

**AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL
ASSESSMENT**

OF CENTRAL KINGSTON

DUNCAN HAWKINS BA MIFA

FEBRUARY 2006

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction and Scope of Study
- 2.0 Geological and Topographical Background
- 3.0 Prehistoric
- 4.0 Roman
- 5.0 Saxon, 400-1000
- 6.0 Early Medieval 1066-1200
- 7.0 Medieval, 1200-1350
- 8.0 Late Medieval and Early Post Medieval, 1350 – 1650
- 9.0 Late Post Medieval and Early Modern, 1650-1862
- 10.0 The Surviving Resource
- 11.0 Kingston area Action Plan K + 20 and potential archaeological impacts
- 12.0 Future Resource Management

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 1 The Study Area
- Fig. 2 Topography (note the whole study area is located on an identical geological base)
- Fig. 3 Prehistoric
- Fig. 4 Roman
- Fig. 5 Saxon
- Fig. 6 Early Medieval
- Fig. 7 Late Medieval and early Post Medieval
- Fig. 8 17th century map
- Fig. 9 John Rocque, 1747
- Fig. 10 Horner, 1813
- Fig. 11 Tithe Map, 1840
- Fig. 12 Ordnance Survey, 1865
- Fig. 13 Ordnance Survey, 1895
- Fig. 14 Ordnance Survey, 1932
- Fig. 15 Areas of past archaeological investigation
- Fig. 16 Royal Borough of Kingston, areas with potential for significant change/improvement
- Fig. 17 Royal Borough of Kingston preferred options vision key diagram
- Fig. 18 Royal Borough of Kingston, character areas showing historic townscape

1.0 **INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY**

- 1.1 The purpose of this study is to provide background data for an archaeological management strategy for Kingston Town Centre (the study area) as defined in Fig. 1. The study area encompasses but extends slightly beyond the Kingston Town Centre area action plan K + 20 areas (Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, 2005) to include the whole of the historic core of the Medieval and Post Medieval study. This study however specifically responds to proposals for future development as drawn up in the area action plan.
- 1.2 This study aims to provide an evaluation of the archaeological resource within the study area as basis for informing decision making in the planning process where archaeological deposits may be affected by development proposals, particularly in the context of the Kingston Town Centre area action plan. This study specifically excludes any assessment of the built heritage.
- 1.3 Apart from the possible exception of Southwark, Kingston has undergone more archaeological investigation in the last four decades than any other town in Greater London, and is certainly

“the most extensively excavated town in the historic county of Surrey”
(Andrews, 2004, p169)

Consequently the archaeological and historical development of the town is now both very well understood and extremely well documented. Furthermore the town has in the last decade been the subject of a number of important thematic archaeological studies (most recently Andrews, 2004), which have already reviewed, assessed and synthesised the ‘raw’ archaeological data for the town centre contained in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre catalogues.

- 1.4 As a result, this study is based primarily on these published sources, but incorporates additionally a review of all archaeological interventions (up to the end of 2005) recorded in the study area as held in the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre catalogues. Consultations have also been held with Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society (KUTAS), Kingston Heritage Service, and English Heritage’s Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service.

2.0 **GEOLOGICAL AND TOPOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND (Fig. 2)**

Geology

- 2.1 The study area's geology has been shaped by the complex of river gravels laid down as drift deposits during and after the last glaciation, some 10-13,000 years ago forming the flood plain terrace.
- 2.2 Overlying these gravels across the study area is a layer of 'Brickearth'. The British Geological Survey (British Geological Survey South London, England and Wales, Sheet 270 solid and drift edition, 1:50,000 series) defines these 'Brickearths' as part of the Langley Silts. However past archaeological work in Kingston suggests a varying origin with much of the Brickearth in fact comprising recent (Holocene) alluvial clays and silts.
- 2.3 Subsequent fluvial erosion has significantly impacted on the Brickearth as has nineteenth century Brickearth extraction (particularly in the northern part of the study area 'North Kingston') though in neither case is it possible to accurately quantify on the basis of the available evidence. However past archaeological intervention shows Brickearth extraction in the area of the former and existing Kingston Gasworks to have been particularly severe with the truncation of the geological sequence and removal of archaeological remains (eg. archaeological interventions SKR99 and RMD99).

Topography

- 2.4 The early topography of the study area is best understood as comprising a low lying portion of the Thames floodplain (the whole generally between 5.5 and 9.5m AOD) within which certain areas ('islands' or 'headlands') of marginally higher and drier ground stood out amongst a system of braided 'river' channels of the Thames tributaries, the River Hogsmill and Latchmere stream and their associated alluvial 'floodplains'. This early topography has been extensively published (eg. Penn and Rolls 1981, 1-11, Hawkins 1996, 1998, 2002, Andrews 2004) but can be refined here.
- 2.5 Within the study area five principal areas of drier ground can be identified as shown on Figure 2. These are:
1. The central island (c. 8m AOD)
 2. The South Lane – East Lane island or headland known as 'Le More' in the Medieval period (c. 8m AOD).

3. The area east of Skerne Road and north of the railway (c. 6 to 8m AOD). Most of this area has been truncated as a result of nineteenth century Brickearth extraction and the subsequent development of the Gasworks. Consequently its former prominence is generally no longer apparent. However, it may once have been prominent enough to be known as 'Walehulle' or the hill of the welsh (Wakeford, 1984, 251-6).
 4. A low ridge rising from Eden Street eastwards up to the generally higher ground toward Wheatfield Way and then eastward along Fairfield North before blending into the higher ground to the east. There is a noticeable drop of c.1m from Fairfield North to London Road approximately from 9m AOD to 8m AOD.
 5. A low ridge of high ground at around 9m AOD formerly commencing just north of the Bittoms and extending east along Grove Crescent and southwards to include County Hall and Kingston University. Prior to modern redevelopment the land here lay at two distinct levels, with the land to the south being higher.
- 2.6 A further 'island' of slightly higher ground may be located in the block of land encompassed by Wood Street, Dolphin Street/Fife Road and Clarence Street (marked 6 on Figure 2). Archaeological evidence of alluviation from the Rotunda site (CMKOO invention report, Darton et al, forthcoming) may indicate a water course along the line of Wood Street/Clarence Street whereas archaeological work on the north side of Clarence Street east of Castle Street suggests an area of higher drier ground (EMP92, intervention report).
- 2.7 The pattern of the river channels in and around Kingston is highly complex and will undoubtedly be further clarified by future work. The Hogsmill river appears now to flow around the southern and eastern edge of the 'central island' now occupied by the Market Place and All Saints Churchyard (Penn & Rolls, 1981, 1-11, Hawkins 1996 Fig 1, 46, Hawkins 1998, Fig 1 271, Hawkins, 2002 Fig 1 96, Fig 2, 97, Andrews 2004, 169-185).
- 2.8 Earlier archaeological work, particularly at Eden Street and Eden Walk (Penn, Field and Serjeantson, 1984, 207-24) indicates the former presence of a channel (a probable 'east arm' of the Hogsmill) which appears to have flowed northwards, bounding the east side of the 'central island' and separated it from the higher ground around Skerne Road. This probably joined another channel, the 'Latchmere/Downhall channel', comprising the Latchmere stream (an existing watercourse) and the Downhall ditch (a watercourse known from documentary evidence) which together ran east to west to join the Thames and formed the northern boundary to the 'central island'. Both the east arm of the

Hogsmill and the Downhall channel remained active into the mid nineteenth century as 'sewers', although subject to progressive silting, rubbish disposal and eventual culverting. Evidence from a number of sites suggest the now 'lost' channels of the Hogsmill and Latchmere were substantial water courses in places in excess of 20m wide and capable of depositing alluvial sequences several metres deep.

- 2.9 There is evidence from archaeological, documentary and photographic sources of flooding in Kingston in the Medieval and Post Medieval periods, particularly around the High Street area, and the course and confines of the Thames and Hogsmill were not stabilized until the end of the 19th century. The Hogsmill has been canalized from east of the study area and now flows in a deep concrete-lined channel throughout the study area. The sequence of flooding and reclamation forms the basis for much of the settlement history of Kingston up to the end of the Medieval period, particularly in the areas of the town bordering the Thames and Hogsmill.
- 2.10 Recent evidence from the southern part of the study area just north of the Bittoms (BIM90, intervention report), at Oaklea Passage (OAP00 intervention report) and on the east side of South Lane (KHR01, intervention report) suggests a further stream channel, probably a tributary of the Hogsmill running north-north west toward that river. Map evidence suggests parts of this channel survived into the early nineteenth century. The possible channel at Wood Street/Clarence Street has been alluded to above (2.6).
- 2.11 Surrounding the watercourses at Kingston were extensive areas of 'marsh' which might best be described as areas prone to overbank flooding (and fluvial deposition and erosion) rather than a true 'wetland' (there being no distinct 'peat' formations except occasionally within former river channels, and in the Canbury Gardens area north of the railway and west of Skerne Road which has been progressively reclaimed from the Thames and its margins since the late eighteenth century). These 'wetlands' were progressively stabilised by drainage from the late 11th century onwards, a process that was not completed until the early twentieth century (Surrey Comet 1900).
- 2.12 Formerly the Thames at Kingston was a substantially wider and shallower river. The Thames frontage of the study area has been progressively reclaimed from the late 11th century – by some 75m at its confluence with the Hogsmill, some 50m in the area of Bishops Hall and some 25m in the area of Horsefair and Turks Boatyard (Hawkins, 2002, 95).
- 2.13 None of the existing and former river channels at Kingston appear to be associated with complex waterfront enwharfment structures of the types encountered in London and

Southwark. Reclamation instead appears to have been largely piecemeal (by individual waterfront property) and Medieval and early Post Medieval waterfront structures within the study area comprise low timber revetments braced by simple posts or stakes and designed to prevent underbank erosion (eg. Andrews 2004, p175).

3.0 **Prehistoric (Fig 3)**

Early Prehistoric (Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic)

3.1 A few flint tools of late Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic date have been recovered within the study area but in very small quantities and residual contexts. The earliest evidence for settlement is in the Neolithic period. The most important site yet identified is at Eden Walk where both early and late Neolithic pottery, worked flint, worked antler and animal bone were recovered from a former river channel, part of the east arm of the Hogsmill (Penn, Field and Serjeantson 1984, 207-24). Whether this represents temporary occupation in a blocked channel or debris, perhaps washed in from an adjacent site, is however unclear. Elsewhere tenuous evidence for a late Neolithic brushwood platform has been identified at 59a and 59b Clarence Street, probably in the same river channel as the remains identified at Eden Walk. A radio-carbon date of 2100 BC was obtained (CKT99 intervention report). A number of Neolithic axes have been recorded from the River Thames at Kingston.

Late Prehistoric (Bronze Age, Iron Age)

3.2 The Eden Walk channel also contained some brushwood, perhaps a platform or trackway of Middle Bronze Age date, overlain by a spread of burnt flint. Again, it is uncertain what this represents, but it may have been localised consolidation on the edge of the channel for seasonal use.

3.3 Other (Late) Bronze Age features and finds have been found during excavations at East Lane, South Lane and the Bittoms (Hawkins, Kain and Wooldridge, 2002 185-210 also WDB00, BIM90 and KHR01 intervention reports). These sites may all represent part of a single, dispersed Late Bronze Age settlement on the South Lane gravel 'island'.

3.4 A relatively dense scatter of pottery of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age date, together with a possibly contemporary burial, has been found at Orchard Road/Wheatfield Way (ORR95, WWE95 intervention reports), perhaps part of another settlement.

3.5 Recent archaeological work revealed a Bronze Age ditch at 21-23 London Road, containing burnt flint and pot, possibly representing a Bronze Age field system (LDK01 intervention report, Darton et al, forthcoming).

3.6 In addition to these discoveries; the Thames at Kingston has produced a large assemblage of Bronze Age weaponry, some probably deliberately deposited as votive offerings (Biden 1852 1-6, Needham 1987, 97-137).

3.7 There is as yet only limited evidence for later Iron Age activity within the study area, although a possible late Iron Age/early Roman settlement was recorded in 1967 at Fairfield West (Canham 1968, 124-128). This may represent a continuation of the earlier settlement at Orchard Road (3.4 above). Orchard Road abuts Fairfield West on the south west. The Hogsmill Valley upstream from Kingston is rich in Iron Age remains and it may be that the Fairfield West/Orchard Road finds are part of a larger activity or settlement site.

Future Research Priorities

3.8 Prehistoric discoveries within the study area will undoubtedly increase with further archaeological work, although probably in relatively small quantities. These may yet however substantially change our knowledge of Kingston's palaeotopography and early settlement.

3.9 At a local level any future opportunities to investigate and understand the important Prehistoric remains associated with the east arm of the Hogsmill in the area of Brook Street/Eden Walk/Clarence Street should be taken, as should any opportunities to implement a programme of geoarchaeological and palaeoenvironmental sampling of channel deposits here and elsewhere. A part of this investigation of channel deposits should include the interpretation of data from boreholes and test pits routinely undertaken prior to new development across the study area, as this can provide much useful information on the Holocene geology, and past topography. Particular importance should be attached to obtaining environmental samples that can inform on Prehistoric landscapes and economies.

3.10 At a regional level future investigation should be set both within the research frameworks set out in 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/English Heritage p18-27 inclusive' but also those set out in 'Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey; towards a research framework for the County'. Surrey Archaeological Society/English Heritage 2004, p16-17, 31-32, 47-48 and 61-62.

3.11 Of particular importance is the need to understand the emerging picture of late Prehistoric activity within the study area its sub-regional and regional context (of note here is the emerging and apparently intensive pattern of mid to late Iron Age activity along the Hogsmill valley, possibly representative of sophisticated stock rearing communities on the heavier and mixed soils extending from the Thames floodplain to the downlands above Ewell).

