusual notation that there was pasture for the livestock in the
village, presumably an early reference to a village green acting as common pasture. Twenty villagers are numbered (that is, twenty heads of households), a priest and one slave. It can be assumed there was a church, although one is not specifically mentioned, nor are any other obvious potential assets such as a mill or a fishery. It was valued at £6, a modest total. For comparison, the much larger manor of Staines with over 100 inhabitants, 6 mills and 2 weirs was valued at £35. A mill is not recorded in the manor until 1591, although there was a windmill by 1311 (VCH 1962, 57–8).

Other than innumerable boundary changes (which, incidentally, make the identification of the ‘cloven barrow’ from its mention in a boundary charter even more than usually difficult), Sunbury has had little history of note. It was too far upstream from London to become as popular as Richmond, Hampton or Twickenham among the 18th-century wealthy who transformed those villages into suburbs, although it did witness some fine Georgian architecture, very little of which remains. It seems to have been a refuge for a small Huguenot colony from around 1703. The population (of the parish) grew from 48 (the 22 noted above, plus the totals from two other manors within the modern parish) to 174 by 1547, 80 households (perhaps 3–400 people) in 1664, 1,447 by 1801 and 2,300 by 1861. The opening of the railway in 1864 brought about rapid growth, to over 4000 by 1881. Between 1931 and 1951 the population grew from 6500 to over 16,000 (VCH 1962, 58).

Sunbury applied for Urban District status in 1892, and a Council was formed in 1894. At first it met at the Institute, then at the Assembly Rooms, but by the end of 1895 had taken a lease on Church Villa. By 1930, when the district had expanded and more members sat, this building was too small, and a temporary replacement was built. The Council purchased Church Villa outright in 1929, but the offices moved to Benwell House in 1932, Church Villa being used as a fire station from then until the 1960s.

The parish church is referred to as early as AD1157 (VCH 1962, 61), and a priest had already been noted in 1086, implying a church perhaps as early as Saxon times. A church dedicated to St Mary the Virgin was built in 1752 to replace the medieval church on the same site, which was too small for the population. By 1856 it was again too small and in 1857, S S Teulon made what VCH tactfully calls ‘drastic alterations’ (Pevsner is less reticent: ‘revolting’ is his judgement on Teulon’s ‘steamroller sensitivity’(Nairn et al. 1971, 470). Internal murals by Heywood Sumner (1896) soften the impact a little.

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted at the Surrey History Centre, and online at Landmark Historical Mapping 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 (see Appendix 2).

The earliest map available of the area is Saxton’s large map of 1575 covering four counties around London
(Fig. 2). At this scale, no detail is shown, but Sunbury exists as a small settlement in Middlesex. Other 16th- and
early 17th-century maps are similar (not illustrated). Ogilby’s map of 1672 begins to show more detail but is still
basically schematic (Fig. 3). Sunbury has a church, at a road junction, with development along the roads and the
river. Warburton (1749) adds a little more detail, including more roads, and an ait in the Thames, but it is still not
possible to identify any site within the town in detail (Fig. 4). Rocque’s map of a generation later (Fig. 5) is more
detailed, although in fact much of Rocque’s ‘detail’ at the level of individual fields or buildings can be shown to
be inaccurate (simply ‘filling in’) in other places. Here, his depiction of the roads catches the general feel of the
place without inspiring much confidence in detail, although to be fair to him, this is a Surrey map and he may
have skimped on detail across the river in Middlesex). The parish was enclosed in 1803 (VCH 1962, 52) but the
SHC does not possess an enclosure map; it is not certain one exists. No tithe map was prepared for Sunbury.

The site is first depicted in detail on the Ordnance Survey First Edition (Fig. 6), surveyed 1865 and 1868
but not published until 1874 and 1884. By this time, the site boundaries are already in their current form. There
is a large building called Church Villa, in the north-west corner and the rest of the site is laid out to gardens, with
a water pump in the south-west. Of some interest is the brewery between Church Villa and the Church. A
number of smaller buildings lining the Church Street frontage, south of the site, are not easily discerned on this
map but are more clearly seen on the Second Edition. One of these occupies the southernmost part of the site. By
1896 (Fig. 7), the brewery has been removed, although some of its buildings still stand, but Church Villa and the
smaller buildings on Church Street remain. The opposite side of the street has now been fully developed, on land
formerly part of the vicarage grounds. The Third Edition (1914/15) is identical for the site and environs (not
illustrated). Unfortunately for both the 1920 and 1934 revision, the 25-inch series was not available. The 6-inch
sheet for 1920 (Fig. 8) shows an additional, fairly substantial, building at the north rear of the site and now
indicates that Church Villa is the UDC offices; in fact it is known to have been so since 1895, the Urban District
Council having been formed in 1894 (see above) It is not altogether clear what Church Villa was before then. A
workhouse on Green Street in Sunbury closed in 1842, it seems unlikely this would have been it (next to a
brewery would hardly be the ideal place for it). The depiction of Church Villa differs slightly from the earlier
maps but this difference is almost certainly due only to the change of scale and style rather than indicating a new
building or substantial alteration.
By 1957, the site is shown as a fire station (Fig. 9), and is now occupied by several large buildings, those to the rear must postdate the 1930s. A very slight modification to link the two north-eastern buildings has taken place by the 1965 map (not illustrated) but the site is still the fire station. By 1975 the site has assumed its current layout, one large complex occupying the central area, and indeed, most of the area.

