HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT

EIGHT ALBERT EMBANKMENT

8 Albert Embankment (and adjoining sites) London SE1

Historic environment assessment

NGR 530622 178737

Sign-off history

issue no.	issue date	prepared by	reviewed by	approved by	reason for issue
6	06/02/20189	Rupert Featherby (Archaeology Tom Light (Graphics)	Rupert Featherby Lead Consultant	Chris Thomas Director	Sixth issue: client comments

PO code: PO950

www.mola.org.uk

Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED
tel 0207 410 2200 fax 0207 410 2201 email:enquiries@mola.org.uk
Museum of London Archaeology is a company limited by guarantee
Registered in England and Wales
Company registration number 07751831 Charity registration number 1143574
Registered office Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED

Contents

Executive summary 1

1 Introduction 3
1.1 Origin and scope of the report 3
1.2 Designated heritage assets 4
1.3 Aims and objectives 4

2 Methodology and sources consulted 5

3 Site location, topography and geology 7
3.1 Site location 7
3.2 Topography 7
3.3 Geology 7
3.4 Deposit Model 8
3.5 Summary 9

4 Archaeological and historical background 10
4.1 Overview of past investigations 10
4.2 Chronological summary 10

5 Statement of significance 18
5.1 Introduction 18
5.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival 18
5.3 Archaeological potential and significance 19

6 Impact of proposals 21
6.1 Proposals 21
6.2 Implications 21

7 Conclusion and recommendations 23

8 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets 25

9 Planning framework 28
9.1 Statutory protection 28
9.2 National Planning Policy Framework 28
9.3 Regional policy 30
9.4 Local planning policy 32

10 Determining significance 34

11 Non-archaeological constraints 35

12 Glossary 36

13 Bibliography 38
13.1 Published and documentary sources 38
13.2 Other Sources 39
13.3 Cartographic sources 39
13.4 Available site survey information checklist 40

Appended to this report is the Geoarchaeological Deposit Model report, 2017, and the Predetermination Archaeological Watching Brief report 2017

Figures

Cover: Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1871 (not to scale)

Fig 1 *Site location*

Fig 2 *Historic environment features map*

Fig 3 *Geology map*

Fig 4 *Location of 2009 geotechnical boreholes (Waterman-Group 2009)*

Fig 5 *Location of 2016 geotechnical boreholes in Central Site (Concept Site Investigations, dwg ref: 162894/01, dated November 2016)*

Fig 6 *Plan of Vauxhall Manor 1681*

Fig 7 *Rocque's map of 1746*

Fig 8 *Horwood's map of 1799*

Fig 9 *Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1871 (not to scale)*

Fig 10 *Goad Fire Insurance plan of Front and Middle Sites 1889 (www.bl.uk)*

Fig 11 *Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25":mile map of 1914 (not to scale)*

Fig 12 *Ordnance Survey 3rd edition revised 25":mile map of 1935 (not to scale)*

Fig 13 *Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1950 (not to scale)*

Fig 14 *Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1958 (not to scale)*

Fig 15 *West Site looking north-east. Grade II listed 1930s former London Fire Brigade headquarters centre and left. 1980s wing on the right (MOLA photo 01.12.2016)*

Fig 16 *Central Site looking west, comprising 1930s former London Fire Brigade maintenance depot (MOLA photo 01.12.2016)*

Fig 17 *East Site (in foreground) looking north-east. Building to the rear is outside the site (MOLA photo 01.12.2016)*

Fig 18 *Existing basement plan in West Site (The Gordon Tamalin Partnership; dwg. No. 8575.02; November 2007)*

Fig 19 *Existing basement plan in Central Site (The Gordon Tamalin Partnership; dwg. No. 8901.01; August 2009)*

Fig 20 *Projected locations of the 18th and 19th century Potteries and the 18th century Starch/Mustard Manufactory*

Fig 21 *Proposed site ground floor plan (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-Z0-00DR-A-03-0100, Rev P0, 05/10/2018)*

Fig 22 *Plan of proposed West Site basement level 1 (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-A0-B1-DR-A-10-0098, Rev P0 05/10/2018)*

Fig 23 *South/south-west facing section of the proposed West Site and basement in the northern half of the site (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-A0-DR-A-12-2101, Rev P0 05/10/2018)*

Fig 24 *South/south-west facing section of the proposed West Site and basement in the southern half of the site (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-A0-XX-DR-A-12-2100, Rev P0 05/10/2018)*

Fig 25 *East/south-east facing section of the proposed West Site and basement (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-A0-XX-DR-A-12-2104, Rev P0 05/10/2018)*

Fig 26 *Proposed Central Site basement level 2 (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-B0-B2-DR-A-10-0097, Rev P0 18/07/2018)*

Fig 27 *East/south-east facing section of the proposed Central Site and basement (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-B0-XX-DR-A-12-2200, Rev P0 05/10/2018)*

Fig 28 South/south-west facing section of the proposed Central Site and basement showing the Network Rail Viaduct (Pilbrow and Partners Drwg No 1528-PP-B0-XX-DR-A-11-2205, Rev P0 05/10/2018)

Fig 29 Plan of proposed East Site lower ground level (Pilbrow and Partners, Drwg No 1528-PP-C0-00-DR-A-10-0099, Rev P0, 05/10/2018)

Fig 30 West facing section of proposed East and lower ground (Pilbrow and Partners, Drwg No 1528-PP-C0-XX-DR-A-12-2300, Rev P0, 05/10/2018)

Note: site outlines may appear differently on some figures owing to distortions in historic maps. North is approximate on early maps.

Executive summary

GVA Second London Wall on behalf of U and I (8AE) Limited and the London Fire Commissioner (LFC), has commissioned MOLA to carry out a historic environment assessment in advance of proposed development at 8 Albert Embankment and adjoining sites in the London Borough of Lambeth. The development proposal encompasses three parcels of land. From west to east these comprise, the Grade II listed early 20th century former London Fire Brigade Headquarters, currently the Lambeth Fire Station ('West Site'; this includes a Grade II listed fire drill tower); the Fire Brigade maintenance depot, now referred to as The Workshop, to the east of Lambeth High Street ('Central Site'), and a small area of waste ground on the eastern site of the mid/late 19th century and later railway viaduct into Waterloo Station ('East Site'). All buildings date to the early 20th century, with the exception of the south-east wing of the former Headquarters building, which dates to the late 1970s and is not part of the listing for that building. The scheme comprises the demolition of the existing buildings, other than the listed structures, and the construction of new mixed-use buildings comprising residential, office, hotel, retail, gym and services spaces.

The majority of the site (West and Central Site) lies within the North Lambeth Archaeological Priority Area (APA), which is designated for Thames riverside activity, while the entire site lies within the Albert Embankment Conservation Area as designated by the London Borough of Lambeth.