4.0 **ROMAN**

4.1 Roman finds have been recorded within the study area since the sixteenth century. However, it is critical to note that there is no evidence for a substantial Roman settlement at Kingston within the study area, rather the evidence is for a scatter of rural hamlets and farms.

4.2 Leland (Smith, 85) writing in 1535-43 says of Kingston:

“And yn the old tyme (ie Roman period) the commune saying ys that the bridge, where the commune passage was over the Tamise at Olde Kingston, was lower on the ryvar then it is now and when man began the new town yn the Saxons tymes they toke from the very clyve of Come Park side to builde on the Tamise side; and sette a new bridge hard by the same”

4.3 This indicates a belief of Kingston’s early 16th century citizens that there had been an ‘Olde Kingston’ in the Roman period with a bridge over the Thames, downstream of their existing town, and that the ‘new town’ was founded in the Saxon period.

4.4 Leland’s record of finds at Kingston and particularly the local belief of a Roman bridge, may have influenced Thomas Gale’s 1709 (66, 71, 72) interpretation of the Antonine Itinerary’ in which he was to identify Kingston as ‘Tamesa’, which Gale suggested would have been a major settlement with a bridge across the Thames.

4.5 The 19th century saw significant Roman finds in the area of ‘Canbury Field’ (the area north of the railway line, between Skerne Road on the west, Richmond Road on the east and Kings Road on the north, within the study area downstream of the present town centre where three hundred years earlier Leland had been told ‘Olde Kingston’ stood). Edward Jesse writing in 1832 records finds made during the construction works for the present Kingston Bridge (begun in 1824) and then adds:

‘In digging for Brickearth in some fields on the Surrey side of the river, but within a short distance of the Kingston Ford, a number of skeletons have been found which occupied a considerable portion of the fields. It is evident that they must have been placed there after some tremendous engagement and that they are not the remains of a civil sepulchre. In the first place, they are all males, in the next the jaws were all perfect, and the teeth those of young subjects. There were not any vestiges of womanly remain – neither boundary or inscription as might have been expected to mark a regular cemetery, but there were found some pieces of fragments of broken earthenware, very

characteristic of Roman memorial styles of workmanship, deposited here and there amongst the several layers of bodies. Several ornaments such as jet pins and other articles were also found which have been pronounced by competent judges to be Roman’.

4.6 William Biden, writing in 1852 (1-7) stated:

‘also were discovered several human skeletons with Roman ornaments lying near them, in a field not far from the spot on the Surrey side of the River; a brass clasp, the spring of which is as perfect and as elastic as when new may be instanced as a most interesting specimen’.

4.7 A further reference to these burials comes from the 1854 correspondence of Dr Roots, a noted local Antiquary to Alderman Gould, the then Mayor of Kingston.

“It is true that many of the slain, as Dr Roots supposes in that encounter were exhumed a few years ago in the Canbury Field adjoining the Gas Works, and as many Roman relics were discovered mingled with the remains in the graves, Dr Roots has little or no doubt that they were the bodies of the Romans slain in battle’.

4.8 While we can dismiss the notion that these burials were casualties of a battle they do point to (on artefactual evidence) a Roman period inhumation cemetery at Canbury Fields’.

4.9 Few other finds of note were made in the 19th or early 20th century, though around 1902 there emerged from what was probably the garden of a ‘Curiosity Shop’ in Eden Street a small Roman altar dedicated to Fortune and the Emperors of Rome which is in Kingston Museum. This altar can now be shown to have been imported into Kingston in the late nineteenth century probably from the west or north of England and therefore to have no connection with the towns Roman past (Hawkins, forthcoming).

4.10 In 1885 a coin of Constantine I was recovered at 22 Eden Street but no details of its context are now known. No further finds seem to have been made until 1926 when, during the construction of the now demolished Kingston Power Station, west of Skerne Road and downstream of the modern town centre, a flat roof tile (dating no later than the end of the 2nd century AD) and several sherds of Roman pottery (including Samian) was identified by Finny (Finny, 1929).

- 4.11 Almost without exception modern archaeological interventions within the study area have revealed no trace of Roman activity in situ, the only evidence for the period being residual finds of pottery and very occasionally ceramic building material often in association with former river channels. Sites producing this material include the Bentalls site, Eden Walk, Canbury Passage, Sopwith Way and Cromwell Road (intervention reports BEN87, 88 and 90, Sertjeantson et al 1992, London Archaeol 4 No 2, 1981, 47, intervention reports SWK96, CWR92 and CLD95).
- 4.12 Four sites in the study area however stand out as being of high significance. In the first, undertaken in 1967 by the Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society on the site of the Castle Pub in Fairfield West, four post holes set in a shallow scoop associated with Iron Age and Roman pottery and Roman tile were identified (Canham, 1968 124-128). A continuation of this settlement may have been identified at Orchard Road (WWE 95, intervention report), where residual Roman pottery was recovered.
- 4.13 In 1988 Roman building material and animal bone was recovered from two pits, possibly indicating ritual activity, at No 2 Clarence Street (London Archaeologist 1989 74-5 and intervention report CLA88).
- 4.14 In the Museum of London's Department of Greater London Archaeology (SW) 1989 investigation at the rear of 82 Eden Street (intervention report, EDE89), a small silted-up river channel (part of the braided channel system) was revealed, into which approximately 350 Roman coins (mainly House of Constantine), jewellery and rolled lead strips (possibly curses) had been deposited (Hammerson, 1996 154-155). The scattered nature of the finds throughout the channel led the excavator to interpret them as votive deposits. Some building material was also recovered within the channel, including roof tiles, flue tile, painted wall plaster and cut stone and ashlar blocks. Subsequent investigations at 70-76 Eden Street in 1995 revealed a pit containing Roman finds (Miller and Stephenson, 1999).
- 4.15 At Skerne Road, Kingston archaeological investigation in 2001-2002 revealed evidence for in situ Roman activity spanning the 1st to 4th centuries. A number of pits, some of which may be ritual, containing building material and animal bone, together with the possible remains of a post built building were identified (Bradley, 2006 forthcoming).
- 4.16 The 'Canbury Fields' cemetery, the material from Skerne Road and the assemblages of Roman pottery and tile from the power station, Canbury Passage and Cromwell Road areas can be seen as the remains of a probably unenclosed, rural settlement apparently dating to the 1st to 4th centuries. While perhaps larger than a farm, this settlement is unlikely to have been much more than an agricultural hamlet. Examples of small

Roman rural settlements have been identified in similar riverside locations at Putney and Heathcote Road, Twickenham. There is also some suggestion of another riverside settlement at Lower Teddington Road, Hampton Wick where truncated features containing mixed Roman pottery were excavated in 1990. The presence of another such settlement on Kingston's riverside, downstream of the existing town centre and stretching away from the Thames toward Kingston Hill is not surprising.

- 4.17 The Eden Street/Fairfield West and Orchard road material is more enigmatic. Perhaps we have here the remnants of another 1st to 4th century settlement, again probably agricultural, though as yet the evidence is fragmentary.
- 4.18 The evidence of possible ritual activity from Skerne Road, and Clarence Street and the clear evidence of such activity from Eden Street is noteworthy. This may represent shared behaviour amongst similar communities living close by (or perhaps by the same dispersed community), rather than a series of 'special places' or proto shrines though the latter remains a possibility. The presence of animal bone (certainly horse and cattle remains at Eden Street and Skerne Road) may be an important indicator of the economy of these small rural communities.

Future Research Priorities

- 4.19 Roman discoveries are likely to increase within the study area in the future, albeit in modest quantities. As with the Prehistoric periods, future finds could fundamentally alter our understanding of Roman Kingston.
- 4.20 At a local level important areas for future investigation are at north Kingston, where potential future development sites occur at Down Hall Road and around the Gas Works between Skerne Road and Richmond Road; at Ashdown Road/Ladybooth Road/Eden Street and Wheatfield West where Roman activity on the slightly higher ground east of the east arm of the Hogsmill is likely to be represented and may give a deeper context to the existing finds from Eden Street, Fairfield West and Orchard Road. It is unlikely that large scale further development will take place in the area of 2 Clarence Street. However, any groundworks which do occur in this area should be archaeologically monitored.
- 4.21 As with the Prehistoric periods setting the Roman finds within their local environmental and topographical context is critical.
- 4.22 At a regional level future investigation should be set both within the research frameworks set out in 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology, 2002', Museum

of London/English Heritage p10-43, but perhaps more particularly those identified by Bird (Bird 2004 1+2, p75 and 88) in 'Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey; towards a research framework for the County', Surrey Archaeological Society/English Heritage 2004.

- 4.23 Future research and interpretation must focus on the interrelationship of the Roman settlements at Kingston with the wider settlement patterns of the Hogsmill valley including the important Roman settlement and probable religious centre at Ewell and possibly stock raising centre at Old Malden. Clarification of the nature of Roman activity to the east of the study area around Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill remains a priority.

5.0 **SAXON**

- 5.1 During the Anglo Saxon period we have our earliest historical references to the study area.

The documentary evidence pre-conquest sources

- 5.2 The earliest written reference to Kingston is from 838 when a synod attended by Egbert of Wessex, the Archbishop of Canterbury and many of the Bishops of Egbert's domains was held at:

'illa famosa loco quae appeletur cyningestun in regionae sudregiae'.

- 5.3 Blair (1991, 20) has suggested that 'Cyningestun' may be a new name first used in 838 for an existing settlement the 'lost'.....

'villa regali nomine Freoricburna in regione suthregeona',

- 5.4 However, post 838 references to Freoricburna suggest this is unlikely (Andrews 2004, 171).
- 5.5 Kingston is recorded again in 925 when Athelstan was consecrated here as King of the English. A now lost charter of 946 states that Eadred was also consecrated King at Kingston. A meeting of the witan was held at Kingston in 972, and in 978 Ethelred II was consecrated King here. Knut (Canute) issued a charter at Kingston although the specific year in which this was done is not now known.

The documentary evidence post conquest sources

- 5.6 By 1086 at the time of the Domesday Survey Kingston was clearly a substantial rural settlement in royal ownership:

"Kingston in lordship, it was in King Edwards revenue. Then it answered for 29 hides, now for nothing. Land for 32 ploughs. In lordship 2 ploughs, 86 villagers and 14 smallholders (bordars) with 25 ploughs, a church, 2 slaves. 5 mills at 20s; 2 fisheries at 10s, a third fishery, excellent, but without dues; meadows; 40 acres; woodland, 6 pigs. Value before 1066, later and now £30. Of the villagers of this village Humphrey the chamberlain had and has one villager in his charge for the collecting of the queens wool. He also took 20s from him as ingoing when his father died" (Morris, 1975, 30c).

- 5.7 Roger of Wendover states that a fourth king, Edwy (955) was consecrated at Kingston, and from his description of the Coronation night suggests the existence of a Banqueting Hall and a bedchamber (Giles, 1849, 257). William of Malmesbury (Giles 1847, 128) and Florence of Worcester (Thorpe, 1848, 130) appear to provide no information on Saxon Kingston that is not contained in earlier documents. Ralph De Diceto writing in the late 12th century places 7 Anglo Saxon coronations at Kingston (Stubbs, 1876 140-8, 235-7).
- 5.8 Post-Conquest evidence indicates that the area of the royal demesne administered from Kingston comprised the two hundreds of Kingston and Elmbridge and it is possible that this was also the case prior to the conquest (Wakeford, 1990, 4, Blair 1991, 20).
- 5.9 Blair (1991, 20) has argued on the basis of post conquest sources for an important church at Kingston perhaps an early Minster serving all of Kingston hundred and perhaps Elmbridge hundred also.

The Antiquarian Sources

- 5.10 Leland writing in 1535 – 1543 (Smith, 85) after describing the Roman remains at Kingston records:

“And when men began the new town yn the Saxon tymes they toke from the very clyve of come park side to build on the Tamise side and settle a new bridge hard by the same. The tounisch men of Kingston contend that wher their town church is now was sumtyme an abbay. But I se no likelihod of it. For Henry the Second did appropriate ther church as a parochie church, not as abbay, priory or celle, to Marten Abbey in Southerey. The tounisch men have certen knowledge of a few kings crounid ther afore the conqueste; and contende that 2 or 3 kings were buried yn ther parochie church, but they can not bring no profe nor likelihod of it”.

- 5.11 Despite Leland’s scepticism there are a number of points of interest here. Firstly that there was a tradition in the sixteenth century that building material was robbed from Roman buildings on Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill and used in the construction of structures in a ‘new’ saxon settlement by the Thames. Such reuse of Roman building material, was a common feature of Anglo Saxon architecture.
- 5.12 The contention of the sixteenth century men of Kingston that their parish church lay on the site of an abbey may have been founded in All Saints possible origins as an Anglo

Saxon Minster, perhaps arising from confusion over the latin word for both Minster and abbey.

5.13 The Tudor townsmen rightly believed that a 'few' Anglo Saxon kings were crowned in Kingston, but we cannot know what the foundation was for their belief that two or three kings were buried in the church. The members of the tenth and eleventh century West Saxon Royal House were interred at Winchester, Glastonbury, Malmesbury and London. However, while Royal burial in these centuries within a church at Kingston would seem unlikely, the burial of Royal officials or other members of the Court attendant on the King at Kingston might not.

5.14 The assertion of the townsmen that Kingston Bridge originated in the Saxon period does however appear to be false. The earliest documentary evidence for the 'Great' or 'Thames' bridge at Kingston is from 1193 (Wakeford, 1990, 8). Archaeological evidence from the bridge excavations suggests a construction date of no earlier than 1170 (Potter, 1998, 140). This archaeological evidence along with the failure of Domesday book to record a bridge in 1086 would seem to dismiss the possibility of a Saxon bridge. However, this is not to say that the Thames could not be crossed at Kingston in the Saxon period for it was fordable here until the early modern period.

