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Summary

In December 2010 Oxford Archaeology (OA) were commissioned by Hill Partnerships to conduct archaeological trial trenching at The County Arms public house, Hall Road, Isleworth, Greater London. The programme comprised two archaeological evaluation trenches measuring 12.5 m in length. No significant archaeological remains were uncovered in either trench. A shallow, truncated post-medieval gully was observed in trench 1 and a Victorian rubbish pit in trench 2. Trench 1 also contained a modern gas or oil tank. The site had been previously disturbed, particularly to the south with 0.74 m of made ground in Trench 1. No remains of the buildings pre-dating the construction of The County Arms Public House were observed.
1 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **Location and scope of work**

1.1.1. On the 21st of December 2010, Oxford Archaeology (OA) conducted an archaeological evaluation at The County Arms public house, Hall Road, Isleworth, Greater London, centred on National Grid Reference TQ 14930 75310.

1.1.2. The development area is situated to the west of Isleworth in the district of Hounslow on the former site of The County Arms public house which was under demolition during the site works. It is bordered by Hall Road to the west, Worton Road and Worton Hall to the north-east and by residential house and development to the south.

1.1.3. The work was designed to assist in defining the character and extent of any archaeological remains within the proposed redevelopment area, in accordance with the guidelines set out in *Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment* (Department for Communities and Local Government 2010) in advance of a planning application. The results will enable decisions to be made by GLAAS, on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, with regard to the treatment of any archaeological remains found.

1.1.4. The site archive is currently held by OA and will be deposited with the appropriate county stores in due course.

1.2 **Geology and topography**

1.2.1. The site lies on the Taplow 2nd Terrace river gravel formation at a height of approximately 16.5 m OD (British Geological Survey 1981). The gravels in this area overly London Clay and are overlain by Brickearth. Ground investigation prior to the archaeological evaluation demonstrated that the London Clay was encountered at approximately 5 m below ground level. The Brickearth deposit had been truncated away by previous development (JNP Group 2009, 7).

1.2.2. The proposed development area comprised the grounds of the former county Arms public house and included hard standing car parking to the north, east and west, with grassed and landscaped garden to the south and east of the plot.

1.2.3. The river Crane flows from the north-west around the south of Hounslow and Isleworth, joining the Thames 1.7 km to the east of the site.

1.3 **Archaeological and historical background**

1.3.1. The archaeological and historical background of the site has been the subject of Desk Top Assessment and will be briefly summarised below.

**Prehistoric and Roman**

1.3.2. Palaeolithic and Mesolithic activity although rare is widely distributed and most common on the flood plains and tributaries of the Thames. The site is situated 1.7 km from the River Thames and Crane and this proximity indicates that lithics from the early Mesolithic to Early Neolithic could be encountered on this site. Residual flints have been recovered from several sites nearby (Kneller Gardens MLO64015, South Middlesex Hospital MLO63069 and Thornbury Road MLO72939).
1.3.3. Later Neolithic and Early Bronze Age activity tended to be located on the higher gravels and brickearth to the west of Greater London. There is an increased chance of archaeological remains from this period surviving within the development site. Middle Bronze Age sites found at Bankside Close and South Middlesex Hospital demonstrate that by this period people were settling in and around Isleworth and this occupation appears to have continued into the Iron Age. No Iron Age artefacts, however, have been recovered from within 1 km of the site.

1.3.4. Roman activity in the area is likely to have been influenced and attracted by its proximity to the London to Silchester road. Only a small amount of Roman activity has been recorded in the area; a single coin of Constantinius I recovered from Worton Lane, pottery from South Middlesex Hospital and ditches at Syon Lodge to the north-east of the site.

Saxon and Medieval

1.3.5. No evidence has been uncovered to suggest that there was a Saxon settlement on the site although local place names indicate a presence in the area and a coin hoard found in Isleworth (MLO50607) as well as fish traps in the Thames (MLO54151) indicate that occupation continued after the Roman period.

1.3.6. The village of Worton is first mentioned in the Medieval period (Reynolds 1962) and the existence of settlements and farmsteads in this area is attested to by the presence of Worton Manor 480 m to the north-east. A 13th century watermill was located on North Street, Isleworth (MLO50531) and medieval pottery was recovered from the sites of Kneller Gardens and South Middlesex Hospital.

1.3.7. Settlement on the site appears to have been developed by the time of Moses Glover's 1635 map on which up to five buildings are recorded on the plot.

Post-Medieval

1.3.8. The nature of settlement in this area did not change significantly during the post-medieval period. The most significant additions to the landscape was Worton Hall (MLO85671) in 1783 directly to the east of the site and several landfill sites, two of which lay within 600 m of the development area (MLO72692 and MLO 72662).

1.3.9. Small scale settlement and agriculture are attested to by gullies and plough soils uncovered at Kneller Gardens (MLO64017), South Middlesex Hospital (MLO63065), Bankside Close (MLO72185) and Battersea Church Road 1.2 km to the east (MLO64405).