This desk-based study assesses the impact on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). Although above ground heritage assets (historic structures) are not discussed in detail, they have been noted where they assist in the archaeological interpretation of the site. Buried heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals comprise:

- ***Doulton and Watts (later Doulton and Company) Pottery**. The Lambeth manufactory of this renowned pottery was established on the Central Site in the 1820s (its late 19th century headquarters building lies immediately south of the site and is Grade II listed). It was a major producer of art pottery and of ornamental and commemorative pieces and tablewares, along with sanitary stonewares and other industrial ceramics. It flourished until the 1950s, when the factory moved off site. There is high potential for footings of the manufactory buildings, kilns, and waster (misfired pottery) dumps, of medium or high heritage significance, depending on the nature and the extent of the remains.*
- ***Stiff's London Pottery**. The manufactory was established on the West Site by James Stiff, former mould maker at the Doulton Pottery, in the mid 19th century. It was famous for varied types of stoneware, notably colourful pottery. There is high potential in the north-east (outside the existing basement), for building footings, kilns, and waster dumps, of medium or high significance, along with a buried dock wall ('Stiff's Dock') in the north-west, of low or medium significance.*
- ***Early pottery manufactories**. This part of Lambeth, with close access to the Thames, was a flourishing centre of pottery manufacture from the late 16th and early 17th century. This included, in the early/mid 18th century, the Lambeth High Street Pot House in the West Site, which was established in seven old houses and a yard, formerly the London residence of the bishops of Hereford, and made a tin-glazed ware ('delftware'). Evidence of pottery industry has been found nearby, in the form of dumps of wasters. Such material can provide a valuable insight into processes and products, and developments in early manufacture techniques. Remains of pot house structures and processes would be of medium or high significance.*
- ***Starch/Mustard Manufactory**. This was established on the Central Site in the late 18th century. There is high potential for footings of buildings and evidence of industrial processes, of low or medium significance.*
- ***Later medieval and post-medieval settlement**. The West and Central Sites were located in the historic settlement of Lambeth Water. There is moderate potential for remains of settlement activity including footings of houses, rubbish and cess pits and early small-scale industrial activity of low or medium significance.*

Archaeological survival is expected to be low across two-thirds of the West Site, and a small area in the south of the Central Site, beneath existing basement levels here. Survival is expected to be high across the remainder of the three sites.

The deepening of the east of the existing basement level on the West Site a further 2.0m is unlikely to have any further impact to archaeological remains, which have likely already been removed. The extension of the basement into the unbasemented area to a depth –1.0m OD would cut into the underlying natural geology and remove all remains within its footprint. The construction of new basement levels to a finished floor level of between –4.8m and –5.8m OD in the Central Site would entirely remove any archaeological remains present and extend well into the natural geologies. The excavation of a new lower ground floor in the East Site would remove any remains that may be present, although the bases of very deep cut features may survive.

The insertion of new piled foundations would not have any further impact to archaeological remains within the extents of the basement areas. One proposed building (A1) extends beyond the footprint of the existing basement on the West Site. The new piled foundations in this area, along with pile caps and ground beams would severely truncate any remains that may be present. The piled secant wall along the southern, eastern and northern boundaries of the proposed basement in the West Site would remove all remains in its footprint.

Owing to the generally high survival potential on the site for remains of up to High significance it is likely that the local authority will ask for further site specific work to clarify the nature and extent of remains. This could comprise a targeted evaluation of test pits or trenches on the site, and would be used to inform the local authority's advisor of a suitable mitigation strategy.

Whilst the decision would ultimately lie with the LPA's archaeological advisor based on the results of the evaluation, it is likely that for extensive, well preserved remains, an archaeological excavation of impact areas would be requested to ensure that no archaeologically sensitive material is removed without prior recording. For areas of poorly preserved remains, it is likely that no more than a watching brief on impact areas would be required.

Any such works would be carried out under an approved Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

1 Introduction

1.1 Origin and scope of the report

1.1.1 GVA Second London Wall on behalf of U and I (8AE) Limited and the London Fire Commissioner (LFC) has commissioned MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology) to carry out a historic environment assessment in advance of proposed development at 8 Albert Embankment and adjoining sites Lambeth, SE1 (National Grid Reference 530622 178737: Fig 1). The development proposal encompasses three parcels of land. From west to east these comprise:

- *West Site*. This comprises the Grade II listed early 20th century former Headquarters of the London Fire Brigade, which continues to operate as the Lambeth Fire Station, the former Communication Mobilising Centre (CMC Building), the contemporary Grade II listed Drill Tower and hardstanding used for parking.
- *Central Site*. Located to the east of Lambeth High Street, this comprises the previous Fire Station vehicle maintenance workshops, and associated hard standing, The Workshop, now used as a temporary Fire Brigade Museum and events space.
- *East Site*. Currently unoccupied hard standing on the eastern site of the railway viaduct previously used for parking by the London Fire Brigade – now leased temporarily for community garden.

1.1.2 Other than the two Grade II listed buildings, the scheme comprises the demolition of the existing buildings. These date to the early 20th century with the exception of the south-east wing of the former Headquarters building, which dates to the late 1970s and is not part of the listing for that building. Following the demolition of these buildings, new mixed-use buildings comprising residential, office, hotel and services space would be constructed. The development includes the construction of basement levels including:

- *West Site:* deepening the eastern extent of the existing basement a further 2.0m and its extension northwards by 16%;
- *Central Site:* The excavation of a new two level basement across the area footprint to a maximum depth of *c* 11m below ground level;
- *East Site:* The excavation of a new lower ground floor level across the area footprint.

1.1.3 This desk-based study assesses the impact of the scheme on buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). It forms a technical appendix in support of an Environmental Statement, assessing the impact of the proposed development (hereafter the three parcels are collectively referred to as the 'site') on the historic environment. It will enable the archaeological advisors to the local planning authority (LPA) to formulate an appropriate response in the light of the impact upon any known or possible heritage assets. These are parts of the historic environment which are considered to be significant because of their historic, evidential, aesthetic and/or communal interest.

1.1.4 This report deals solely with the archaeological implications of the development and does not cover possible built heritage issues, except where buried parts of historic fabric are likely to be affected. Above ground assets (ie, designated and undesignated historic structures and conservation areas) on the site or in the vicinity that are relevant to the archaeological interpretation of the site are discussed. Whilst the significance of above ground assets is not assessed in this archaeological report, direct physical impacts upon such arising from the development proposals are noted. The report does not assess issues in relation to the setting of above ground assets (eg visible changes to historic character and views). This archaeological report is not intended to support an application for Listed Building Consent.

1.1.5 This assessment updates a desk-based assessment issued in November 2010 (MOLA 2010) for a planning application for an earlier scheme that was refused (London Borough of Lambeth, ref: 10/04473/FUL).

1.1.6 The assessment has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG 2018; see section 9 of this report) and to standards specified by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA Dec 2014a, 2014b),

Historic England (EH 2008, HE 2015), and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS 2015). Under the 'Copyright, Designs and Patents Act' 1988 MOLA retains the copyright to this document.