5.15 William Camden (Adeney and Madden, 1975, 156) in his 'Brittania' adds to Leland's description:

"After Tamis hath taken unto him the Mole, he Carithe his stream Northwardly and runneth fast by Kingstone, called in times past Moreford, as some will have it which toune had beginning from a little toune more ancient than it of the same name, standing upon a flat ground and subject to the inundation of Tamis. In which when England was almost ruinated by the Danish wars, Athelstan, Edwin and Ethelred were crowned Kings upon an open stage in the Market place, and of these kings here crowned it came to be named Kingston as one would say the Kings Town".

5.16 Camden's description has little in common with Leland but rather introduces 'new' traditions. A deed of AD 1323 refers to land against 'le More' which Wakeford (1990) believed lay upstream (south) of Kingston town centre alongside the Thames. Perhaps 'Moreford' was a crossing point in this area. Archaeological evidence has recently shown this area, which forms part of the 'south lane island', to contain extensive sixth and seventh century settlement remains (Hawkins, Kain and Wooldridge, 2002 185-210). Camden's account might be a rendering of a local tradition that the earliest Saxon settlement lay in the area then known as 'Moreford'.

5.17 The crowning of kings on an open stage in the Market Place, seems improbable. The Market Place is first recorded in 1242. If, *however*, a Minster Church stood under, or close by the site of All Saints church (located on the north side of the Market Place), and if such a Minster church were the crowning place during the documented Anglo-Saxon coronations, then the *acclamation of these kings*, in the area now occupied by the Market place is perhaps not so implausible.

5.18 John Speed's 'The Histore of Great Britaine' (Speed/Humble 1632) contains the following comment on Saxon Kingston:

"Ethelstan, the eldest sonne of King Edward (as hath beene said) was crowned with greater solemnitie than any of his ancestors ever before him. The place was Kingston upon Thames in the County of Surrey the yeere.....924. Where, in the midst of the toune a high scaffold was built, and thereon the Coronation performed to the open view of all."

5.19 This seems to be an echo of the tradition recorded by Camden.

5.20 John Aubrey (1718-19, reprinted 1975, 18-21) writing in about 1670 records of Saxon Kingston:

"its ancient name was Moreford that is, the great way over the river. But the Saxon Kings making it sometimes their place of residence occasioned the name of Kingston to be given it....."

..... Several of the Saxon Kings have been crowned here....."

..... In St Mary's Chapel which adjoins to the south side of the chancel (of the parish church) are the pictures of the Saxon Kings crowned here....."

5.21 Aubrey's account echoes Camden, through the paintings of the Anglo Saxon kings seems an entirely new element (perhaps these were painted after Camden's publication).

5.22 In the 1793 sixth Edition of the Ambulator (p153-4) is to be found the following description of Kingston:

"Some of our Saxon Kings were also crowned here; and close to the north side of the church is a large stone, on which according to tradition, they were"

placed during the ceremony. Adjoining to the same side (in fact the south side: Authors) **was formerly a chapel which contained the images of the Saxon Kings that were crowned here, and also that of King John, who gave the inhabitants their first charter. In the inscriptions over these figures, some of them were said to have been crowned in the Market Place and others in the Chapel; but no particular spot is mentioned in the old chronicles that record these coronations. These figures were destroyed by the fall of the chapel in 1730;.....”.**

- 5.23 This appears to be the earliest reference to the so called ‘Kings stone’ a large sarsen block which now stands outside Kingston’s Guildhall. If the ambulator account of 1793 was consistently wrong, in its location of the chapel and stone, then the king’s stone originally stood on the south side of All Saints church, in the area of St Mary’s Chapel.
- 5.24 In or around 1825 the ‘Kings Stone’ was removed from the churchyard and placed by the door of the Old Guildhall for use as a mounting block. When the old Guildhall was demolished in 1840 the stone was removed to the corporation yard; later, through the exertions of alderman Frederick Gould, a notable antiquary, the stone was set up on display in 1850. The ‘Kings stone’ is now thought to be no more than part of the fabric of St Mary’s Chapel (Measor, 1861) and the traditions associating it with the Saxon coronations perhaps no older than the eighteenth century (Hawkins², forthcoming).
- 5.25 Most nineteenth century historians and antiquarians comments on Saxon Kingston are an amalgam of earlier work. W.D. Biden writing in 1852 (p9-10) however, stated that a Saxon Royal palace stood south of the modern town centre, and that an Episcopopol palace of Saxon date lay at Bishops Hall, west of All Saints church. The latter appears to have resulted from Biden misinterpreting the origin date of the name ‘Bishopshall’. This name in fact stems from the acquisition of a House in this part of Kingston by the Bishops of Winchester in 1202 and which was apparently used by them directly until 1391 and finally demolished c1600.
- 5.26 Biden’s suggestion of an Anglo Saxon palace south of the modern town centre appears, as far as can be ascertained, to have no earlier documentary or place name basis, though recent archaeological investigations in this area have revealed evidence of Saxon activity (below). Possibly Biden was aware of finds of ‘Saxon’ material of which we now have no record. This is possible as both Biden and his acquaintance Frederick Gould were collectors of ‘antiquities’.

Modern Archaeological Research

- 5.27 The period of modern archaeological research into Anglo Saxon Kingston commenced early in the twentieth century with the work of W. E. St Lawrence Finny and Philip Mainwaring Johnston.

The early Saxon period 400-700

- 5.28 Wakeford (1984, 251-6) has drawn attention to the survival of two 'wahl' place names in the fields of Kingston and it is not impossible that a 'British' community survived in this area into the fifth century. The earliest Saxon activity seems to be from the period c400-700 and is focused in several distinct locations. In the 1974-76 excavations at Eden Walk (Penn, Field and Serjeantson, 1984 207-24), the 1978 excavations at 76 Eden Street, and the 1989 excavations at 82 Eden Street/7-17 Lady Booth Street (intervention report, Ede 89, London Archaeologist, 1990 188-195), on the east of the modern town centre quantities of chaff tempered pottery of fifth to seventh century date were recovered. While the material at Eden Walk and 76 Eden Street may have been residual within a water lain 'brickearth' that at 82 Eden Street/7-17 Lady Booth Street was clearly in situ being recovered from a truncated pit and a V shaped ditch possibly defining an area to the east. In 1985 excavations at 23 Brook Street to the south of Eden Street/Lady Booth Road produced tenuous evidence for a grubenhaus dwelling (unpublished intervention report, Nelsons, Kingston Heritage Service, ERG1). However, the remains of at least twelve sixth and seventh century pottery vessels were recovered as a vast quantity of broken sherds. The 82 Eden Street/7-17 Lady Booth Street and 23 Brook Street finds are from east of the 'central island' and would have been separated from it by the east arm of the Hogsmill.
- 5.29 In 1996 investigations at South Lane, south of the modern town centre revealed the remains of a settlement dating to 400-700 (Hawkins, Kain and Wooldridge, 2002, 185-210). At least one potential building of post and stakehole construction was represented and large quantities of pottery recovered, including an intact drinking cup. This settlement appears to have been entirely domestic, with evidence of weaving and antler working. The settlement was located at the northern end of the 'South Lane island'. Contemporary pottery probably originating from this settlement and probably deposited through 'manuring' was encountered further south on the 'island' in 1995 and 2000 (PHR95 and WDB00 intervention reports) and to the east in 2001 (KHR01 intervention report).
- 5.30 Rignold has drawn attention to an important and potentially highly significant early hoard of at least 10 gold tremmises of Justin I found in 1848 in the Thames at Kingston

(Rignold 1975, 665). Unfortunately we do not now know the precise findspot of these coins which are often found in the west in a high status funerary context.

- 5.31 From this early to mid Saxon period we can therefore suggest the 'central island' was largely unoccupied. To the south the 'South Lane island' was clearly occupied by at least one settlement possibly a farmstead. East of the central island lay an area of further activity, probably a settlement, possibly agricultural, on the higher ground rising from Eden Street to Wheatfield. High status contemporary finds, elsewhere often recorded in a funerary context, have been recovered from the Thames.

The Later Saxon period 700-1066

- 5.32 The most significant find of this period comes from the 'central island'. It is a fragment of a carved stone cross recovered from the fabric of the north chancel of All Saints church and identified by Mainwaring Johnson as of mercian type of the eighth century but more recently by Dominic Tweddle as of tenth or eleventh century date. Although this find was not in situ and could have been brought into Kingston later it might indicate an earlier church on the site of All Saints church (Tweddle et al, 1995, 146; Johnson 1926, 232, Finny 1926, 211-9, Finny 1941).
- 5.33 The settlement at South Lane appears to have passed out of use by the close of the seventh century as shown by the complete absence of Ipswich type wares. The 'South Lane island' on which it lay appears to have then been abandoned for several centuries thereafter. At Eden Walk on the eastern side of the 'central island' two late Anglo Saxon or Saxo-Norman ditches were cut into the 'brickearths', possibly for drainage of the marshy land (this area is known, to have been 'wet' until c1500, Syac 1980, 245) broadly contemporary drainage ditches have now been identified at Cromwell Road (Howe et al, 2001, 353) and the London Road area (Darton et al, forthcoming). At 29 Thames Street again on the 'central island' an eighth to tenth century boundary ditch was identified running at right angles to the river Thames. The property boundary which this ditch represents subsequently survived into the post medieval period (Syac 1980, 245).
- 5.34 At the Bittoms, east of the 'South Lane island' two pits, of eighth to tenth century date were identified during investigations in 1990 (intervention report BIM90, Bird et al 1991 – 2,158). The pits were located on the area of relatively high ground. Both pits probably had a craft function and one may have formed part of a structure used for weaving. Contemporary activity was evidenced at Tiffin School in 1995 (intervention report TIF95, Jackson et al, 1997, 223, Howe et al, 2001 353).

5.35 Finny's 1926 excavation work (Johnson, 1926, 232; Finny, 1926, 211-9, Finny, 1941) on the site of St Mary's Chapel, the supposed chapel of the Saxon coronations, on the south of All Saints Church led Philip Mainwaring Johnson (who visited the site) to give a date of between 1030 and 1050 for its construction. Unfortunately we now do not know what the basis for this dating was. The surviving engravings of this building suggest a Romanesque or earlier structure with a pre 1100 date for its massive western doorway. The late Saxon dating of St Mary's Chapel must therefore remain unproven though possible.

Discussion

5.36 From documentary sources alone we can suggest that from at least the first half of the ninth century through to the late eleventh century Kingston was a significant Royal Estate centre. The land administered from this estate centre, probably the hundreds of Kingston and Elmbridge, may also have formed the territory of an early Minster church.

5.37 Clearly the earliest Saxon activity for which we have firm archaeological evidence was not within the 'Central island' which was to become the core of the Medieval and Modern town. The earliest settlement evidence dating perhaps from 400 to 700 is from the much smaller but slightly higher 'South Lane island' to the south. Contemporary activity, probably an agricultural settlement, is evidenced from east of the 'central island' on the slightly higher ground toward rising from Eden Street to Wheatfield. By at least the tenth or eleventh century however we can suggest on sculptural evidence that a church had been established on the 'central island', on the site of All Saints church. Some time before this the settlement on the 'South Lane island' was abandoned while, broadly contemporary activity on the 'central island', in the form of the cutting of a property boundary and later drainage ditches is evidenced. It seems likely that it was the foundation of a precursor to All Saints church which led to a settlement shift from one island to the other.

5.38 If we accept that the existing parish church of All Saints is likely to be the successor to a Saxon church, possibly a Minster, then what interpretation do we place on the potentially late Saxon chapel of St Mary? It could be that the existence of a church actually occasioned the creation of St Mary's as a subsidiary. Both buildings perhaps forming part of a complex of ecclesiastical and secular buildings at the core of the Royal Estate Centre. In this context it is even possible that St Mary's originated as a masonry hall rather than as an ecclesiastical building. Certainly this building was regarded as

very special by the people of Kingston as is shown by its retention as an anachronistic lateral lady chapel through every major remodelling of All Saints church.

Future Research

- 5.39 The pattern of early, middle and late Saxon settlement within the study area is now becoming clearer, with evidence for settlement shift(s) between the 6th and 9th centuries a trend common across south east and central England. Future archaeological work is likely to refine this picture significantly.
- 5.40 At a local level future work particularly in the Ashdown Road/Ladybooth Road/Eden Street areas and south of the Bittoms is likely to augment our knowledge of early Saxon settlement. The location of the burial grounds associated with these settlements currently remains unknown, and forms a research priority.
- 5.41 Evidence for the (arguably nationally important) late Saxon Royal Estate centre is most likely to be encountered within the existing All Saints Church and churchyard. Any alterations to fabric, groundworks (eg. drainage/planting) has a potential to reveal evidence relating to this complex and should ideally be mitigated by design measures or failing this through appropriate archaeological intervention. It may even be appropriate to review in this context the level of statutory protection afforded to the church and churchyard and to the existing buildings around the boundaries of the churchyard which fall within its Medieval dimensions (below).
- 5.42 A potentially valuable research exercise here would be to carry out a detailed non intrusive geophysical survey within All Saints church and churchyard to see if there are indications of late Saxon structures or enclosures, although later grave digging may have obliterated such evidence.
- 5.43 The area between the churchyard and Thames (including Thames street and the Bishophall complex) is most likely to contain archaeological remains of settlement surrounding the late Saxon Royal Estate Centre, though such remains might also be encountered along the southern extent of Wood Street and the western end of Clarence Street. The potential for late Saxon settlement remains should be taken account of in any future redevelopment of the Bishops Palace House complex.
- 5.44 At a regional level future work should be undertaken within the research framework set out in 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/English Heritage p46-56 though many of the research objectives set out there

relate more specifically to central London. Despite the passage of nearly twenty years many of the essentially basic research objectives set out by Poulton (Poulton, 1987, 218-219) remain valid for Kingston today.