**Listed buildings**

St Mary the Virgin dates from 1752, built to a design by Stephen Wright, to replace a medieval church on the same site. It was extensively remodelled in 1857, and has undergone further 20th-century alterations. It is listed at Grade II*: Eighteenth-century tombs in the graveyard, and the churchyard walls and railings are also listed. The Old Vicarage dates from the same period, the building and its garden walls and gates are listed. Vicarage Cottage is claimed to be earlier, with late 18-century additions: possibly an existing cottage was modified when the new church was being built. ‘The Old Manor’ is late 18th century, while 4 Holly Cottage is late 17th or early 18th century. This little cluster forms a coherent grouping. The Three Fishes public house (35 Green Street, facing the site) is a 16th-century timber-framed building. These are the only Listed Buildings whose settings could be affected by development on the proposal site. Development proposals would need to be sympathetic to the setting of these buildings, and to the historic character of the townscape generally.

**Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields**

There are no registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within close proximity of the site. Sunbury Park, adjacent to the site, although not Registered, is defined as part of the Area of Special Landscape Character. Development on the site would therefore have to be designed so as not to detract from its character or appearance (Local Plan Policy BE27).

**Historic Hedgerows**

There are no hedgerows on the site that would qualify as ‘important’ as defined by Schedule 1 of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.
Aerial Photographs

The site areas lies within an area which has been developed since before the advent of aerial photography. No photographic collections have therefore been consulted.

Discussion

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

Consideration of the known archaeological resource in the area is not straightforward. The SMR contains many entries for prehistoric finds within the search radius, but almost all are river finds which do not necessarily relate to prehistoric activity in this location. Nonetheless, the topographic setting is one that is likely to have been generally favoured for prehistoric settlement, and cropmark evidence suggests prehistoric activity not far from the site. The presence of possible barrows on both banks of the Thames nearby also points to the general potential of the area. Although little positive archaeological evidence for other periods has been recorded from the area studied, this is probably a result of a lack of systematic investigation. Sunbury has Saxon origins and the site lies at the core of the medieval settlement, practically adjacent to the church, the site of which dates from the 12th century of not earlier. Medieval settlement would have centred on the church.

The site area is a reasonably large one and is within an Area of High Archaeological Potential as defined in the Local Plan. The site has been repeatedly built over, including two large council office buildings and two large fire station buildings, and the current building occupies almost the entire area that the previous buildings had left open. All of these buildings are likely to have truncated the archaeologically relevant levels to a greater or lesser degree, but it cannot be assumed that archaeological deposits could not have survived, albeit perhaps in isolated pockets. Should the site indeed contain intact archaeological deposits, these would have the potential to contribute to a number of questions relevant to the aims outlined in the county’s Archaeological Research Framework (Bird 2006), spanning prehistoric to medieval times. In particular, the riverside location offers the prospect of any deep deposits being waterlogged, with enhanced preservation of artefacts and environmental remains, and environmental study is a key objective for the county (Bird 2006, 73). However, on balance, the likely degree of truncation means that the overall potential of the site can be considered low, unless it could be demonstrated that truncation was less severe than imagined, or that deep, waterlogged deposits were present.
Given that the site is almost totally built over, and what isn’t is occupied by protected trees, preliminary pre-demolition investigation would be difficult to carry out even if merited. It is suggested therefore that an appropriate way forward is for a watching brief to be carried out during sensitive groundworks which would be implemented by an appropriately worded condition attached to any consent gained. A scheme for this watching brief will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Borough and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor, such as an organization registered with the Institute of Field Archaeologists.
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### APPENDIX 1: Sites and Monuments Records within a 1km 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>2437</td>
<td>1095 6850</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Mesolithic</td>
<td>Two flint axes from Thames, 1907, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1097 6855</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Human and animal bones including antlers found 6m below the surface on the river bank, in 1926. Dating evidence not stated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>1075 6840</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Dagger found in Thames, 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>1035 6785</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age rapier from Thames, 1934, Saxon T-shaped axe from Thames, 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>1045 6810</td>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Two spearheads from Thames, 1933, one of each date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1003 6912</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>Cloven Barrow mentioned in a Saxon charter. A mound thought to be this has been shown to be remains of a brick kiln. ‘Several’ barrows are thought to have been destroyed during construction of The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>0968 6890</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Linear and ring ditches visible on aerial photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>105 685</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Weir (grid reference wrong?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1122 6855</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Possible barrow mound visible on aerial photograph (presumably it is the ditch not the mound that is visible, though OS maps shows a mound not too far from here.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4267</td>
<td>112 682</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>1062 6851</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Human bones and burials recorded and reburied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5118</td>
<td>1042 6856</td>
<td>Watching brief</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Only relatively recent finds were recovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15236</td>
<td>11210 68818</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Elliptical entry for report of a beautiful building with gardens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10857 | 11093 68661 | Listed Building | Post-medieval | Thames Street: 10 (Bellevue) early 18th century; 16–20 (even), late 17th century; 21, mid 17th century; 30 and 32 18th century; 36–42 (even) mid 19th-century terrace; 47 and 49, early 18th century; 59 and 61 former assembly room, mid 19th century; 64, mid 19th-century; 66–70 (even) mid 18th century; 57 late 19th-century bank, Orchard House, early 18th-century, walls and railings also listed; The Little House, 18th century; Monksbridge, late 18th century, walls and gates also listed; Thames Cottage, mid or late 18th century (listed twice); the Flower pot public house, early 18th century; Northolt, 18th century; Thames House 19th century with post box; Riverside house early 19th; West Lodge, early 18th; Riverbank, early 18th century, coal and wine tax post, mid 19th century |