1.1.7 Note: within the limitations imposed by dealing with historical material and maps, the information in this document is, to the best knowledge of the author and MOLA, correct at the time of writing. Further archaeological investigation, more information about the nature of the present buildings, and/or more detailed proposals for redevelopment may require changes to all or parts of the document.

1.2 Designated heritage assets

1.2.1 The Front Site contains two Grade II listed buildings, the former London Fire Brigade headquarters (**HEA 1a** on Fig 2) and the Drill Tower (**HEA 1b**), both built in the 1930s and officially opened in 1937. The late 19th century Grade II listed Southbank House (**HEA 25**), formerly the headquarters building for Doulton's Lambeth Pottery, lies just outside the site, adjacent to the southern boundary of the Central Site.

1.2.2 The site does not contain any further nationally designated (protected) heritage assets, such as scheduled monuments or registered parks and gardens.

1.2.3 The entire site lies within the Albert Embankment Conservation Area (CA57) as designated by the London Borough of Lambeth. This area is characterised by large office buildings, the majority of which date from the 20th century, fronting the River Thames along the Albert Embankment.

1.2.4 There are three locally listed buildings in close proximity to the site: the former Queen's head public house (71 Black Prince Road), built in 1890 (**HEA 28**), is located 10m from the southern boundary of the Rear Site, on the opposite site of Black Prince Road, while the mid 19th century Windmill public house (44 Lambeth High Street) (**HEA 29**) is adjacent to the north-east corner of the Front Site. The historic graveyard on Lambeth High Street, 40m north of the site, is a locally listed designated space and landscape (**HEA 19,** Basil Holmes 1896, 188) and contains a Grade II listed 18th century wall belonging to the former burial ground.

1.2.5 The majority of the site (West and Central Site) lies within the North Lambeth Archaeological Priority Area (APA), which includes prehistoric settlement, Roman settlement and boat, medieval riverside zone village centres and important houses, post-medieval settlement and early industrial development (Lambeth Local Plan 2015). GLAAS is currently re-assessing APAs throughout the London boroughs in line with new guidelines to link archaeological sensitivity tiers to specific thresholds for triggering archaeological advice and assessment. LBL's APAs are due to be reviewed in 2019 (historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/greater-london-archaeological-priority-areas/).

1.3 Aims and objectives

1.3.1 The aim of the assessment is to:

- identify the presence of any known or potential buried heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals;
- describe the significance of such assets, as required by national planning policy (see section 9 for planning framework and section 10 for methodology used to determine significance);
- assess the likely impacts upon the significance of the assets arising from the proposals; and
- provide recommendations for further assessment where necessary of the historic assets affected, and/or mitigation aimed at reducing or removing completely any adverse impacts upon buried heritage assets and/or their setting.

2 Methodology and sources consulted

2.1.1 For the purposes of this report the documentary and cartographic sources, including results from any archaeological investigations in the site and a study area around it were examined in order to determine the likely nature, extent, preservation and significance of any buried heritage assets that may be present within the site or its immediate vicinity and has been used to determine the potential for previously unrecorded heritage assets of any specific chronological period to be present within the site.

2.1.2 In order to set the site into its full archaeological and historical context, information was collected on the known historic environment features within a 200m-radius study area around the area of proposed development, as held by the primary repositories of such information within Greater London. These comprise the Greater London Historic Environment Record (HER) and the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC). The HER is managed by Historic England and includes information from past investigations, local knowledge, find spots, and documentary and cartographic sources. The LAARC includes a public archive of past investigations and is managed by the Museum of London. The study area was considered through professional judgement to be appropriate to characterise the historic environment of the site. Occasionally there may be reference to assets beyond this study area, where appropriate, e.g., where such assets are particularly significant and/or where they contribute to current understanding of the historic environment.

2.1.3 In addition, the following sources were consulted:

- MOLA – in-house Geographical Information System (GIS) with statutory designations GIS data, the locations of all key indicators of known prehistoric and Roman activity across Greater London, past investigation locations, projected Roman roads and burial grounds from the Holmes burial ground survey of 1896; georeferenced published historic maps; Defence of Britain survey data, in-house archaeological deposit survival archive; and archaeological publications, including a MOLA monograph on the Doulton stoneware pothouse in Lambeth (Tyler *et al*, 2005) and a MOLA monograph on London's delftware industry (Tyler *et al*, 2008);
- Historic England – information on statutory designations including scheduled monuments and listed buildings, along with identified Heritage at Risk;
- The London Society Library – published histories and journals;
- London Metropolitan Archive – historic maps and published histories;
- British National Copyright Library – historic Ordnance Survey maps from the first edition (1860–70s) to the present day;
- British Geological Survey (BGS) – solid and drift geology digital map; online BGS geological borehole record data;
- Waterman – existing site survey and architectural drawings as existing (The Gordon Tomalin Partnership 2007 and 2009), proposed drawings (Pilbrow & Partners Oct 2018) geotechnical investigation (Waterman 2009);
- GVA Second Wall – geotechnical investigation (Concept 2016), basement impact assessment (WSP/ December 2017;
- Internet - web-published material including LPA local plan, and information on conservation areas and locally listed buildings.

2.1.4 The assessment included a site visit carried out on the 1 December 2016 in order to determine the topography of the site and existing land use/the nature of the existing buildings on the site, and to provide further information on areas of possible past ground disturbance and general historic environment potential. Observations made on the site visit have been incorporated into this report. It was not possible to access the basement in the Central Site and most of the basement in the Front Site due the risk from asbestos contamination.

2.1.5 Fig 2 shows the location of known historic environment features within the study area. These have been allocated a unique historic environment assessment reference number (**HEA 1, 2**, etc), which is listed in a gazetteer at the back of this report and is referred to in the text. Where there are a considerable number of listed buildings in the study area, only those within the

vicinity of the site (i.e. within 100m) are included, unless their inclusion is considered relevant to the study. Conservation areas are not shown. Archaeological Priority Zones are shown where appropriate. All distances quoted in the text are approximate (within 5m).

2.1.6 Section 10 sets out the criteria used to determine the significance of heritage assets. This is based on four values set out in Historic England's *Conservation principles, policies and guidance* (EH 2008), and comprise evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value. The report assesses the likely presence of such assets within (and beyond) the site, factors which may have compromised buried asset survival (i.e. present and previous land use), as well as possible significance.

2.1.7 Section 11 includes non-archaeological constraints. Section 12 contains a glossary of technical terms. A full bibliography and list of sources consulted may be found in section 13 with a list of existing site survey data obtained as part of the assessment.