6.0 EARLY MEDIEVAL, 1066-1200

- 6.1 Extensive archaeological excavation in and around the study area has revealed little evidence for tenth or eleventh century settlement (Hawkins, 1998 271-8) while the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are relatively well represented. In particular the major archaeological excavations at the Horsefair north of the modern Kingston Bridge (Potter, 1988, 140), and on the Charter Quay site (Andrews, 2004 169-185), between Kingston Market Place and the River Thames revealed no evidence of late Anglo Saxon or early Norman activity. The evidence from these excavations is instead for mid to late twelfth century colonisation and development of previously undeveloped land.
- 6.2 Such archaeological evidence as we have for the late Anglo Saxon and early Norman periods appears to be consistent with the limited documentary evidence. While Kingston was an important Royal estate centre in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and is recorded as such in Domesday Book (Morris, 1975, 30c), it was clearly not a town (Butters 1995, 40-1). Kingston's urban origins can now be seen as belonging to the mid to late twelfth century when it can be argued that key elements of Kingston's urban topography, its bridges and Market Place were grafted onto the earlier estate centre, and the parish church of All Saints was comprehensively rebuilt. So rapid is the settlements economic growth in the second half of the twelfth century that the suspicion must be that much of this development was being artificially stimulated, in order to generate additional revenue for the major landholder, the Crown.
- 6.3 The urban origins of Kingston are therefore wholly consistent with the pattern of urbanisation seen across much of southern and central England between the Norman Conquest and the mid thirteenth century (Bartlett, 2000 331-5).
- 6.4 In the Domesday Survey of 1086 Kingston appears as the estate centre for a vast agricultural land holding, as well as for the Hundred of Kingston. The estate administered from Kingston had a relatively large population, but a significant proportion of these would have lived in the many satellite settlements scattered throughout the land holding (Butters, 1995, 39-40). There is therefore no clear documentary evidence for a substantial population at Kingston itself in 1086.
- 6.5 Few elements within Kingston's modern urban topography can be suggested as having an origin prior to 1100. One which possibly can is the churchyard of the Parish church

of All Saints (formerly All Hallows). Within the churchyard, until the eighteenth century, stood a small Romanesque building, then in use as the Chapel of St Mary and attached to the southern side of All Saints church. The chapel was provided with a massive western doorway which stylistically dates the building to pre 1100 (Hawkins 1998, Fig 2, 274).

- 6.6 The churchyard, which lies at the centre of Kingston was originally very much larger than today and late Medieval and Post Medieval encroachment can be suggested on the basis of cartographic evidence on its eastern, southern, western and north western sides. On the north west of the churchyard this encroachment has been proved archaeologically (Thompson et al, 1998, 118, CLA88, intervention report).
- 6.7 A church is recorded at Kingston in the Domesday Survey which could perhaps have been the building which we now know as St Mary's Chapel. Alternatively the Domesday Church may have been a building on the site of the existing and adjacent All Saints Church. It has been argued on post conquest evidence that Kingston possessed a powerful early minister church (Blair, 1991, 20), and it is difficult to equate such a church with St Mary's Chapel. One possibility is that for some reason the Minster church had been destroyed or demolished prior to 1100 (perhaps in the Viking wars of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries) and replaced with a smaller structure. This was the interpretation of W. E. St Lawrence Finny who excavated St Mary's Chapel in 1926 (Finny, 1941, 16). The identification of All Saints with the site of the Domesday Church (and perhaps with the earlier Minster) may however be supported by the recovery of a reused tenth or eleventh century cross fragment from within the existing building (Tweddle et al, 1995, 146). Finny had believed this cross-fragment to be ninth century. It is possible therefore that a precursor to All Saints together with St Mary's chapel lay at the core of the Norman Estate Centre.
- 6.8 West of All Saints churchyard, on a north south alignment parallel to the Thames runs Thames Street. At number 29 Thames Street archaeological investigations revealed an eighth to tenth century boundary ditch (which survived as a property boundary into the post Medieval period) running at right angles between the River and Thames Street (SYAC 1980, 245). This feature may indicate both that Thames Street had originated by the tenth century and that the area between it and the River Thames was at least partly settled. It can perhaps be conjectured that Thames Street continued southwards towards the (by this date) well established town of Guildford. Whether any of the other roads in Kingston predate 1100 is wholly unclear.

- 6.9 In 1100 therefore the central island comprised a relatively narrow north south aligned rectangle of land surrounded on all sides by watercourses and marsh. At the centre of this island may have lain an estate centre enclosure, now represented by All Saints churchyard, and at the centre of the enclosure the building which became the chapel of St Mary, with probably a separate church alongside. There may have been a small settlement between the estate enclosure and the Thames, with a road running southwards to Guildford.
- 6.10 The form of pre-twelfth century access into the central Kingston island is unknown. In the absence of any evidence we can only conjecture that the surrounding watercourses were crossed by fords. Even the Thames, the largest of the watercourses surrounding Kingston was fordable until the early modern period.
- 6.11 There is no documentary evidence for Kingston Bridge over the River Thames prior to 1193. In the Pipe Roll for the year ending Michaelmas 1193 the Sheriff of Surrey, accounting to the exchequer for the 'farm' or annual rent of the county, deducts from it £2 13s6d, spent by him, by the kings order, on the repair of Kingston bridge when the King's army was there. Clearly this is a repair to an existing structure. Evidence from the 1985-87 archaeological excavation of the bridge at the Horsefair provides a dendrochronological date for one of the timber piles of 1170 which most probably represents the first construction of the Bridge (Potter, 1998, 140).
- 6.12 Kingston Bridge carried the main road into the settlement from the west. We cannot be certain of the mid river form of Kingston Bridge in the twelfth century. Archaeological excavation has shown that in its earliest form, the Bridge was approached by a masonry and earth causeway on the Kingston Bank (Potter, 1988, 140) and this may have been the case on the Hampton Wick bank also, but the evidence is unclear (Thompson et al 1998, 169 HAW89, intervention report). As first constructed the Kingston side of the bridge ran from its approach causeway out over four masonry piers, but there is no clear evidence for the superstructure. Documentary evidence shows that the main structure of the bridge was timber from at least the early sixteenth century and this seems likely to have also been the case in the late twelfth. Early modern engravings of Kingston Bridge prior to its replacement in 1826-27 show the mid river bridge as a low timber structure with narrow, irregularly spaced piers. Manning and Bray recorded a description of the bridge in the early nineteenth century (Manning and Bray, 1804 – 14 Volume 1, 346).

“The Bridge in its present state is an ordinary structure of timbers so inartificially put together, as would warrant us in pronouncing that, whatever changes it hath undergone in its materials, from frequent repairs, there has been no deviation from the plan on which it was originally built. The supporters, which are more than twenty in number, on each side, occupy the space of a hundred and twenty six yards exclusive of about forty yards of masonry employed at both ends”

- 6.13 The construction of Kingston Bridge in the later twelfth century may have formed an obstacle to the passage of larger vessels between London and riverside settlements upstream, such as Windsor. Consequently the Bridges construction may have helped establish Kingston’s role as an inland port, by making it an unavoidable transshipment point for larger cargos being carried up and down the Thames. The building of Kingston Bridge certainly made Kingston a strategically important point from the late twelfth century as the bridge was the first crossing point above London until the construction of Putney Bridge in 1727-29.
- 6.14 Broadly contemporary with the earliest phase of Kingston Bridge is the still extant Clattern Bridge (A scheduled ancient monument and listed building) which crosses the River Hogsmill at the southern end of Kingston Market Place carrying the Guildford Road into Kingston from the south. Although not mentioned prior to 1293 this bridge contains late twelfth century fabric (Nairn, Pevsner and Cherry, 2002, 334).
- 6.15 Two other Medieval bridges are recorded at Kingston (Wakeford, 1990 10-16). These are ‘Bowebridge’ or ‘Stonebridge’, first recorded in 1383, which carried the main road (Clarence Street) into the town from the east; and ‘Barre Bridge’ first recorded in 1355 which carried the main road (Skerne Road) into the town from the north. Neither Bowebridge or Barre Bridge are now extant, and we cannot be certain at what date these two bridges were originally constructed. It is however tempting to speculate that like Kingston Bridge and Clattern Bridge these were broadly contemporary constructions of the latter twelfth century.
- 6.16 The four roads carried by the four Medieval bridges at Kingston converge onto the central island. The construction of the bridges clearly facilitated access to the interior of the island over the surrounding watercourses and must have enhanced the opportunities for economic development.

Kingston Market Place, south of All Saints churchyard, like Kingston Bridge and Clattern Bridge also appears to have originated in the latter twelfth century, although first recorded in 1242 (VCH, 1911, Vol III, 501). The archaeological excavations at Charter Quay, Kingston indicated that the western frontage of the Market Place was being developed (from an apparently virgin site) no earlier than the mid twelfth century (Andrews, 2004, 175). Evidence for 12th century building timbers was recovered from 13th century revetments. One of the timbers had a felling date of 1120.

- 6.17 As with the churchyard the extent of the Market Place has probably been much reduced by late Medieval and post Medieval encroachment and perhaps originally extended from the old southern limits of the churchyard on the north, down to the northern bank of the River Hogsmill at Clattern Bridge on the south, and from a point approximately 10m west of the modern Market Place frontage on the west to the line of what is now the eastern side of Apple Market on the east.
- 6.18 To the north of All Saints churchyard running northwards to the Downhall ditch and sandwiched between the River Thames on the west and the eastern arm of the River Hogsmill on the east lay a rectangular block of land later known as the Horsefair. The Horsefair excavations show that the first phase of Kingston Bridge, and a similarly orientated late twelfth century ditch were the earliest features within what had previously been undeveloped land. A number of fair activities appear to have been held here in the late Medieval and early post Medieval periods and it is possible that this space may also have been deliberately laid out in the late twelfth century and that it was originally intended for market or fair functions.
- 6.19 Documentary evidence indicates that Henry I gave the parish church at Kingston to Gilbert the Sheriff who in turn granted it prior to 1130 to Merton Priory (Blair 1991, 99). On the available evidence this parish church would appear to have been a precursor of the existing parish church of All Saints, but on the same site.
- 6.20 The earliest fabric known to have existed, in situ, within All Saints church was a late (and much altered) Romanesque arch at the western end of the Nave. Although dismantled during the 1862-6 restoration of the church, a surviving early photograph indicates a probable date of 1160-1180 for this feature (Butters, 1995, 44). A reconstruction drawing was made by Philip Mainwaring Johnson in 1926 who in the same paper also recorded some contemporary stonework from the church (Johnson 1926, 232-8). Although the earliest visible fabric in the tower of All Saints is thirteenth

century, it has been suggested that elements of an earlier building may be encapsulated in the core of the later structure (Johnson 1926, 237; Butters 1995, 42; Cowie, undated).

- 6.21 Mainwaring Johnson was the first to suggest that the twelfth century church had a nave co-terminus with the existing nave, and that the existing tower was a replacement of a twelfth century structure, though since the nineteenth century it has been suggested that in its earliest form All Saints church was cruciform in shape with a chancel, transepts and a narrow, aisle-less nave. If these interpretations are correct then Kingston's parish church may have been rebuilt on a massive scale in the later twelfth century.
- 6.22 The construction in the latter twelfth century of Kingston Bridge over the Thames and Clattern Bridge over the Hogsmill would have involved a considerable initial outlay of capital, together with the long term commitment of resources for maintenance and management. If the four Medieval bridges at Kingston were all constructed at broadly one and the same time then the expense involved would have been prodigious. Archaeological evidence indicates that the market, one of the chief factors of Kingston's Medieval economy, was being developed from the mid-twelfth century onwards while the Horsefair, another area which may have had market or fair functions, was being established at or around the same time. Contemporary with this, at the centre of the central island, All Saints parish church was apparently undergoing a large scale reconstruction, at what must have been considerable cost. Are all these factors coincidental arising from organic growth within an existing settlement or are we witnessing the impact of outside influences?
- 6.23 In the case of All Saints the latter twelfth century rebuilding of the church can be attributed to the dynamic impact of Merton Abbey's acquisition of this church. In the case of the bridges and market we cannot know for certain. However, it is not impossible that these features were deliberately contrived elements of urban planning, added as an investment to the earlier Royal estate centre in order to stimulate economic growth and thereby maximise its potential to generate revenue for the Crown. The order of the King to the Sheriff to arrange for the repair of Kingston Bridge in 1193, might perhaps be seen as the safeguarding of this investment rather than an act of generosity. If the emergence of Kingston as a town in the twelfth century was planned then the exercise was successful. In 1086 the whole vast agricultural estate of which Kingston was simply the centre was valued at £30. In 1200 in the first recorded

charter to the town of Kingston, the annual rent paid by the men of the town (the area effectively of the central island and its fringes) directly to the exchequer was £40.

Future Research

- 6.24 Future archaeological work is likely to significantly refine and enhance our understanding of late eleventh and twelfth century Kingston.
- 6.25 The transformation from Anglo-Norman estate centre to Angevin town must be seen in the context of a wider process of urbanisation and it is clear that documentary research (eg. Butters, 1995 39-46) has much to contribute here.
- 6.26 At a local level any opportunities to examine archaeologically (and date) the sites of Barre Bridge and Bowe/Stone Bridge will be important though it is possible that the former will have been completely destroyed during the construction of the railway. The full publication of the Horsefair excavations remains a priority.
- 6.27 At a regional level future archaeological investigations should be undertaken within the research framework set out in Andrews 2004, 181-185 and 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/English Heritage 58-66. The inclusion of a documentary historian in any project team is essential.