1.3.10. This area of Greater London saw a significant increase in activity during the post-medieval periods and historic mapping attests to the construction and remodelling of buildings on this site. These buildings were houses, out-buildings and farm buildings and the 1st edition OS map also shows a pond.
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2 AIMS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Aims
2.1.1. The objective of this archaeological evaluation was to:
   - establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the proposal area
   - determine and confirm the character of any remains present, without compromising any deposits that may merit detailed investigation under full area investigation
   - determine or estimate the date range of any remains from artefacts or otherwise
   - make available the results of the investigation to inform the planning application and the potential for any further mitigation strategy
   - produce a report and full archive
   - disseminate the results of the investigation at a level appropriate to their importance.

2.2 Methodology
2.2.1. The evaluation comprised two 12.5 m long trenches within the garden area of the former County Arms public house. The location of the trenches was dictated by the available space around the building. One trench was placed approximately parallel with Hall Road, at the front of the property, the second trench approximately 90 degrees to Hall Road along the southern boundary.

2.2.2. Machine excavation was carried out under constant archaeological supervision with a tracked 360 degree excavator using a toothless ditching bucket.

2.2.3. Trenches were located by tapped survey from fixed points around the site including walls of the public house and fence lines.

2.2.4. All archaeological features and deposits were recorded using OA's pro-forma sheets. Trench locations, plans and sections were recorded at appropriate scales and colour, monochrome and digital photographs were taken of all relevant features and deposits. All field work took place in accordance with OA's field manual (Wilkinson 1992).

2.2.5. Ground and weather conditions were generally good during the field work despite the presence of settled snow overnight.
3 Results

3.1 Introduction
3.1.1 No significant archaeological features or artefacts were identified during the evaluation. Descriptions of all deposits and details of trenches are tabulated in Appendix A.

3.2 Trench 1
3.2.1 Trench 1 was machined to an average depth of 0.90 m and the natural geology was gravel (Plate 1). It contained a single truncated post-medieval gully, 104, aligned E-W running for approximately 6 m before terminating (Fig. 3, Section 102). The terminus is a result of truncation, likely due to previous ground works. A single fragment of CBM, probably peg tile and a fragment of a thick glass vessel were recovered from the gully fill.

3.2.2 The trench was affected by previous ground works, particularly to the east where 0.74 m of made ground was observed (Fig. 3, Section 101). The remains of a modern gas or oil tank were also observed to the west of the trench at a depth of approximately 0.90 m below current ground level.

3.3 Trench 2
3.3.1 Trench 2 was machined to an average depth of 1.00 m and the natural geology was gravel and contained a single Victorian rubbish pit, 204 (Fig. 3, Section 202). The pit was vertical sided but not fully excavated due to health and safety concerns about the depth and stability of the surrounding trench sides. Fragments of glass bottles, ceramics and metal were recovered from the fill. Trench 2 appeared not to have been significantly disturbed by previous construction work and contained no evidence for made ground (Plate 2).

3.4 Finds Summary
3.4.1 Nine fragments of pottery from seven separate vessels were recovered from context 205. All fragments are of a late post-medieval or modern date. In addition to the pottery, two fragments of glass bottles were also recovered from context 205. Both date to the late 19th or 20th century.

3.4.2 A single fragment of roofing tile was recovered from context 105 along with a thick glass bottle bottom fragment. The roof tile dates to the 18th or 19th century and the glass may date to the 17th or 18th century.

3.4.3 Detailed assessment of the finds recovered during the evaluation are presented in Appendix B.
4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Reliability of field investigation
4.1.1. Ground conditions were reasonable and there was good visibility in each trench. Made ground was present, particularly to within trench 1 and this has truncated post-medieval archaeological remains.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and results
4.2.1. No archaeological remains or artefacts pre-dating the post-medieval period were observed.
4.2.2. Made ground is present, particularly to the south of the site and this has truncated an underlying post-medieval gully. No evidence for made ground was observed in trench 2.

4.3 Significance
4.3.1. No significant archaeological remains or artefacts were observed during the evaluation and although the investigation was limited to two trenches, it seems likely that the results in these trenches are an accurate reflection of the archaeological potential of the site. The lack of made ground in trench 2 suggests the possibility of isolated pockets of undisturbed ground in the area, although no evidence for archaeological remains pre-dating the post-medieval period were observed in any of the trial trenches.

4.4 Recommendations
4.4.1. Recommendations for any future work based upon this report will be made by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS).
## Trench 1

**General description**
Trench contained a single, shallow, truncated gully aligned E-W. Possibly the base of an old service trench or land drain. Runs for approximately 6 m from the eastern end of trench 1 until it is truncated away. The western end of the trench contained a large iron tank with concrete access hole. Possibly an old oil or gas tank. Trench sondage at western end to a depth of 1.50 m below ground level.

Natural geology is gravel.