3 Site location, topography and geology

3.1 Site location

3.1.1 The area of proposed development is located in Lambeth east of Albert Embankment road and the River Thames, to the south-east of Lambeth Bridge. The site has been divided into three areas for the purpose of this assessment (Fig 1):

- The West Site is located at 8 Albert Embankment (NGR 530528 178760) and comprises the former London Fire Brigade Headquarters (now Lambeth Fire Station), a Grade II listed building, a Drill Tower, also Grade II listed in the north-east corner, and car park which spans three quarters of the site. The site is bounded by Albert Embankment to the west, the international Maritime Organisation building and its rear access road to the north, Lambeth High Street to the east and Black Prince Road to the south.
- The Central Site is located at the workshop site (NGR 530622 178737). The site is bounded by Whitgift Street to the north, the railway viaduct from Waterloo to the east, the Grade II listed Southbank House to the south and Lambeth High Street to the west.
- The East Site is located on waste ground (NGR 530693 178674) the opposite side of the railway viaduct to the Central Site. It is bounded by open ground used for car parking and then the railway viaduct to the west, the same open ground and then 22 Newport Street to the north, Newport Street to the east and Black Prince Road to the south.

3.1.2 All three areas fall within the northern part of the historic parish of Lambeth, and lay within the county of Surrey prior to being absorbed into the administration of the Greater London Borough of Lambeth.

3.1.3 The western boundary of the West Site lies just 25m east of the River Thames, which flows roughly south to north in this location.

3.2 Topography

3.2.1 Topography can provide an indication of suitability for settlement, and ground levels can indicate whether the ground has been built up or truncated, which can have implications for archaeological survival (see section 5.2).

3.2.2 The topography is relatively flat although there is a very gradual slope down from east to west towards the River Thames which lies 25m to the west of the western boundary of the West Site. It is likely the Thames frontage has been artificially raised to form the Albert Embankment. At the West Site the north-east corner lies at 4.2m Ordnance Datum (OD), the south-east corner at 4.0m OD, the south-west corner at 4.4m OD and the north-west corner at 4.6m OD. The Middle Site is flat with all four corners lying at 4.2m OD. The Rear Site slopes up from the south-east corner (4.5m OD) to the north-west corner (4.8m OD), although this may be due to the demolition of earlier buildings.

3.3 Geology

3.3.1 Geology can provide an indication of suitability for early settlement, and potential depth of remains.

3.3.2 The British Geological Survey (BGS) digital data indicates the underlying geology of the site comprises the Kempton Park Gravel (Fig 3) over London Clay. A survey undertaken of the geology of Lambeth, based on borehole records, confirmed this geological sequence (Densem and Doidge 1979). The western edge of the West Site may overlie alluvial deposits which, being heavily waterlogged, have good potential to contain a range of environmental remains.

3.3.3 In November 2008 an intrusive Site investigation was carried out within the West and Central Sites by Waterman-Group (Waterman-Group 2009). This was done solely for engineering

(non-archaeological) purposes and comprised three boreholes (BH1, 2 and 3) the locations of which are shown on Fig 4. The survey showed a layer of made ground across the area. It is likely that the upper deposits of made ground are relatively modern in date, while the lower deposits could potentially be of archaeological interest. The results of the survey are shown in the Table 1 below. The thick deposits of made ground in BH2 (in the west of the Middle Site) may be the result of the fill/backfill of a pit, and it is likely that the top of the natural gravel has been truncated in this part of the Central Site.

3.3.4 The archaeological excavation at 9 Albert Embankment (**HEA 23**) 50m to the south recorded the top of the gravels between 3.1m OD and 2.8m OD (1.5-1.8mbgl).

Table 1: summary of 2009 geotechnical data for West and Central Sites (Waterman Group 2009)
Levels are in metres below ground level (mbgl)

BH/TP ref.	Made ground	Top of Gravel
BH1 (West Site)	<2.3	2.3mbgl
BH2 (Central Site)	<5.9	5.9mbgl
BH3 (Central Site)	<1.8	1.8mbgl

3.3.5 Previous geotechnical boreholes from the BGS and a geotechnical survey by Concept in November 2016, within the site and the immediate surrounding area have to create a geoarchaeological deposit model, the results of which are presented below (MOLA 2017).

3.4 Deposit Model

3.4.1 The Geoarchaeological deposit model produced by MOLA to supplement this assessment (See Appendix 1) provides a preliminary indication of the buried stratigraphy on the site and the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential, but should not be taken as the full or correct interpretation of the past environments that formerly existed here.

3.4.2 Deposits of archaeological or palaeoenvironmental interest are discussed below in stratigraphic order, from the oldest to the most recent, and illustrated in the cross-section drawn across the site (See Appendix 1, Fig 3). The study area has been divided into landscape zones on the basis of the location, extent and thickness of the various deposits identified in the deposit model and shown on the plan and transects (See Appendix 1, Fig 4). For a full description of the deposits and landscape zones identified in the geoarchaeological deposit model see Appendix 1, a summary of the deposit descriptions and relevant landscape zones is presented below.

Terrace / floodplain Gravels

3.4.3 The present course of the River Thames and its main tributaries (such as the River Lea) was established about 0.5 million years ago. Subsequent cold and warm climate periods caused alternating erosion (downcutting) and deposition. This, together with a background gradual tectonic uplift, led to a sequence of progressively younger Pleistocene deposits down the valley sides. These (mainly gravel) deposits form a series of terraces, which represent former floodplains of the river that subsequently became incised and left dry as the river down-cut to lower levels.

3.4.4 According to BGS (1994) mapping, the Pleistocene gravels at the site may include deposits of the Taplow Gravel (280,000 – 180,000 years ago) or the younger (and slightly lower) Kempton Park Gravel (120,000 – 30,000 years ago). Based on the results of the Lea Valley Mapping Project, the higher gravels at the site (underlying Landscape Zone 1) are part of the 'high terrace', which has been dated to around 72,000 years ago and is therefore of similar age to the Kempton Park/East Tilbury Marshes Gravel (Corcoran *et al* 2011).

Holocene Alluvium

3.4.5 Within the Thames floodplain, alluvium (waterborne sediments) above *c* 0.0m OD is generally thought to date from the Mesolithic through to the post-medieval period. Alluvial deposits are associated with rises in sea level which created a gradual transition from marshland to mudflats/saltmarsh as alluvium was deposited across the floodplain.

Made ground

3.4.6 Due to the variable level of detail in recording made ground, modern, historic and undated made ground has not been separated in the geoarchaeological deposit model. The majority of the made ground on the site is likely to have formed as part of demolition activities in the latter half of the 20th century.