7.0 MEDIEVAL 1200-1350

- 7.1 Kingston's urban status was recognised by King John's grant of a charter in 1200, allowing the freemen of Kingston to pay him a fixed annual sum in return for becoming lords of the manor. By this time Kingston was one of the wealthiest towns in Surrey and sometimes paid more in taxes than Guildford and occasionally more than Southwark. The 13th century saw rapid urban growth throughout the country, mainly as a result of the great increase in trade. Kingstons growth is part of a wider national process and is not exceptional.
- 7.2 Kingston had no formal defences, such as a ditch and bank or circuit wall, although the surrounding watercourses, which effectively marked the Borough's legal boundaries, may have provided minimal protection particularly if the four bridges into the town were barred. There is a reference to a castle being captured at Kingston during the Barons' Wars in 1263-5 (Malden 1911, 345), but no trace of it survives above ground and its form and even location remain to be demonstrated archaeologically. It may have been built to guard the Thames river crossing. A location to the north of Clarence Street around 'Castle Street' has been suggested. Apart from All Saints church, and the Lovekyn Chapel (both still extant) there were no other churches, chapels or religious houses in Medieval Kingston (nor subsequently until the Post Medieval period). A 'hospital' for lepers is likely to have been no more than a house, possibly on the fringe of the town close by the Lovekyn chapel.
- 7.3 The eastern edge of the Thames in the 12th century lay some 50m to the east of its present line, and a small gravel bank split the mouth of the Hogsmill (Lurteborne) into two channels (of which only the southern, now canalised, survives). The northern channel was c. 20m wide and ran north-north-west probably joining the Thames south of the present-day Bishops Hall complex. The presence of this former channel of the Hogsmill had a major effect on the medieval topography of the town in the adjacent area, influencing the layout of streets and alleys, the shape of the market place, and the boundaries and extent of adjoining properties to the west. Furthermore, it is clear that this channel marked the western edge of the 'central island', and also broadly defined the limit of building in this direction until at least the 17th century when more extensive development of the reclaimed land began.
- 7.4 The excavations at Charter Quay revealed evidence for continuous medieval occupation, interspersed with episodes of flooding and land reclamation, dating from the early 12th

century onwards. The earliest phase of land reclamation can be assigned to the early 13th century and began along the east side of the former channel of the Hogsmill. Reclamation may have had the dual purpose of extending westwards the properties alongside the market, as well raising the level of the land to alleviate the problem of flooding which would have been a constant threat. This threat was perhaps increased after the construction of Kingston Bridge in the late 12th century which may have slowed the flow of the Thames upstream causing an increase in silting, particularly around the mouth of the Hogsmill. Flooding is recorded at regular intervals in Kingston during the second half of the 13th century – in the 1250s, the 1260s and the 1280s.

7.5 Documentary sources indicate that Kingston did not originally extend to the south of the Hogsmill, and in 1253 the legal boundary of the Borough was considered to be where the Creek (Hogsmill) lay at the south end of the market towards Guildford. The tenants of Merton Priory's manor of Canbury refused to perform watch duties south of the Hogsmill as this was seen as beyond the limit of the town. However, a small suburb of houses and yards was established there by the 1290s, and archaeological evidence indicates activity there a least a century earlier. The pattern of property divisions south of the Hogsmill suggests that this was a piecemeal process of settlement, advancing from the south end of Clattern Bridge by a series of small-scale reclamations from the Thames and Hogsmill shores. The suburb was known as *Clateringbrugende* in the 1290s, and by 1314 the roadway was called *Westbitamestrete* (later West-by-Thames Street, and now High Street). Other suburban development probably took place in the vicinity of London Road, the principal route out of town to the east, and pits of mid/late 13th – 14th century date found recently in this area may reflect this expansion (SyAC 2001, 353).

7.6 Many of the town's earliest medieval buildings would have been constructed around the market. It is known that the Market Place, frontage at Charter Quay was fully occupied by houses (possibly with street level shops and workshops) by 1200. The land behind, initially open to the Thames is likely to have been used as wharfage. Later cellars along the market frontage had removed all traces of earlier, timber buildings in this area.

7.7 Little can be gleaned about the function or internal layout of Medieval buildings at Charter Quay, but it is likely that they may have been used as shops or workshops as well as domestic accommodation. They were set within what were originally relatively large plots or properties which were wide enough to allow the buildings to be built parallel to the street frontage. On the market frontage at Charter Quay the three original plots appear, from later evidence, to have been approximately 10-12m wide

(two poles) – the suggested length of building based on the re-used wall plate in the later revetment. The properties to the south of the Hogsmill, on the High Street frontage, may have been slightly narrower, perhaps 10m wide.

- 7.8 Documentary evidence indicates that trades and occupations known to have been represented on the west side of the market place included fishmongers; Kingston was famous for its salmon, and eels were also caught in large numbers. There were also some occupational surnames in this area, which must have become formalised in the 13th century. They included *le Coliere* (charcoal supplier), *le poter* (potter) and *le Orfevre* (silversmith/goldsmith). Trades and occupations to the south of the Hogsmill included a chandler and butchers. The riverside site on the south side of the mouth of the Hogsmill is first known to have been occupied by Symon le Merchaunt, a 13th century occupational surname which suggests that the plot was used for trade.
- 7.9 Kingston was a major pottery production centre from at least as early as the mid 13th century. Prior to the beginnings of the well-documented Surrey whiteware industry at this time, the local pottery industries of Kingston and the surrounding region are less well understood. The major traditions have been defined (eg. Vince and Jenner 1991) and include Early Surrey sandy wares, shelly wares and flint-tempered wares, all with origins in the 11th or 12th centuries; source areas for each have been postulated, although actual production sites are as yet elusive. However, recent excavations at the Rotunda site (Darton et al, forthcoming) have recovered a large number of pottery wasters (but no kilns), provisionally interpreted as South Hertfordshire Grey ware and dated to the early 12th – late 13th century (SyAC 2001, 353).
- 7.10 The origins and development of the Surrey Whiteware industry, and in particular the Kingston-type ware industry, have already been thoroughly explored (Pearce and Vince 1988; Miller and Stephenson 1999), and are summarised here. On the basis of existing evidence from both Kingston and various sites in London, the Kingston-type ware industry, the earliest of the Surrey Whiteware industries as currently defined, seems not to have begun before the early 13th century. It was not until the middle of the 13th century that Kingston-type wares appeared in London, and in Kingston itself earlier excavations have produced some evidence of a pre-whiteware phase in which London-type Rouen style jugs were used, a type introduced at the end of the 12th century. Several pottery kilns have been found in Kingston, around Eden Street, Union Street and more recently along London Road which lay on the eastern outskirts of the town. Wasters associated with all these kilns are exclusively of 14th century date, and it seems that earlier kilns in the town remain to be discovered. Documentary sources

refer to the supply of 3300 'pitchers' from Kingston to the royal court between 1264 and 1266, and the repertoire of the late 13th century potters of the town can be reconstructed from the range of Kingston-type wares excavated from London (Pearce and Vince 1988, figs. 39-42).

- 7.11 Wherever the earliest whiteware kilns were established, it is apparent that their location in Kingston itself was anomalous, for the simple reason that there is no local source of white-firing clay here – the nearest known outcrops of iron-free clay from the Reading Beds are several miles away. The largest market for Kingston-type wares was always London, and the discovery of a dump of whiteware wasters at Bankside in Southwark, in a fabric identical to the Kingston wasters, tends to support the conclusion that the Kingston industry was founded by potters from London, moving closer to the source of the white-firing clay. Why they chose Kingston is uncertain, but may not be unconnected with the expansion of the town following the construction of the bridge across the Thames in c.1170, and the establishment of the market. The proximity of the river (for the transport of both raw clay and finished goods) and access to large supplies of timber for fuel were probably also important factors.
- 7.12 The original potters may have come from London, but the Kingston and London-type industries soon diverged, and Kingston became the centre for the production of a range of highly decorated jugs, with vibrant polychrome motifs, stamped bosses and anthropomorphic forms, produced alongside plainer utilitarian jars, bowls and pipkins. The *floruit* of the industry was in the second half of the 13th and first half of the 14th century, after which Kingston wares declined in popularity in London in the face of competition from rival whiteware industries at Cheam (some six miles away) and on the Surrey/Hampshire border.
- 7.13 As well as the local whitewares, Kingston, as a major market, might have been expected to act as the redistribution centre for a number of other wares. While Kingston products were supplying London, London-type wares travelled in the opposite direction. Products of the various 13th/14th century greyware industries located around London in Hertfordshire, Berkshire and Surrey are also represented in the town, but imported continental wares are extremely rare.
- 7.14 The major surviving building from this period apart from the 13th and 14th century elements of All Saints Church is the Listed Grade II* Lovekyn Chapel which is located just outside the area of the Kingston Town Centre action plan but within the study area.

This chapel, originally dedicated to St Mary Magdelene was a chantry chapel founded in 1309, partly rebuilt in 1352, later used as a grammar school and much rebuilt in 1886. The east end is flanked by Turrets and there is some perpendicular tracery. Inside two shallow recesses face one another their purpose is unknown.

Future Research

- 7.15 Future archaeological work is likely to significantly refine and enhance our understanding of thirteenth and early fourteenth century Kingston. Again documentary research has much to contribute.
- 7.16 At a local level the archaeological identification of Kingston's castle remains problematic, and it is possible that what may have been a temporary structure will have left few archaeological traces. The full publication of the Horsefair excavations remains a priority.
- 7.17 At a regional level the archaeological identification of the 'South Hertfordshire Greyware' type pottery kilns which are represented by the pottery assemblages recovered from the London Road area is particularly important and most probably these will be encountered in the areas flanking Wood Street and London Road.
- 7.18 Future archaeological fieldwork should be undertaken within the research framework set out in Andrews 2004, 181-185 and 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/English Heritage 58-66. The inclusion of a documentary historian in any project team is essential.

8.0 **LATE MEDIEVAL AND EARLY POST MEDIEVAL 1350 - 1650**

- 8.1 The 14th, 15th and 16th centuries witnessed continued expansion of Kingston as the prosperity of the town increased, and market rights were established by the Borough Charter of 1441. At Charter Quay this development was represented by a phase of 'industrial' activity assigned to the 14th century, and by the construction of timber buildings on stone and tile foundations which extended over a far more extensive area than before. The yard areas behind these buildings were progressively built up with ancillary buildings such as workshops, stores and stables. Land reclamation and the expansion of properties to the west continued throughout this period; the construction of timber revetments, some of the later ones incorporating re-used boat timbers, began on the Thames waterfront, probably in the 14th century.
- 8.2 To the north of the Hogsmill, all trace of the late medieval buildings on the market frontage had been destroyed by later cellars, but documentary evidence provides some indication of the nature of these buildings, with evidence for jettied upper storeys and shops at ground floor level. Part of the west side of the Market Place was known as le Hyerowe, presumably because of the height of its terrace of buildings. This development is likely to have involved some encroachment onto the west side of the market place, and may be reflected in the rental of 1417 which records several sets of posts in the street, probably supporting jettied upper stories. The earliest cellar remains surviving on the market frontage have been assigned to the 16th century, but it is possible that some replaced earlier, medieval cellars or undercrofts. An undercroft, well-known in the 19th century but rediscovered in 1986, was excavated at the Horsefair site immediately to the north of Kingston Bridge (and is now incorporated in the John Lewis store), but it appears that Kingston as a local market centre did not possess the wealth of medieval undercrofts which survive in regional centres such as Guildford.
- 8.3 It is clear that there were sub-divisions of the properties on the west side of the Market Place during this period. Evidence for this appears in town rentals of quit-rents compiled in 1383, 1417 and 1427, and at least one of the properties on the market frontage at Charter Quay may have been divided at this time. In this area, the pattern of property boundaries exhibits a characteristic curvilinear 'bridgehead' form that would have provided maximum access to both the market and the waterfront. Small changes in alignment of these boundaries, some of which still survive today or are recorded on 19th and 20th century maps, reflect the periodic advances of the properties across the reclaimed ground. Several alleyways providing access between the market place and

waterfront can also be seen to have become permanently established at this time. The sub-divisions, from wider to narrower properties, resulted in new buildings being constructed at 90° rather than parallel to the street frontage, a common development in towns at this time as the pressure on land increased, particularly in areas such as market places.

- 8.4 The southern suburb now stretched further to the south of the Hogsmill along both sides of Westbitamestrete (High Street), and Emms Passage probably became formalised as an alleyway at this time, linking the waterfront and the High Street. Two properties were identified on the street frontage north of Emms Passage, but it appears that the division of what had previously been a single property may not have taken place until around the end of the 14th century. Instead, the area was given over to some form of industrial activity. What this activity was is uncertain, but the whole of the frontage was occupied by a series of pitched-tile hearths dated archaeomagnetically to the last quarter of the 14th century. Pottery production can be ruled out, but the concentration of hearths in this area may reflect the location of a 'dirty' industry on the edge of the town. Baking or malting is a possibility, although documentary study has failed to determine the names of the occupiers of the properties on the street frontage.
- 8.5 It is clear that not all of the buildings to the south of the Hogsmill were timber structures. In the 19th century 'some beautiful early capitals and bases of piers' were found on land formerly called *La Ryole*, in the Bittoms area. A date of *c.* 1300 has been suggested for these and their presence clearly indicates a stone building (perhaps an undercroft) of some importance and architectural merit – possibly that of a London wine merchant. It may be no coincidence that there was a substantial house in Vintry Ward (the district of wine importers) in the City of London also called *la Ryole*, and perhaps this merchant also had a house in Kingston. It is known that other important City merchants held property in Kingston and these included the Lovekyns who were involved in some of the town's inns and wine shops. These merchants were presumably attracted by its location which provided both an important local market and a transshipment point.
- 8.6 Around the end of the 14th or the beginning of the 15th century the properties at Charter Quay were divided, new buildings constructed and there was a change in use of the area. This may have resulted from a change in ownership. The London Charterhouse, founded in 1370, acquired the considerable Kingston property of John Wenge as part of its initial endowment and the Priory continued to purchase property in Kingston in the 15th century. Several inns on the west side of the Market Place were probably first

established in the 15th century, their rear yards stretching westward to the Thames. They included the Saracen's Head (later the Sun), which was established at least a generation before 1417, and the George which was part of the Charterhouse estate, developed out of Wenge's tenements.