**Contexts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Topsoil. Firm dark grey brown sandy silt with occasional rounded and sub rounded small and medium pebbles. Rare large tree roots</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Compact brick, mortar and concrete layer. Possibly remains of a previous hard standing area.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Make-up layer of friable mixed redeposited mid brown gravels and silty clay with occasional CBM fragments.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural. Firm mid orange brown silt with frequent small and medium gravel and occasional flints.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Cut of gully that is truncated by layer 102. Survives as a very shallow gully for approximately 6 m within the trench before it is truncated away. Contained a single fill, 105.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Firm light grey brown sandy silt with occasional small rounded pebbles.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Cut for modern tank. Not bottomed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Metal tank with concrete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

| Avg. depth (m) | 0.9 |
| Width (m)      | 1.85 |
| Length (m)     | 12.5 |

**Finds**

- CBM Glass

**Date**

17th - 19th century
Trench 2 contained a single Victorian rubbish pit. The natural geology was gravel with a light yellow sandy lens towards the NE end. This was also investigated to ensure it was a natural feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Topsoil. Firm dark grey brown sandy silt with occasional rounded and sub rounded small and medium pebbles. Frequent small and medium tree roots and medium fragments of brick and clay tile.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Subsoil. Mid grey brown silty clay with occasional small rounded pebbles and rare medium sub angular flints. Occasional small and medium tree roots.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Interface layer. Mixed silty clay and gravel layer with frequent small and medium gravels.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural. Mid orange brown silty with frequent small and medium gravel pebbles and occasional small flints and occasional lens of light yellow orange sand.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Cut</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>&gt;0.4</td>
<td>Cut of Victorian rubbish pit. Linear or rectangular (runs beyond limit of trench). Steep, straight sides with sharp top profile. Not bottomed due to health and safety concerns about the depth of the feature and the stability of the surrounding sides.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. FINDS REPORTS

B.1 Pottery

By John Cotter

4.4.2. A total of 7 sherds of pottery weighing 694 g. were recovered from a single context (205). This is all of late post-medieval or modern date. All the pottery was examined and spot-dated during the present assessment stage. For each context the total pottery sherd count and weight were recorded on an Excel spreadsheet, followed by the context spot-date which is the date-bracket during which the latest pottery types in the context are estimated to have been produced or were in general circulation. Comments on the presence of datable types were also recorded, usually with mention of vessel form (jugs, bowls etc.) and any other attributes worthy of note (eg. decoration etc.).

4.4.3. The assemblage is in a fresh but broken condition with large sherds present. The seven sherds represent seven separate vessels, mostly in Staffordshire-type mass-produced white earthenwares, with a likely date range of c 1900-1930 for the most diagnostic pieces. These include a large part of a Keiller’s Dundee marmalade jar with a ‘VIENNA 1873’ exhibition inscription dating it to c 1873-1930, and the corner of an Art Deco decorated butter dish lid, dating to c 1890-1920 or slightly later. The end of a (?Doulton) stoneware hot water bottle of similar date is also present along with a bone china jug rim and a sherd from a green-glazed majolica jardinaire. Basically these sort of wares could have been in use up the Second World War. Apart from all being of broadly contemporary date the pottery types present are fairly unremarkable and no further work is recommended.
B.2 Ceramic building material (CBM)

By John Cotter

4.4.4. The CBM assemblage comprises a single piece of roofing tile weighing 370 g. from a single context (105). This has not been separately catalogued but is described here. The tile is represented by a large fresh edge fragment in a fine sandy orange-red fabric which is probably of 18th- or 19th-century date. It is quite thick for an ordinary flat roof tile (c 14-15 mm thick) and displays a gentle curvature suggesting it might be from the side of a ridge tile or some other specialised roof tile. Alternatively it might just be a slightly warped flat roof tile (‘peg tile’). No further work recommended.

B.3 Glass

By Ian Scott

4.4.5. The glass from the Counry Arms site comprises 4 items, including parts of three bottles (context 205) and a large sherd or fragment of very thick dark green glass (context 105).

1) Thick strongly curved sherd with some irredescence abd surface flaking. The sherd varies from 23 mm to 35 mm thick. It is strongly curved suggesting that the complete object was spherical or hemisphaerical if a little irregular. The metal is very dark green and given its thickness virtually opaque. L: 112 mm; W: 88 mm. Context 105. It is possible that this is part of a thick walled vessel, but its precise purpose is unclear. The dark metal is suggestive of bottle glass of late 17th- or 18th-century date. In the absence of a clear identification the dating can only be a suggestion.

2) Base of cylindrical bottle with trace of embossed label. Mould blown in dark olive metal, with thick irregular base. Dark olive green glass. Very slight vertical mould marks or seams on the surviving body of the bottle indicate that the it was made in a dip mould. Trace of an embossed inscription, only part of two letters ‘G’ and possibly ‘I’ or ‘T’ survived. H extant: 83 mm; D: 93 mm. Late 19th or early 20th-century date

3) Cylindrical soda or mineral water bottle. Colourless metal. Moulded in a two-piece mould with embossed label reading: ‘R. W & S L[ord]’ below the shoulders and ‘WHITE’ embossed vertically on the body. Also embossed ‘WHITE’ twice on base. Lacks most of neck and all of finish. H extant: 186 mm; D: 65 mm. R White’s lemonade was first produced in Camberwell in the mid 19th century, and is still available today. This bottle dates to the late 19th or early 20th century.
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