Landscape Zones

3.4.7 The geoarchaeological deposit model identified three landscape zones within its study area; the site falls into two of the landscape zones where slightly different sequences of deposits exist (See Appendix 1, Fig 4):

- Landscape Zone 1 covers the bulk of the Development Area. The zone defines an area that sits on a higher level of terrace gravels overlain by made ground. No alluvium is likely to exist in this zone and the surface of the natural gravels has in places been truncated by post medieval development.
- Landscape Zone 2 covers the central area of the West site. The zone defines an area of deep truncation associated in part with cellar construction. All archaeologically significant material has been removed. This might extend further across the West site in particular.
- Landscape Zone 3 is limited to two small areas in the north west of the whole site, one partly within the West site and the other in very north-west tip of the Central site. The zone defines an area where the surface of the terrace gravels is lower, and is in places overlain by Holocene alluvium. Areas of low Gravel closer to the river were probably minor channels, which became increasingly redundant as the pattern of water flow changed in the Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene. They can contain fine-grained and organic sediments from later periods.

3.5 Summary

3.5.1 The results of the deposit model and geotechnical investigations suggest that truncated gravel deposits can be observed as high as 1.4mbgl. While a thin band of alluvial deposits may survive within two small areas of the site, one partly within the West site and the other in very north-west tip of the Central site, in general past developments have truncated down into the underlying gravels.

4 Archaeological and historical background

4.1 Overview of past investigations

4.1.1 A watching brief on site investigation works was carried out by MOLA in 2017 on the West Site (**HEA 1a**). This involved the monitoring of four test pits excavated by the client's contractor. Test pit 1 uncovered a red brick floor 1.3m below ground level with a rubble fill containing ceramics. The location of this test pit in relation to the plans of Stiff's pottery works suggest that it is within one of the warehouses, possibly at a cellar or basement level. Test Pit 2 recorded stock bricks located under granite blocks immediately beneath ground level, these were tested with a keyhole and found to extend a further *c* 5.8m in depth. It is likely that this is the location of the dock wall. Further remains of the dock wall were uncovered in Test Pit 3; a horizontal core drilled at basement level recorded a *c* 1.0m thick stock brick wall, faced with asphalt behind the red brick skin basement wall. Test pit 4, a borehole drilled from basement level, recorded 0.75m thick reinforced concrete, overlying asphalt (interpreted as a damp course layer), beneath this was two courses of yellow stock brick, although the core was stopped at this depth (1.1m beneath the basement level) due to water pressure.

4.1.2 Archaeological investigations have been carried out at 14 locations within the 200m radius study area. Eight of these investigations recorded evidence of pottery manufacture in the area dating from the 17th century through to the 20th century. Little archaeological evidence dating to earlier periods has been recorded during these past investigations, although prehistoric flint tools, a single sherd of Roman pottery, medieval pottery, field boundaries/ditches and cultivation soil have been recovered. The results of these investigations, along with other known sites and finds within the study area, are discussed by period, below.

4.2 Chronological summary

Prehistoric period (800,000 BC–AD 43)

4.2.1 The Lower (800,000–250,000 BC) and Middle (250,000–40,000 BC) Palaeolithic saw alternating warm and cold phases and intermittent perhaps seasonal occupation. During the Upper Palaeolithic (40,000–10,000 BC), after the last glacial maximum, and in particular after around 13,000 BC, further climate warming took place and the environment changed from steppe-tundra to birch and pine woodland. It is probably at this time that England saw continuous occupation. Erosion has removed much of the Palaeolithic land surfaces and finds are typically residual.

4.2.2 The Mesolithic hunter-gather communities of the postglacial period (10,000–4000 BC) inhabited a still largely wooded environment. The river valleys and coast would have been favoured in providing a predictable source of food (from hunting and fishing) and water, as well as a means of transport and communication. Evidence of activity is characterised by flint tools rather than structural remains.

4.2.3 The Neolithic (4000–2000 BC), Bronze Age (2000–600 BC) and Iron Age (600 BC–AD 43) are traditionally seen as the time of technological change, settled communities and the construction of communal monuments. Farming was established and forest cleared for cultivation. An expanding population put pressure on available resources and necessitated the utilisation of previously marginal land.

4.2.4 The location of the site on well-draining gravel close to the predictable resources (eg game, fish and water) of the River Thames would have been ideal for occupation during this period. Little evidence dating to the prehistoric has been recorded within the study area. An archaeological excavation at 19 Albert Embankment (**HEA 13**) 100m to the south of the West Site, recorded a variety of prehistoric flint tools (probably dating from the Palaeolithic and Neolithic periods), which may represent a flint working site. Prehistoric worked flints were also found during an archaeological evaluation at Lambeth Bridge House (**HEA 17**) 120m north of the West Site. The GLHER also locates a chance find of a late Neolithic to late Bronze Age spearhead (**HEA 1h**) within the Middle Site. However, the precise location of this find is uncertain. The grid reference given in the GLHER locates it within the site but the address 'off

Millbank' suggests it was found outside the site and possibly not even within the study area.

4.2.5 The nearest known remains dating to the later prehistoric period are from Waterloo Station where worked flints and Late Bronze Age pottery recovered during an archaeological investigation (site code: WSD89) 880m to the north of the site, outside the study area, while remains dating to the Late Mesolithic/Early Neolithic periods have been found during archaeological excavations (site code: WSC90) 950m north-east of the site, again, at Waterloo Station. These consisted of cut features, pits, post-holes and linear slots at the junction of sands and alluvial silts. These features and the surrounding sands produced many worked flints and potsherds. Undated prehistoric cut features and finds have also been found in the vicinity of Waterloo Station and a little closer to the site, in Lambeth Palace Gardens 530m north of the site where two undated pits and a gully of possible prehistoric date from which a small amount of worked flint debitage was recovered, were recorded (site code: LPL11).

Roman period (AD 43–410)

4.2.6 During the Roman period the site probably lay within the hinterland of *Londinium* (London), which lay on the north side of the River Thames in the area of the City *c* 2.2km to the north-east of the site. Settlement and other activity in the general area would have been influenced by administrative and infrastructure factors associated with the establishment of *Londinium* as the provincial capital by the 2nd century AD. Small, rural settlements, typically located along the major roads leading to the capital, acted both as markets and as producers to the capital (MoLAS 2000, 150).

4.2.7 It is traditionally believed that there was an early Roman river crossing in the Lambeth area, based largely on the possible remains of a Roman road excavated in the grounds of Lambeth Palace in 1935 (*Survey of London* 1951, 1) 600m to the north of the site. The river was possibly fordable at this point (*c* 600m to the north of the site), providing access to Thorney Island (in the area of Westminster Abbey), although no physical evidence for the river crossing has been found to date. Despite the location of the site on well-draining gravels close to the River Thames, which would have been ideal for occupation, the only evidence of Roman occupation or activity that has been recorded within the study area is a single sherd of Roman pottery found during an archaeological evaluation at Lambeth Bridge House (**HEA 17**) 120m north of the West Site.

4.2.8 Little activity has been recorded in the wider area either, the closest being in Lambeth Palace Gardens 530m north of the site, where a worked soil horizon cut by a posthole and a pit which produced abraded Roman pottery was noted during an archaeological investigation (site code: LEG94), while at St Thomas's Hospital 630m north of the site a single cut feature containing a sherd of Roman pottery and a fragment of tile were recovered (site code: LMP00).