- 8.7 Reclamation of the former Hogsmill channel continued throughout the 14th century, interspersed with periods of flooding, and as earlier was carried out within individual properties. At least three revetments of 14th century date were recorded in the same property at Charter Quay which had earlier been extended to the west by revetments dating to the early 13th century.
- 8.8 As properties were extended to the west there were also attempts to manage the shores of the Thames and the Hogsmill by a system of revetments, in order to limit the effect of flooding. Close to the Thames at Charter Quay, were several irregular lines of posts which probably represented evidence for reclamation and flood control in the 14th century. There were no horizontal timbers between these posts, and perhaps originally they merely consisted of a series of closely, but irregularly spaced 'piles' along the river's edge. These were succeeded in the late 15th or early 16th century by revetments incorporating re-used boat timbers. These revetments comprised small sections of clinker-built boats similar to the earlier, 14th century examples in the channel, but these were held in place by a series of elm posts rather than re-used building timbers. The use of elm roundwood was a characteristic feature of the late 15th / early 16th century revetments in this area and probably reflects an increasing shortage of suitable oak timber.
- 8.9 Elsewhere, the earliest Thames-side revetments so far discovered in Kingston were found in the immediate vicinity of old Kingston Bridge during excavations there in the late 1980s (Potter 1988). A sequence of at least six revetments either side of the old bridge were recorded, together spanning some 200 years from the early 13th century to the later 14th century, with the last going out of use early in the 15th century. These revetments comprised a variety of construction techniques, some purpose-built and containing sawn planks, others with re-used boat and building timbers.
- 8.10 Kingston continued to expand in the 16th century. During this period Kingston became established as an important centre for boat building, tanning, milling, brewing and river barge traffic. By the 1580's various trades within the town were organised into guilds. In 1540 John Leland described Kingston as:

“the best market town in the whole of Surrey”

- 8.11 The presence of a royal residence at Hampton Court appears to have had neither an extensive or permanent effect on Kingston’s development, though tradesmen from Kingston were often engaged on works at the palace.
- 8.12 At the beginning of the 16th century houses in Kingston were generally small, with some tiled roofs though the majority appear to have been thatched. The houses were mainly built of timber on stone footings, with wattle and daub infill. There is evidence for a phase of rebuilding in brick with tiled roofs from the mid sixteenth century. This appears to be part of a wider phenomenon throughout much of England and is well evidenced at other (old) Surrey towns such as Guildford.
- 8.13 The former Hogsmill channel at Charter Quay was finally infilled at the beginning of this period. In 1563 John Jenys leased a piece of land at the Thames end of Bishops Hall Lane with 15.24m of a drainage channel called the Creek – the same name also given to the lower part of the Hogsmill below Clattern Bridge from the 16th century. Jenys was required to fill and level this drainage channel while maintaining a watercourse for water to drain from Thames Street into the river. There were continuing efforts made to manage the rivers and defend against floods. Reclamation continued particularly to the north of the confluence of the Thames and Hogsmill, by the dumping of soil and rubbish which raised the ground level by upwards of a metre.

Future Research

- 8.14 Future archaeological work is likely now to refine rather than significantly alter our understanding of late fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and early seventeenth century Kingston. Again documentary research is likely to provide an important contribution.
- 8.15 At a local and regional level further information is needed on the scale of Kingston’s tanning, malting and brewing industries and their place in the local and regional economy.

- 8.16 At a regional level further archaeological data is needed on Kingston's redware pottery industry active in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century with probable (but as yet unidentified) kiln sites close by No 17 High Street. Kingston's role as a boat building centre and inland port has been under researched and this is likely to be an important area for future research and analysis (Hawkins, forthcoming³).
- 8.17 Future investigations should be undertaken within the research framework set out in Andrews 2004, 181-185 and 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/English Heritage 58-66 and 68-87. The inclusion of a documentary historian in any project team is essential.

9.0 **LATE POST MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN**

- 9.1 Kingston continued to expand in the 17th century, and at the Hearth Tax assessment of 1664-6 the town consisted of 455 households, representing a population in excess of 2000. By comparison, London had a population of *c.* 100,000, and Kingston's relatively small size must in part be a reflection of the proximity of the capital.
- 9.2 Kingston was a flourishing market town, aided by a charter granted by Charles I in 1628 forbidding the holding of any other market within a seven mile radius. This charter heavily emphasises Kingston's role as an inland port, and the town continued to serve as such throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, daily transporting goods to and from London. Its boats at this time included pinnaces, which were capable of going to sea, and presumably could sail upstream as far as Kingston Bridge. Goods being transported upstream would have been unloaded at this point and transferred to smaller barges, to carts for transport overland, or were sold in the market. A recent study of Kingston trade tokens (Everson 2001) indicates how much trade in Surrey went by river, with only Guildford and Croydon of the large centres not being on the Thames. Of the 55 towns and smaller settlements recorded as issuing tokens in the middle of the 17th century, Kingston (21 issues) lies fourth behind Southwark (400+), Rotherhithe (54) and Guildford (22), emphasising the importance of London within the region.
- 9.3 After the royal family began to make more frequent use of Hampton Court Palace in the 17th century, many courtiers stayed in the town, with the Crane Inn on the west side of the Market Place being the principal lodging place. Inns were an important feature of the Market Place throughout this period and several had a continuous life from the medieval period. Kingston remained virtually free of the plague which swept England in the 1570s, largely because it banned all people coming from infected areas and established what was in effect an isolation hospital outside the town. However, the town succumbed in 1625 and 1636, and precautions were taken to prevent the disease spreading to Hampton Court. The town certainly transported goods to the palace up the river, although traffic was suspended for a time during the outbreak of plague and in 1625 there were virtually no boats travelling downstream to London. Notwithstanding these interruptions, the volume of trade was the pretext for the grant of a second market day in the week in 1662.

- 9.4 Unlike Guildford, there are few obvious survivals of buildings of this period in Kingston. Nevertheless, elements of these may survive even in the most unpromising of circumstances. At Charter Quay parts of the cellar and roof structure of a 17th century range were recorded within a 19th - 20th century department store (Hides) which had been formed from several earlier, largely 19th century buildings and given a new façade. Also present, although not in its original location, was an elaborately carved mid 17th century staircase.
- 9.5 The properties to the north of the Hogsmill at Charter Quay retained their medieval boundaries until the 19th century. However, there were further sub-divisions of other properties along the Market Place and Thames Street frontage in the 17th century, and there was continued encroachment onto the Market Place itself. As further land reclamation at the confluence of the Thames and Hogsmill took place there was also lateral division of the tails of the properties behind the street frontage to form new tenements, accessed through lanes and alleyways from the Market Place. What had been open areas became more intensively built-up, and although yards and alleyways were retained they often became hemmed-in and encroached upon by new buildings. The digging of new wells and cess pits in the remaining open areas may reflect an attempt to improve sanitation following outbreaks of the plague in 1625 and 1636.
- 9.6 Seventeenth-century Kingston is known to have contained maltings and brewhouses, slaughter houses and tan yards, forges, timber yards and a brick yard. Especially represented in the area to the south of the Hogsmill were the carpenters, joiners and wood merchants who operated the timber yards. Numerous other crafts and small-scale industries are recorded in documentary sources, and presumably many of these activities were reflected in the town's waterborne trade. However, there are few archaeological finds which might reflect the function of Kingston as an inland port at this time, nor are there any indications of specialised vessel forms in the post-medieval pottery assemblage which might be related to specific craft or industrial functions.
- 9.7 Kingston was well within the catchment area for provisioning London with wood and charcoal via the Thames (Galloway *et al* 1996), and most woodlands around the town were probably dedicated to this lucrative fuel trade. During the medieval period the supply of livestock would have been mainly from the local area, but by the post-medieval period trade was extensive and far-reaching. It is possible that some of the cattle bone assemblages recorded in Kingston may have come from animals brought to Kingston's livestock market, slaughtered and the processed meat sent to London. Dumps of horse bone have also been found on several sites including Eden Walk and

Charter Quay where there is evidence of both skinning and disarticulation, with at least some meat removal. Horse remains from most medieval and post-medieval sites are consistently of older or diseased animals presumably at the end of their useful lives, and the animals at Kingston are no exception. Tanning and related industries were often situated next to rivers for easy access to water and the area of the town, close to the Horsefair, may have become a specialist centre for these activities from the 16th century onwards, perhaps replacing an earlier focus of this activity in the area of Eden Walk. Bishops Hall had become a tanner's yard by 1631 and subsequently developed into Kingston's largest and most important tannery which continued to operate on the same site until its closure in 1963 (eg. Butters 1995, 65-94).

9.8 The more recent, relatively well-documented history of Kingston, can still be supplemented by new archaeological information. For example, recent excavations of the Quaker burial ground in London Road '...provided a rare opportunity to investigate an early Quaker community through analysis of their burial practices and physical remains' (Bashford and Pollard 1998, 154). Incidentally this appears to be the only pre-modern post Saxon burial ground in the town outside of All Saints Churchyard.

9.9 By the close of this period it is clear that Kingston's development was stagnating. Although home to a number of 'industries' and crafts Kingston developed no heavy industries prior to the twentieth century. Tanneries, breweries and milling (only one mill site – Hoggs Mill lay within the study area) were the staples of Kingston's economy. Daniel Defoe writing in the eighteenth century said of Kingston that it was remarkable

"...for little..."

9.10 Nevertheless Kingston's population continued to grow. In 1811 the population was 5000, by 1841 it was nearly 10,000 and by 1851 was over 12,000. With the coming of the railway in 1862 the population expanded rapidly and by 1901 had reached 34,375.

Future Research

9.11 For this period documentary history and archaeology are complementary. Again future research is unlikely to fundamentally alter our understanding of the development of the town in the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries, but has the potential to refine that understanding.

- 9.12 At a local and regional level further information is needed on the scale of Kingstons tanning, malting and brewing industries and their place in the local and regional economy. The form of Kingston's early public buildings the pest houses, workhouses, prisons and Militia Barracks are little known, though the sites are all well documented.
- 9.13 At a regional level Kingston's continued role as a boat building centre and inland port has been under researched and this is likely to be a promising area for future research and analysis (Hawkins, forthcoming³).
- 9.14 Future archaeological investigations should be undertaken within the research framework set out in Andrews 2004, 181-185 and 'A Research Framework for London Archaeology 2002', Museum of London/EH 68-76. The inclusion of a documentary historian in any project team is essential.

10.0 THE SURVIVING RESOURCE

- 10.1 Approximately 25% of the study area has been subject to archaeological intervention since 1926 (Fig. 17). These interventions range from major large scale archaeological excavations as at Horsefair and Charter Quay to small scale archaeological evaluations (trial trenching exercises) and monitoring exercises (watching briefs). This level of investigation allows some general statements to be made regarding the character of the surviving archaeological resource within the study area.
- 10.2 Totally negative archaeological interventions within the study area appear to generally result from the past truncation of the archaeological resource (eg. SKR99 and RMD99) through ground reduction or redevelopment rather than through an 'absence' of past human activity. However, in many cases, particularly beyond the historic core of the Medieval and post Medieval town past human activity is represented at only a very low level (eg. occasional residual finds, plough soils etc).
- 10.3 Within the historic core of the Medieval and early Post Medieval town (as defined in Figures 6 and 7), archaeological remains can generally be described as urban or urban fringe (Carver, 1987). Sensitive archaeological remains are encountered very close to existing ground level. At Charter Quay, Horsefair and Clarence Street late Medieval and early Post Medieval deposits were encountered immediately below the floor slabs of modern buildings demonstrating the importance of archaeological input into demolition programmes in this part of the study area.
- 10.4 Also within the historic core of the Medieval and early Post Medieval town, Medieval and early post Medieval cellars and walls have been encountered directly beneath the floors and walls of modern buildings or partly incorporated into them. Further such remains might be anticipated, particularly on the Market Place frontages (including Apple Market) and along the western half of Clarence Street.
- 10.5 Adjacent and over former water course and adjacent to existing watercourses the preservation of organic remains (wood, leather, plant material etc) has been shown to be very good. In these areas the depth of alluvial deposits can be significant, with depths in excess of three metres previously recorded. The palaeo-environmental

potential of these areas is extremely high and proposals for archaeological investigation should be drawn up in consultation with English Heritage's Scientific Advisors.

- 10.6 Except in proximity to existing and former water courses, and where subterranean structures occur, archaeological remains in the study area (including cut features) seldom extend to a depth greater than 1.5m below existing ground level and most typically occur between existing ground level and a depth of 1.25m. There is no evidence for 'deep urban' stratigraphy at Kingston of the type seen in the City of London or North Southwark. Preservation in situ of the archaeological resource in the study area is therefore incompatible with development proposals that incorporate basements or semi basement 'undercrofts'.
- 10.7 Outside the historic core of the Medieval and Post Medieval town archaeological remains within the study area can be characterized as non urban or 'rural'. This is particularly important in considering Prehistoric, Roman and early Saxon remains within the study area which can only be understood in the context of all past finds, rather than on an individual site basis. 'Keyhole' archaeological interventions in these areas, as conducted in areas of deep urban stratigraphy would be wholly inappropriate.
- 10.8 The study area contains one scheduled monument, Clattern Bridge (ref:LO98). A former scheduled monument, the Lovekyn Chapel is now a Grade II* listed building.
- 10.9 On no occasion has there been any attempt to preserve archaeological remains within the study area in situ. Elements of the Medieval Kingston Bridge and a Medieval undercroft from the Horsefair excavations have been preserved within the John Lewis development but not in situ. These important monuments are not on regular public display. Part of a Medieval pillar probably from a Merchant's House is on display outside Kingston Library. The 'Kings Stone' part of the fabric of St Mary's Chapel, is on display outside Kingston's Guildhall.
- 10.10 Relatively few sites within the study area have been lost to destruction without archaeological investigation since the Second World War. The largest probable area of destruction (yet to be proved archaeologically) is in the area of Kingston University's Penrhyn Road complex where several phases of large scale development and redevelopment took place in the late twentieth century. A vast (but patchy) area of

destruction attributable to nineteenth century brickearth extraction has been identified at North Kingston, north of the railway line.