10856 | 11082 68601 | Listed Building | Post-medieval | Lower Hampton Road: 3 Willowbank, early 19th-century house (listed twice at different grid references); 2 Rivercote, late 18th century |

10855 | 11023 68726 | Listed Building | Post-medieval | Green Street, Hawke House, early 18th-century house, 18th and 19th century wall and railings; 4 and 4a late 18th century; Manor Cottage, 18th century; Blakesy Lodge mid/late 18th; Three Fishes public house, late 16th century. |

10854 | 11015 68630 | Listed Building | Post-medieval | 181 French Street (William and Mary House), early 18th-century house, wall and railings also listed; 183 late 18th-century; Ivy House, late 17th century. 181 also listed as pair with 179 (Clyde House), but then called Ellesmere House and given different grid reference and date (mid 18th century). |

10853 | 11017 68619 | Listed Building | Post-medieval | St Mary the Virgin, 1752 by Stephen Wright extensively remodelled 1857 (Grade II*); late 18th-century wall around churchyard; early 18th-century chest tomb; late 18th-century vault and chest tomb. Old Vicarage, late 18th century, wall and gates also listed; Vicarage Cottage, early 18th century |
<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>10831</td>
<td>10695</td>
<td>10589 68518</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Church Road: Anchor Cottage, late 18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10688</td>
<td>10687</td>
<td>10540 68563</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Coal and Wine tax post, mid 19th-century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10654</td>
<td>10655</td>
<td>10629 68536</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Post-medieval</td>
<td>Coal and Wine tax post, mid 19th-century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Listed Building Grade II unless stated.
**APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted**

1575  
Saxton, Surrey, Sussex, Kent and Middlesex (Fig. 2)

1593  
Norden, Middlesex

1594  
Norden, Surrey

1605  
vanderKeere, Kent, Sussex, Surrey and Middlesex

1672  
Ogilby, an actual survey of Middlesex (Fig. 3)

1690  
Seller, Surrey

1729  
Senex, Middlesex

1749  
Warburton, Middlesex (Fig. 4)

1768  
Rocque, Surrey (Fig. 5)

1793  
Lindley and Crossley, Surrey

1823  
C and J Greenwood, Surrey

1874/1884  
Ordnance Survey First Edition, 25-inch series, Middlesex Sheets xii.1 and xxv.5 (Fig. 6)

1895/1896  
Ordnance Survey Second Edition, 25-inch series, Middlesex Sheets xii.1 and xxv.5 (Fig. 7)

1914/1915  
Ordnance Survey Third Edition, 25-inch series, Middlesex Sheets xii.1 and xxv.5

1920  
Ordnance Survey Revision, 6-inch series, Middlesex Sheet xxv.5 (Fig. 8)

1934  
Ordnance Survey Revision, 25-inch series

1957/8  
Ordnance Survey Revision 1:1250 (Fig. 9)

1965  
Ordnance Survey Revision 1: 10,560

1975  
Ordnance Survey Revision 1: 10,560
Church Villas, Church Street, Sunbury, Surrey, 2008
Archaeological Desk-based Assessment

Figure 1. Location of site within Sunbury and Surrey, showing locations of SMR entries (excluding listed buildings).

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey Pathfinder 1190 TQ06/16 at 1:12500 Ordnance Survey Licence 100025880
Figure 2. Saxton’s map of Surrey, Sussex, Kent and Middlesex, 1575.
Figure 3. Ogilby’s map of Middlesex, 1672.
Figure 4. Warburton’s map of Middlesex, 1749.
Figure 5. Rocque’s map of Surrey, 1768.
Figure 6. Ordnance Survey First Edition (1874 and 1884). Not to scale.
Figure 7. Ordnance Survey Second Edition (1895 and 1896). Not to scale.
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Figure 8. Ordnance Survey 1920.
Figure 9, Ordnance Survey 1957/8
Crown Copyright and Landmark Historical Mapping
Copyright reserved. Not to scale.
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