Early medieval (Saxon) period (AD 410–1066)

4.2.9 Following the withdrawal of the Roman army from England in the early 5th century AD the whole country fell into an extended period of socio-economic decline. In the 9th and 10th centuries, the Saxon Minster system began to be replaced by local parochial organisation, with formal areas of land centred on nucleated settlements served by a parish church.

4.2.10 The name 'Lambeth' occurs in many forms in early records. It is of Saxon origin and signifies either a harbour or quay from which sheep were shipped, or a muddy harbour. Of the two the latter seems the more likely (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 1–11).

4.2.11 The shallow crossing point on the Thames *c* 600m to the north, possibly established during the Roman period, continued in use (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 1–11). Situated near the edge of the river is the parish church of St Mary at Lambeth, on Lambeth Palace Road 350m to the north of the site. This was founded before the Norman Conquest of 1066 (*ibid*, 104–17). The exact location of settlement in this period is uncertain, but was probably close to the church, with a manor house in the vicinity of the later site of Lambeth Palace 270m to north of the site (VCH *Surrey* iv, 44–50). The Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) suggests that the Saxon settlement known as Lambeth Water (**HEA 10**) was located *c* 200m to the south of Lambeth Palace and *c* 100m to north of the Front and Middle Sites.

4.2.12 It appears that, before the Conquest, the parish may have comprised three manors (estates). Domesday Book (1086) identifies two of these as 'Lambeth', one being associated with St Mary's, which may therefore be assumed to be in the northern part of the parish extending

south to the area of modern Harleyford Road and the Oval 700m to the south of the site to the west along the river front (Renier 2006, 13). The other manor of Lambeth, known as South Lambeth probably included the study area. To the south and east lay Kennington manor.

4.2.13 The manor of St Mary's Lambeth is mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in 1042 as the place where King Hardecanute died (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 1–11). At the time of the Conquest (1066) it belonged to the Countess Goda, sister to King Edward the Confessor (VCH *Surrey* iv, 50–64).

4.2.14 Apart from the settlement of Lambeth Water, no evidence of Saxon activity has been recorded within the study area. In all likelihood the site lay in open fields or woodland outside the main settlement.

Later medieval period (AD 1066–1485)

4.2.15 By the end of the 11th century the manor of Lambeth had come into the possession of the Crown, and been granted by King William Rufus to the Benedictine convent of St. Andrew, Rochester (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 1–11; VCH *Surrey* iv, 44–50). In 1196, the Archbishop of Canterbury acquired the manor and may have used the manor house as a residence (VCH *Surrey* iv, 44–50). In the late 13th century Archbishop Boniface began rebuilding it to create Lambeth Palace, 270m to the north of the site. The location was conveniently close to Westminster, which was linked to Lambeth by a horse-ferry, and which had become a centre of government. The main settlement during this period consisted of a few houses near the church 350m to the north and a narrow strip of buildings bordering the river up to Vauxhall. The GLHER (HER 090038) suggests the centre point of this settlement is located 230m to the north of the site. There were also houses along Church Street (now Lambeth Road) but otherwise little building further from the river than Lambeth High Street.

4.2.16 It is likely that houses also lined Black Prince Road (**HEA 14**) immediately to the south of the site, which was established in the later medieval period (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 142–3). The plan of Vauxhall Manor in 1681 (Fig 5), shows the location and layout of the settlement of Lambeth Water, and it is probable that the medieval settlement had a similar layout suggesting that the site was in the settlement bounds.

4.2.17 Medieval pottery has been recorded in the vicinity of the settlement during an archaeological watching brief (**HEA 9**) 70m to the north of the Front and Middle Sites, and also during an archaeological evaluation at 11–21 Old Paradise Street (**HEA 20**) 160m to the north of the Middle Site, although the finds were recorded as being residual during the latter investigation.

4.2.18 By 1331, the northern part of Lambeth parish included the settlements of Lambeth, Kennington, Stockwell and South Lambeth, Tulse Hill and Norwood (VCH *Surrey* iv, 44–50).

4.2.19 Of the medieval parish church of St Mary at Lambeth 230m to north of the site, only the tower now survives. The previously wooden church was rebuilt in flint and stone between 1374 and 1378, and the body of the church rebuilt again in the late 15th and early 16th centuries (Roberts and Godfrey 1951, 104–17).

4.2.20 The archaeological excavation at 19 Albert Embankment (**HEA 13**) 100m to the south of the site, recorded medieval field boundaries and cultivation soils, suggesting that much of the area to the south comprised agricultural land and it is possible that the majority of the site was also under cultivation. A medieval ditch and a medieval sand and gravel quarry (**HEA 17**) have been recorded 120m to the north of the Front and Middle Sites, while medieval deposits have been recorded cutting into the natural Gravel and Sands at 9 Newport Street (**HEA 21**) 100m north-east of the Middle Site.

4.2.21 A medieval road (**HEA 14**) would have provided access along the river front and to properties between Lambeth and Vauxhall. This road ran along, or just outside, the southern boundary of the Front and Rear Sites on the line now followed by Black Prince Road. Lambeth High Street (**HEA 30**), running between the Front and the Middle Sites, and Lambeth Road (**HEA 31**) 110m north of the West Site are also recorded in the GLHER as following the line of earlier medieval roads.

4.2.22 During the later medieval period the site either lay on the edge of the medieval settlement of Lambeth Water, or on its periphery in open agricultural fields. A medieval road ran through the site from north to south, so may have attracted some roadside activity, as may the road running adjacent to the southern boundary of the Front and Rear Sites.

Post-medieval period (AD 1485–present)

4.2.23 The Archbishops of Canterbury continued as lords of the manor of Lambeth until the 17th century (VCH *Surrey* iv, 44–50). The settlement continued to spread southwards along the riverfront, primarily along Fore Street and Back Lane (now Lambeth High Street) running between the West and Central Sites. Buildings here included the Kings Head, an inn known from 1580, *c* 100m to the north-west of the site and the townhouse or palace of the Bishops of Hereford which is believed to have been located within the West Site, although this has not be observed archaeologically. The date of its construction is unknown but it is mentioned in the late 17th century (Allen 1826, 345). Between Cockett's and King's Head alleys, *c* 150m to the north-west, was a school where Francis Moore, the originator of Old Moore's Almanac, lived and taught in the late 17th/early 18th centuries.

4.2.24 As mentioned above, the plan of Vauxhall Manor in 1681 (Fig 6), shows the location and layout of the settlement of Lambeth Water, within which the West and Central Sites were situated.

4.2.25 A major focus of archaeological interest in the area, other than the historic settlement, is centred upon the evidence for post-medieval pottery industries, which flourished in Lambeth from at least the 17th century and possibly the late 16th century (Tyler *et al* 2005, 9). The types of pottery manufactured in Lambeth reflected all aspects of the market, from the robust and utilitarian, to the fragile and decorative. Finds relating to these industries have been made close to the site, in the form of dumps of waste material disposed of by the pothouses. These 'waster' fragments typically comprise pottery that mis-fired in the kiln. Such material can provide a valuable insight into processes and products of the factory, including any developments of manufacture techniques.