10.11 Overall it can be stated that a significant percentage of the archaeological resource within the study area remains intact. Remains of national importance are present at Clattern Bridge and the Lovekyn chapel. The area of All Saints Church and churchyard, and the land between the churchyard and Thames is the likely location of the late Saxon/early Norman Estate Centre and arguably of national importance. Archaeological remains across the remainder of the study area north of (and including) County Hall are arguably of regional importance and south of County Hall of local importance.

11.0 **KINGSTON AREA ACTION PLAN K+20 AND POTENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPACTS**

11.1 As part of the Kingston Town Centre area action plan K + 20 substantial areas of the town centre (Fig. 18) have been identified as:

“Areas with potential for significant change/improvement”

11.2 These areas are elaborated (Fig 19) under the designation

‘preferred options vision’.

11.3 Future development or redevelopment in the areas could have a significant archaeological impact. From north to south the archaeological potential of these areas can be summarized as follows: .

Area 1: Land at Down Hall Road/Skerne Road (Kingston action plan designations P12, P13)

11.4 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with channels of the Latchmere Stream/Downhall Ditch likely to be represented. Prehistoric and Roman activity is likely to be evidenced though probably in relatively modest quantities representing rural settlement. Evidence for late Medieval and Post Medieval field systems may be present. Previous Brickearth extraction and development may have had a severe and widespread archaeological impact.

Area 2: Land spanning Kingsgate Road and Richmond Road (Kingston action plan, Designation P14)

11.5 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with channels of the Latchmere Stream/Downhall Ditch likely to be represented. Prehistoric and Roman activity is likely to be evidenced though probably in relatively modest quantities representing rural settlement. Evidence for late Medieval and Post Medieval field systems may be present.

Previous brickearth extraction and development may have had a severe and widespread archaeological impact.

Area 3: Land at Water Lane, Vicarage Road (Kingston action plan designation P5)

- 11.6 The northern half of this area (north of Water Lane) has already been fully investigated archaeologically though little survived (except for diminutive late Medieval and Post Medieval waterfronts on the extreme west of the site and former channel deposits on the north east of the site, intervention reports TUK90, TAD03, BEN88). Most of the northern half of the site, had been truncated by 1930's development. The southern part of the site (south of Water Lane) has not been investigated archaeologically and has a high potential for the late Medieval and Post Medieval periods, with documented Brewery remains and the sites of several inns likely to be represented. The site has already been cleared to ground level.

Area 4: Land at Wood Street/Clarence Street, Kingston Station (Kingston action plan designation P4)

- 11.7 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with channels of the Latchmere Stream/Downhall Ditch likely to be represented. Prehistoric and Roman activity is likely to be evidenced, particularly north of Wood Street, though probably in relatively modest quantities representing rural settlement. Evidence for late Medieval and post Medieval field systems may be present, together with remains associated with Kingstons late Medieval Tithe Barn.
- 11.8 Possible location for features relating to Kingstons 'lost' castle south of Wood Street. Evidence for late Medieval and Post Medieval 'dirty' trades, such as pottery kilns, animal butchery, tanning may be represented, south of Wood Street.

Area 5: Land at Fife Road/Clarence Street (Kingston action plan designation P2)

- 11.9 Part of a possible 'island' of higher ground. Clarence Street frontage may have been developed by c.1200 likely much of the land to the rear was horticultural until the early nineteenth century. Possibly location for features relating to Kingstons 'lost' castle.

Area 6: Bishops Hall complex (Kingston action plan designation P6)

- 11.10 High potential for late Anglo Saxon remains arguably of national importance. Part of historic core of Medieval, and early Post Medieval town, site of Medieval property of Bishops of Winchester. Site of Kingstons principal post Medieval Tannery to 1963.

Area 7: Land on the west side of Eden Street/land at Eden Walk (Kingston action plan designation p1)

- 11.11 Although much of this area has been subject to archaeological investigation and modern development it retains a very high archaeological potential. This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with river channels of the east arm of the Hogsmill previously identified. Associated with these river channels is evidence for Neolithic and Bronze Age activity which may be in situ.
- 11.12 The Clarence Street frontage of this area is likely to have been built up by 1200 and the Eden Street frontage by 1400. The area was a focus of late Medieval and post Medieval 'dirty' trades. Pottery kilns, animal butchery and tanning may be represented.

Area 8: Land east side of Eden Street and Clarence Street (Kingston action plan designation P1)

- 11.13 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with river channels of the east arm of the Hogsmill previously identified. In association with these channels and on the higher ground to the east evidence for Prehistoric (particularly Bronze Age and perhaps some Iron Age) activity can be anticipated, together with Roman and early Anglo Saxon activity. Remains are likely to be encountered in very modest quantities representative of rural communities. The Eden Street frontage of this area is likely to have built up piecemeal between 1400 and 1800. The area was a focus of late Medieval 'dirty' trades. Evidence for pottery kilns, animal butchery and tanning is likely to be represented. The area site includes part of the sites of Kingston's late post Medieval and early modern prison and militia barracks.

Area 9 Land at Fairfield (Kingston action plan designation, P3)

- 11.14 Potential for Prehistoric, Roman and Saxon activity at very low densities representing rural settlement. Evidence for Medieval and Post Medieval field systems.

Area 10 Land south of Eden Street (Kingston action plan designation P10)

- 11.15 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with former channels of the Hogsmill likely to be represented. Site of Kingston's main Post Medieval and early modern brewery.

Area 11 Land at Guildhall (Kingston action plan designation P8)

- 11.16 Southern fringe of Medieval, early Post Medieval Market. Possible area of Medieval, Post Medieval slaughterhouses along the north bank of the Hogsmill.

Area 12 Land at Penrhyn Road (Kingston action plan designation P9)

- 11.17 This area has a high palaeoenvironmental potential with former channels of the Hogsmill river likely to be present. Site of 'Hogsmill', substantial Medieval and Post Medieval Mill probably with 11th/12th century origins.

Area 13 County Hall (Kingston action plan designation P10)

- 11.18 Potential for Prehistoric and late Saxon activity at low densities outside footprint of existing building.

Area 15 Kingston University (Kingston action plan designation P11)

- 11.19 Generally low archaeological potential. Very low density, Prehistoric activity. Past archaeological impacts from modern development may be severe and widespread.

12.0 **FUTURE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Current Archaeological Resource Management Policies

- 12.1 Kingston upon Thames archaeological policies have been among the most effective in Greater London in ensuring the preservation by record of the archaeological resource, not least because of the proactive approach to resource management taken by the Royal Borough and their archaeological advisors, English Heritage. The whole of the Kingston K+20 action area is designated an area of archaeological significance in the Borough Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames UDP: First Alteration, adopted August 2005 archaeological policies states:

AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE: BE19

- a. **WHERE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AFFECT KNOWN AREAS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE, AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, THE COUNCIL WILL EXPECT PROVISION TO BE MADE FOR A SITE EVALUATION, WHERE REQUIRED, BY AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ORGANIZATION APPROVED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY PRIOR TO THE DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS:**
- b. **WHERE EVALUATION PROVES THE EXISTENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS, THE FOLLOWING APPROPRIATE ACTION WILL APPLY.**
 - i **FOR REMAINS OF MAJOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE, THE COUNCIL WILL EXPECT PROVISION TO BE MADE FOR PRESERVATION IN SITU AND WILL CONSIDER THE NEED FOR STATUTORY PROTECTION OF MONUMENTS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.**
 - ii **FOR OTHER REMAINS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE, A FULL ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION WILL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO ANY DEVELOPMENT.**

WHERE THERE ARE REASONABLE GROUNDS TO SUSPECT THAT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS MAY EXIST IN OTHER AREAS, THE PROVISIONS MADE UNDER (A) AND (B) WILL BE APPLIED.

- 12.2 Although worded in such a way as to allow for the preservation in situ of the archaeological resource within the context of redevelopment proposals, in practice the current policy (and previous policies) has not delivered any example of an archaeological site preserved in situ. The main problem in achieving this is that development sites within the study area are inevitably brownfield and usually (though not exclusively) occupied by existing buildings which are often fully let. Consequently,

evaluation of the archaeological resource within the study area has tended to follow planning consent rather than be undertaken prior to determination. This has particularly been a problem in the Market Place conservation area where demolition can only follow planning consent. Even on the large scale excavation at Charter Quay within this area only partial evaluation was possible prior to demolition.

- 12.3 While 'keyhole' evaluation techniques as employed in areas such as the City of London and Southwark could potentially be employed at Kingston in the context of pre-determination evaluations the nature of the archaeological resource, particularly outside the historic core of the late Medieval and early post Medieval town, suggests they may not be appropriate. In this context it should be noted that statistically evaluations examining less than 5% of a total site area have a high potential to fail, or produce misleading 'negative' results.
- 12.4 Detailed archaeological assessments (desk based assessments), on a site specific basis can contribute here, particularly where these are tied in with geotechnical investigations, and detailed documentary, cartographic and pictorial research.
- 12.5 The use of negative archaeological planning conditions covering preservation in situ, as well as 'standard' PPG16 style archaeological planning conditions may be a way forward to achieve preservation in situ of the archaeological resource through engineering solutions eg.

"No works shall take place until a detailed scheme showing the scope and arrangement of foundation design and all new groundworks, which may have an impact on archaeological remains has been approved in writing by, and that the scheme will be monitored by the local planning authority".

Informative: To ensure that archaeological remains are not disturbed or damaged by foundations and other groundworks but are, where appropriate preserved in situ".

- 12.6 On the basis of the available information the following broad assumptions can be made regarding the future management of the archaeological resource within the study area.
- The area of All Saints Church, All Saints churchyard and the land between the churchyard and the Thames potentially contains well preserved Late Saxon and early Norman archaeological remains which are arguably of national significance

(ref: Figs 5 and 6). There should be a presumption in favour of the preservation in situ of the archaeological resource in this area. This is not to preclude any development in this area but to ensure development proposals are drawn up mindful of the need to preserve the archaeological resource.

- The historic core of the Medieval and early post Medieval town contains partly surviving archaeological remains of regional significance (ref: Figs 6 and 7). There should be a presumption in favour of the preservation in situ of the surviving archaeological resource. In particular redevelopment involving mass excavation such as basements should be focused at areas that have already been destroyed or damaged by previous development (ref: Fig 17). Engineering solutions to preserve the archaeological resource should be sought wherever practical.
- Demolition groundworks can be highly destructive of archaeological remains therefore all demolition works undertaken in the historic core of the Medieval and early Post Medieval town (ref: Figs 6 and 7) should be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of archaeological mitigation designed to prevent the destruction or disturbance of archaeological remains during demolition works. Demolition works should be archaeologically monitored in order to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented. Where demolition precedes planning consent, outside of conservation areas, voluntary arrangements for archaeological mitigation should be encouraged. Where demolition is to follow planning consent mitigation should be conditional, eg:

“No demolition shall take place within the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Informative: The site lies within an area where archaeological remains have been identified and any archaeological remains therein should be retrieved or recorded before they are damaged or destroyed due to the development hereby permitted”.
- Where destruction of the archaeological resource is unavoidable a programme of full archaeological investigation, post excavation assessment and publication should be undertaken in accordance with a written scheme of investigation prepared in accordance with the research priorities set out in sections 3 to 9 above. Archaeological fieldwork programmes should allow for public inclusion, through access (where practical), viewing platforms or exhibitions. Publications

should be in an accessible format and disseminated to as wide an audience as possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is given to Phil Andrews for permission to reproduce sections of his 2004 text on Kingstons archaeology. Thanks are also due to Ann McCormack of Kingston's Heritage Services and Mark Stevenson of English Heritage for their contributions and comments on the text and to Wessex Archaeology for their co-operation and assistance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ambulator (6th edition, 1793), 153-4

Andrews P, 2004 – Kingston – Saxon Royal Estate Centre to Post Medieval Market Town: The Contribution of archaeology to understanding towns in Surrey, 169-186 in Cotton, J et al, 2004

Andrews, P et al, 2003 *Excavations at Charter Quay, Kingston upon Thames: The Archaeology of Kingstons Riverside*

Aubrey, J Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey (1718-19) Vol I, 17, 18-21

Ayres, B, 1997 'Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval (Urban)', in Glazebrook, J (ed.), *Research and Archaeology: a Framework for the Eastern Counties 1. Resource assessment*, E. Anglian Archaeol. Occ. Pap. **3**, 59-66

Bartlett, P, 2000 England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225, 331-5

Bashford, L & Pollard, A, 1998 'In the burying place' – the excavation of a Quaker burial ground', in Cox, M (ed), *Grave Concerns: death and burial in England 1700 - 1850*, CBA Res Rep, **113**, 154-66

Biden, W D, 1852 The history and antiquities of the ancient royal town of Kingston upon Thames, 1-10

Bird, J, and Bird D G (eds), 1987 *The Archaeology of Surrey to 1540*, SyAS special volume

Bird, J, Hassall, M and Sheldon, H (eds), 1996. Interpreting Roman London Papers in Memory of Hugh Chapman

Bird, D G, Crocker, G & McCracken, J S, 1989 Archaeology in Surrey, 1987 SyAC, 79, 179-89