4.2.26 In 1963, dumps of waste were discovered at Bruce House 60m to the south of the Central Site (**HEA 26**). These waster dumps were located in formerly open land, and came from a nearby manufactory producing red wares in the late 16th century. This included a group of coarse earthenware wasters, including milk pans, pipkins, jugs, large storage vessels and industrial vessels (TBAOG 1964, 21–2). Many of the pots were glazed dark brown or green, whilst others were decorated with yellow slip (Tyler *et al* 2005, 9). It has been suggested that these wares may be associated with potters working in Lambeth, at locations unknown, from *c* 1590–1610 (Edwards 1974, 4). Further dumps of red ware wasters, including fragments of kiln furniture, were found in 1988 during archaeological investigations 110m to the south of the Front and Middle Sites (**HEA 13**).

4.2.27 In the late 16th century pottery production of a newly fashionable white pottery, tin-glazed earthenware moved to London. Factories were established in Southwark, Lambeth and Vauxhall (Draper 2001, 26). Rocque's map of 1746 (Fig 7) shows that the riverfront development had by this date extended back (eastwards) from the river into what would previously have been open fields. The Lambeth High Street Pot House (**HEA 1e**), which manufactured tin-glazed ware (known colloquially as delftware) from *c* 1732 to *c* 1793, lies within the southern half and possibly the central part of the West Site (Tyler *et al* 2008, 11, 19). It was established in seven old houses and a yard, which was formerly the London residence of the bishops of Hereford (*ibid*, 112). The first years do not appear to have been successful and in 1737 the pothouse, which had been declared bankrupt, was bought by Joseph Fortee, the owner of the Norfolk House pothouse nearby. Fortee took on a number of apprentices for the business (*ibid*, 95).

4.2.28 Other than the Lambeth Pot House, Rocque's map also shows a row of tenements front The Fore Street, now the site of the Albert Embankment in the west of the site and Coquet Alley in the north of the site. A small row of buildings, also probably tenements, runs on a north-south alignment through the central part of the West Site. In the Central Site, tenements front onto Back Lane (Lambeth High Street) along the western boundary of the site, while an L-shaped building lies in the central northern part. The majority of site, particularly the eastern part, remains undeveloped and comprises gardens, or market gardens and orchards. The East Site possibly contains part of a small building in the south-east corner, but most of the site is market garden.

4.2.29 At the far end of Lambeth High Street, *c* 210m to the north of the site, opposite Lambeth Palace, was another tin-glaze manufactory at Norfolk House, which operated from 1680 to 1772–9 under the ownership of Joseph Fortee. Tin-glaze pothouses were also located immediately north of Vauxhall Bridge *c* 670m to the south of the site (1683–1802), Glasshouse

Street (1743–1846) and Copthall (1676–1730) (Britton 1987, 52–67).

4.2.30 Waste from the tin-glaze pothouses was often dumped locally. During the 1930s and 1940s, pottery fragments were recovered during development to the west and east of Lambeth High Street (Bloice and Thorn 1969; Garner 1937). One pottery group (**HEA 1e**) was recovered from the site of the Lambeth High Street Pot House (Bloice and Thorn 1969, 59) and included sherds of saggars with triangular peg holes, biscuit-ware basins, bottles, chargers, drug jars, plates (small), porringers, posset pots, punch bowls and tile. Glazed wares included bowls, chargers and plates decorated in blue, purple and polychrome designs including geometric and Chinese-style patterns (Garner 1937, 50–5). The location of these finds is uncertain, however. The GLHER GIS locates them within the West Site, while giving an address at 12–18 Embankment 10m south of the West Site. Further 18th century kiln waster dumps are also recorded as having been found within the West Site in the 1930s (**HEA 1d**) and in the Central Site (**HEA 1g**). In 1988, archaeological investigations by MoLAS at 19 Albert Embankment, 110m south of the West and Central Sites (**HEA 13**), revealed substantial dumps of waste from the manufacture of mid 18th-century tin-glazed wares.

4.2.31 During the 17th and 18th centuries, stoneware was produced alongside tin-glazed ware (Britton 1987, 52–67). Stoneware was a more durable and non-porous type of pottery and fired at a higher temperature than standard earthenware. Since the 14th century stoneware pottery had been imported, but by the mid-17th century it was being manufactured in England and particularly in London south of the Thames (Tyler *et al* 2005, 10–11). The Lambeth High Street pothouse, which was located in the West Site, was also producing stonewares by 1776 (Tyler *et al* 2005, 11). Dumps of waste from the manufacture of mid 18th century stonewares were found during archaeological investigations 110m to the south of the West and Central Sites (**HEA 13**).

4.2.32 Howood's map of 1799 (Fig 8) is more detailed than Rocque's, and defines the individual tenements or terraced houses along the western, southern and northern edges of the West Site. The Lambeth Pot House has been demolished. One large stable or warehouse block and three houses front onto High Street (Lambeth High Street) along the eastern boundary of the West Site. Two narrow alleys run into the site from the west. Fair Cloth Court runs into the northern part of the site from the High Street with terraced houses on its north side. In the Central Site, the tenements along the western edge of the site are still shown; in the centre of the site is the Stonard and Watson Starch Manufactory. The northern part of the site contains the southern range of an industrial building which runs round a courtyard to the north (outside the site). The East Site contains tenements along its southern boundary and rear yards to the north. Greenwood's map of 1824–6 (not reproduced) shows no change within the site, although the starch factory is now noted as a Mustard Factory.

4.2.33 During the 19th century the most significant pothouse in the area belonged to Doulton. It was established at 15 Lambeth High Street (later renumbered 28), a pre-existing stoneware pot house bought from Henry Willats (Tyler *et al* 2005, 12), directly to the south of the Central Site. Two new kilns were built for the production of red terracotta wares, including chimney pots, ridge tiles and garden vases. The pothouse expanded in 1835 and a new kiln built for terracotta sculpture in 1840. Properties directly to the north were acquired (the Middle Site) in 1843 and 1854. By 1890 there were 70 kilns in Lambeth where in 1840 there had been just 16 (Eyles and Irvine 2002, 22, 27–8, 30). A series of Doulton's stoneware kilns were recorded during excavation at 9 Albert Embankment, 50m to the south of the Middle Site (**HEA 23**). A kiln, flues and a building associated with Doulton's 19th century terracotta works were found during an archaeological evaluation at 20–21 Albert Embankment (**HEA 7**) 200m south of the site.

4.2.34 In 1848 the construction of the London and South-Western railway viaduct to Waterloo took place (Godfrey 2001) separating the East Site from the West and Central Sites.