Bird, D G, 1990 Archaeology in Surrey, 1988-1989, SyAC, 80, 201-27

Bird, D G, 1991-2 Archaeology in Surrey, 1990, SyAC, 81, 147-67

Bird, D G, Crocker, G, Maloney, C & Saich, D, 1996 Archaeology in Surrey, 1992-3, SyAC, 83, 187-228

Bird D G, 2000 The Environs of Londinium: Roads Roadside settlements and the countryside Note 4, p167 in Haynes, I et al 2000

- Bird, D G, 2004 Surrey in the Roman period; a survey of recent discoveries, 65-76. In Cotton, J et al 2004
- Bird, D G 2004 Roman Religious sites in the landscape, 77-90 in Cotton, J et al 2004
- Blair, J, 1991 *Early Medieval Surrey: Landholding, church and settlement before 1300*
- Bradley, T forthcoming, Roman occupation at Skerne Road, Kingston upon Thames
- Butters, S, 1995 *The Book of Kingston*
- Camden, W. *Brittania or a chronological Description of Great Britain and Ireland together with the adjacent islands* (4th edition, 1772) Vol 1, 238
- Camden, W *Brittania or a chronological Description of the flourishing kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland and the islands adjacent from early antiquity* (translated by Richard Gough, 2nd edition 1806, Vol I, 12, 254
- Canham, M P 1968 Extracts from the Bulletins of 1967, *SyAC* 65, 124-128
- Carver, M, 1987 *Underneath English Towns*
- Cotton, J, Crocker, G and Graham A, 2004 (eds). *Aspects of Archaeology and History in Surrey; toward a research framework for the county.* Surrey Archaeological Society, English Heritage
- Cowie, L. W (undated). *A History of the Parish Church of Kingston upon Thames*
- Darton, L et al, forthcoming, Three sites in the London Road area of Kingston upon Thames
- Everson, T, 2001 'Kingston trading tokens and their issuers', *SyAC*, **88**, 43-66
- Field, D & Needham, S P, 1986 'Evidence for Bronze Age settlement on Coombe Warren, Kingston Hill', *SyAC*, **77**, 127-51
- Finny, W E St L, 1927 'The Saxon church at Kingston', *SyAC*, **37.2**, 211-19
- Finny, W E St L, 1929 Roman pottery and tile from Kingston', *SyAC* 38, 229
- Finny, W E St L, 1941 'The Church of the Saxon Coronations at Kingston. Trans South Eastern Union of Scientific Societies

Frost, T 1881 Kingston upon Thames 11

Gale, T A, 1709 Antonini Iter Britanniarum Commentariis Illustratum, 66, 71, 72

Galloway, J A, Keene, D & Murphy, M, 1981 'Fuelling the City: the production of firewood and the distribution in London's region, 1290 - 1400', *Economic History Review*, **69** (3), 447-72

Giles, J A 1847 William of Malmesburys Chronicle, DCI, 128

Giles, J A 1849 Roger of Wendover, Flowers of History, DCI Vol 2, 257

Hammerson, M J 1996. Problems of Roman coin interpretation in Greater London in Bird, J et al, 1996 154-155

Hawkins D, 1997 'Roman Kingston upon Thames: a landscape of rural settlements', *London Archaeologist*, **8** (2), 46-50

Hawkins D, 1998 'Anglo-Saxon Kingston: a shifting pattern of settlement', *London Archaeologist*, **8** (8), 271-8

Hawkins D, 2003 "'From Norman estate centre to Angevin town": Kingston upon Thames urban origins', *London Archaeologist*, **10** (4), 95-101

Hawkins D, Kain, A, & Wooldridge, K, 2002 'Archaeological investigations at East Lane and South Lane, Kingston upon Thames 1996-8', *SyAC*, **89**, 185-210

Hawkins, D, forthcoming¹, Roman Kingston revised

Hawkins, D, forthcoming², The 'Kings Stone' an antiquarian fantasy

Hawkins, D, forthcoming³, Kingston as an inland port 1200-1800

Hinton, M and Nelson, S 1980 Medieval and later pottery made in Kingston upon Thames, *London Archaeologist*, 3 (14), 377-83

Haynes, I, Sheldon, H, Hanningan, L 2000 (eds) *London Underground the archaeology of a City*.

Hinton, M, 1984 'Ancient Burial Ground in Canbury Field, Kingston upon Thames', *SyAC*, **75**, 285-7

Hoad, S 1995 'Romans in Twickenham' *London Archaeologist* 7, No 14, p378-383

Howe, T, Jackson, G & Maloney, C, 2001 Archaeology in Surrey 2000, SyAC, 88, 343-363

Jackson, G, Maloney, C & Saich, D, 1997 Archaeology in Surrey 1994-5, SyAC, 84, 195-243

Jesse, E Roman Antiquities at Kingston, Gleamings in Natural History with local recollections. Kingston Heritage local history collection, pamphlets Vol 44, 1832

Johnson, P M *The Parish Church of All Saints, Kingston upon Thames*. J. Brit Archaeol Assoc 32 (1926) 232

London Archaeologist, Excavation Round Ups, 1968-2005

MacDonald, J 1996 Stony Jacks Roman London in Bird J et al, 1996 p245

Malden, H E, 1911 *The Victoria History of the County of Surrey*

Manning, O, and Bray, W *The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*, Vol 1 (1804), 329

Miller, P, and Stephenson, R 1999 *A 14th century pottery site in Kingston upon Thames, Surrey*, Museum of London Archaeology Service Study Series, 1

Morris, J, 1975 *Domesday Book, Surrey*, 30c

Museum of London/English Heritage, 2000. The archaeology of Greater London.

Museum of London/English Heritage 2002. A Research Framework for London Archaeology

Nairn, I, Pevsner, N and Cherry, B 2002, *The Buildings of England, Surrey*, 334

Needham, S P, 1987 'The Bronze Age', in Bird & Bird (eds) 1987, 97-137

O'Connell, M, 1977 *Historic towns in Surrey*, SyAS Res Vol, 5

Pearce, J, and Vince A, 1988 *A Dated Type Series of London Medieval Pottery, part 4: Surrey Whitewares*, London Middlesex Archaeol Soc Special Paper, 10

Penn, J S, & Rolls J D, 1981 'Problems in the quaternary development of the Thames Valley around Kingston 'A Framework for Archaeology'', *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc*, 32, 1-11

Penn, J S, Field, D & Serjeantson, D, 1984 'Evidence of Neolithic occupation in Kingston: excavations at Eden Walk, 1965', SyAC, 75, 207-24

Potter, G, 1988 'The medieval bridge and waterfront at Kingston upon Thames', in Good, G L, Jones R H, & Ponsford, M W (eds), *Waterfront Archaeology*, CBA Res Rep, **74**, 140-152

Poulton, R, 1998 'Historic towns in Surrey – some general considerations', *SyAC*, **85**, 239-42

Poulton, R, 2004 Iron Age Surrey, 51-64 in Cotton, J et al, 2004

Rignold, S E 1975 'The Sutton Hoo coins in the light of the contemporary background of coinage in England. In the Sutton Hoo ship burial Volume 1 'Excavation background, the ship, dating and Inventory', Rupert Bruce Mitford, 1975

Roots, (Dr), 1854, letter to Alderman Gould. In Alderman Goulds scrapbook 'Kingston Heritage Local History Collection R4700, 51 (900)

Sampson, J, 1997 *Kingston Past*

Schofield, J, 1994 'Medieval and Later Towns', in Vyner, B (ed.), *Building on the Past*

Serjeantson, D, Field, D, Penny, J and Shipley, M 1992 'Excavations at Eden Walk II, Kingston. Environmental reconstruction and Prehistoric finds *SyAC* 81, 71-90

Smith, L T, John Leland. Itinerary in England and Wales in or about the years 1535-43 (LTS IV, 85)

John Speed (1632 3rd edition, Humble G). The History of Great Britain

Surrey Archaeological Collections 1998 *Archaeological investigations of historic Surrey towns: Chertsey, Dorking, Farnham and Godalming*, *SyAC*, **85**

Surrey Comet, July 28, 1900 'Death of Alderman Gould, J. P. A remarkable career'.

SyAC Surrey Archaeological Collections

SyAC, 1998 Archaeological investigations of historic Surrey towns; Chertsey, Dorking, Farnham and Godalming, *SyAC*, 85

Thorpe, B 1848, Florence of Worcester Chronicon ex Chronicis, EHSP Vol 1, 130

Turner, D J, 1987 'Archaeology of Surrey, 1066 - 1540', in Bird & Bird (eds) 1987, 223-261

Tweedle, D, Biddle, M, Kjolbe, Biddle, B. Corpus of Anglo Saxon Stone Sculpture Vol IV SE England, British Academy (1995), 146

VCH: The Victoria history of the county of Surrey (ed H E Malden), 1902-12, 4 Vols

Vince, A & Jenner, A 1991 Aspects of Saxon and Norman London finds and environmental evidence, London Middlesex Archaeol Soc Spec Pap, 12

Wakeford, J. 1984 Two wahl names in the fields of Kingston, SyAC 75, 251-6

Wakeford, J, 1990 *Kingston's past rediscovered*

Whitelock, D et al. 1961. The Anglo Saxon Chronicle, p68

Whitelock D, (ed Douglas D.C.) 1979 English Historical Documents, Vol 1, 500 – 1042, 551

UNPUBLISHED INTERVENTION REPORTS

<u>CODE</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
KA66	1966	1 Union Street
KES67	1967	Eden Walk
KC67	1967	27 High Street
KB67	No Details	No Details
KE68	1968	Fairfield Road
KD68	1968	Eden Street
KF69	1969	London Road
KG70	1970	Brook Street, Kingston
KJ71	1971	1 Thames Street
KH71	1971	21 Vicarage Road
KK72	1972	Old Bridge Wharf
KL73	1973	9 Fairfield Road
KES74	1974	Eden Street
KM75	1975	1A Fairfield West (Road)
No site code	1976	Eden Walk II (Kingston Archaeological Society)
No site code	1976	Guildhall Extension (Kingston Archaeological Society)
KO76	1976	29 Thames Street
No site code	1978	76 Eden Street (Kingston Archaeological Society)
No site code	1979	Guildhall Extension II, 15-17 High Street (Kingston Archaeological Society)
KT80	1980	Old Bridge Street
KU80	1980	Canbury Passage
KND82	1982	19 Union Street, Kingston Heritage/KUTAS
HOR82	1982	Horsefair/Old Bridge Street
KY83	1983	30-32 High Street
No site code	1983	Fairfield Road (Kingston Archaeological Society)
No site code	1983	'Old Public house (possibly Crown), Market Place (Apple Market) (Kingston Archaeological Society)
No site code	1984	Monday Market Site, Fairfield North (Kingston Archaeological Society)
HOR85	1985	Horsefair/Old Bridge Street
HOR86	1986	Horsefair/Old Bridge Street
BEN87	1987	Bentalls/Wood Street
BEN88	1988	Bentalls/Wood Street
CQD88	1988	Charter Quay
CLA88	1988	2 Clarence Street/34-36 Thames Street
CQD89	1989	Charter Quay

EPE89	1989	82 Eden Street, 7-17 Lady Booth Road
BDL89	1989	Bedlesford, 1 Wheatfield Way
BEN90	1990	Bentalls/West Street/Fife Road/Clarence Street
BIM90	1990	Bittoms Car Park
CQD90	1990	Charter Quay
TUK90	1990	Turks Boatyard
CHK91	1991	11a Church Street
POS92	1992	30 Portsmouth Road
EMP92	1992	99-101 Clarence Street
CWR92	1992	Cromwell Road Bus Station
LRK93	1993	84 London Road
KGS93	1993	Kingston Grammar School
THA93	1993	1 Thames Street
COZ94	1994	14-22 Cowleaze Road
CCD94	1994	29 Church Road
EDN95	1995	70-76 Eden Street
CPR95	1995	Old Kingston University Buildings, Canbury Park Road
CLD95	1995	6 Cromwell Road
KMG95	1995	Kingston Guildhall (Magistrates Court Extension), Bath Passage
PHR95	1995	3-4 Portsmouth Road, Milner Road
TDE95	1995	Steadfast Sea Cadets, Thameside
TIF95	1995	Tiffin School
ORR95	1995	Orchard Road
WWE95	1995	Wheatfield Way
TUR95	1995	Turks Boatyard
ACR96	1996	16 Acre Road
ELK96	1996	26-28 East Lane/The Bittoms
FED96	1996	14-18 Fife Road
KPS96	1996	Former Power Station, Skerne Road
SWK96	1996	Sopwith Way
SLK96	1996	South Lane
SAD96	1996	Steadfast Sea Cadets/Thameside
KBR97/KIB97	1997	Kingston Bridge Refurbishment
KCC97	1997	Kingston College, Penrhyn Road
CQY98	1998	Charter Quay
ELA98	1998	East Lane, 26-28 The Bittoms
BKH99	1999	Tiffins School
HGK99	1999	16-18 High Street
SKR99	1999	Former Kingston Gasworks, Skerne Road

LKC99	1999	Lovekyn Chapel, 70 London Road
CKT99	1999	59a-59b Clarence Street
CRG99	1999	26-38 Cromwell Road
CKD99	1999	Former Crown Court, Canbury Park Road
WDB00	2000	17-23 Woodbines Avenue
RMD00	2000	Former Gasworks, Richmond Road
OAP00	2000	4-6 Oaklea Passage
CMK00	2000	Rotunda, Cromwell Road
SCN01	2001	Former Gasworks, Skerne Road
LDK01	2001	21-23 London Road
CDK01	2001	21-23 London Road
LOK01	2001	41 London Road
KHR01	2001	The Bittoms
HSK02	2002	52a High Street
LTP03	2003	26-28 London Road/3-6 The Parade
TAD03	2003	Turks Boatyard
KGK04	2004	Kingston Grammar School, 82 London Road
KTP04	2004	Kingston Tup Public House, 88 London Road