4.2.35 From 1846 James Stiff, a former mould maker from the Doulton works, acquired the site of the old Pot House at the southern end of Lambeth High Street (West Site), and so became Doulton's main competitor. The pot house became known as Stiff's London Pottery (Tyler *et al* 2005, 12).

4.2.36 The Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1871 (Fig 9) shows that the West Site entirely comprises the (Stiff's) London Pottery, while the Central Site comprises the Lambeth Pottery (Doulton Pottery) in the south and terraced houses along the northern boundary. The East Site comprises terraced houses which front onto Broad Street (Black Prince Road). The

property boundaries appear the same as in Horwood's map, although two houses have been extended back, and in 1892 the London and South-Western railway was widened to six tracks (*ibid* 2001).

4.2.37 The Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25":mile map of 1871 also shows that Albert Embankment has now been built adjacent to the western side of the West Site. The construction of the Albert Embankment was led by Sir Joseph Bazalgette and took place between 1866 and 1870 to prevent flooding of the low-lying areas of Vauxhall and Kennington during exceptionally high tides and to incorporate a substantial sewer beneath it (www.lambeth.gov.uk). It resulted in the destruction of many former riverfront buildings including timber and boatyards.

4.2.38 Between 1876 and 1878 Doulton constructed a new headquarters building on the corner of Black Prince Road and Lambeth High Street (Tyler *et al* 2005, 13) directly to the south of the Central Site which is now a grade II Listed Building (**HEA 25**).

4.2.39 The Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25":mile map of 1894 (not reproduced) shows no change within the site. The Goad Fire Insurance plan of 1889 shows the West Site, occupied by Stiff's pottery, and the Central Site, occupied by Doulton's pottery (Fig 10), in more detail. It shows the detailed layout of both Sites at this time, including the location of kilns belonging to the potteries, warehouses and offices. A large 'barge basin' is also shown in the north-west corner of the West Site, accessed by a waterway under the roadway of Albert Embankment. It is likely that this feature dates back at least to the mid- 19th century, as it is around this time that the old landing stages along the Thames were removed, and, with arrangement by the Metropolitan Board of Works, Doulton and James Stiff, new docks were constructed under the embankment itself (Edwards 1973, 8). Stiff's Dock, in the north-west corner of the West Site, was later converted in 1939–40 into a below ground (bunkered) secure Control Room, which is still extant.

4.2.40 A recent watching brief on the West Site (**HEA 1a**) recorded the possible remains of the dock wall and the floor of the warehouse noted in the north of this area on the Goad fire insurance plan of 1889. The floor was recorded 1.3m below ground level in the north of the West Site and contained a quantity of ceramic bearing Stiff's label. Within three of the test pits the possible remains of the docks were found: it appears these were constructed of yellow stock brick, approximately 1m in thickness, and over 5.8m in depth. A thin layer of asphalt was noted on the front of the brick structure likely providing a waterproof layer.

4.2.41 The Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25":mile map of 1914 (Fig 11) shows little or no change within the site. The dock (formerly Stiff's Dock) in the north-west corner of the West Site is still shown. At the Central Site the Doulton Lambeth Pottery had expanded into the south-east corner. The East Site shows no change.

4.2.42 By the end of the 19th century stoneware production in Lambeth was becoming impractical and sales were falling. By the time of the Ordnance Survey 3rd edition revised 25":mile map of 1935 (Fig 12) the potteries at both the West Site and the Central Site had been demolished and replaced with the LCC Fire Brigade Headquarters in the West Site (an L-shaped building which runs along the western and southern boundaries of the West Site), part of which is Grade II listed, and a drill tower in the north-east corner, also a Grade II listed building. The Central Site contains the LCC Fire Brigade Maintenance Depot which covers the majority of the site. There is no change within the Rear Site.

4.2.43 The LCC Fire Brigade Headquarters was officially opened by King George VI on 21st July 1937, according to an engraved stone on its facade. The Historic England descriptions of the Headquarters building and drill tower are as follows:

> **LAMBETH FIRE STATION** (List entry number: 1392337)
>
> Fire station (former Brigade Headquarters of the London Fire Brigade). Built 1937 by the London County Council to the design of EP Wheeler, Architect to the LCC, assisted by G Weald. Sculpture by Gilbert Bayes, Stanley Nicholas Babb and FP Morton.
>
> MATERIALS: Steel frame clad in brown-grey bricks in English bond; ground floor, central part of the first floor, cornice to top floor and top of central tower are faced in Portland stone. Granite courses to base.
>
> PLAN: Long rectangular 8-storey block aligned north–south along river frontage. The building comprised a ground floor fire station, with staff facilities (mess rooms, dormitories etc) at first floor, offices at second, administration at third, and living quarters on the fourth to eighth floors. The appliance room is placed centrally on the ground floor, with main entrance hall to the south plus a smaller entrance hall to the north. Two stairs to rear. Each floor is bisected by a

long axial corridor. A single-storey rear wing, originally housing the LFB museum, and a bandstand to the south east, were demolished in the 1980s to make way for a large new extension.

EXTERIOR: Modern style, expressed through severe geometry, stepped-back upper storeys, flat roof and strong horizontal emphasis. Symmetrical façade of 9 storeys, with top two storeys stepped back, apart from central 5 bays of eighth storey which thus form a centrepiece to the façade. 25 bays, plus set-back blind end bays forming returns to side elevations. Original steel-framed casement windows with horizontal glazing; those to each end are narrower; those to central 5 bays at first floor and the central bay above are triple casements with margin lights.

Ground floor has 7 central appliance bays with deep stepped-back splayed reveals and an upper transom with horizontal fluting (these details are repeated in the lower pedestrian entrances to either side). Appliance bays have folding wooden doors (some replicated) of coffered panels with metal grilles to the upper parts; transom lights also have decorative metal grilles. To each side of the appliance bays are 4 small square windows with metal grilles, arranged 2 to either side of a pedestrian entrance. Entrances have panelled double doors with metal grilles; above each of them is a stone relief of firemen in action by Nicholas Babb. Stone balcony to first floor, continuing around side elevations, bears name of building. Above first floor of central 5 bays is stone cornice with horizontal fluting, curved at the ends and in the centre around two elaborate metal lamp standards. From the first to the third floors are central stone reliefs by Gilbert Bayes with gold mosaic backgrounds. Flanking the first floor are two galleys, above the first floor are two mermen with water hoses, above the second floor Phoebus in his chariot with sun's rays behind, and on the third floor a griffin. Horizontal rustication to eighth-floor centrepiece, which has inset panel of wheat ears, and to ninth floor. Central set-back tower has side pavilions and elaborate stone cornice with square and dot pattern, iron railings and flagstaff above, and large carved LCC coat of arms crest in stone by FP Morton. Return elevations of 6 bays with narrower end windows. Here the top 3 storeys are set back apart from the 2 end bays to south-east rear, which form a corner tower. The rear elevation has balconies on all floors, the three lowest floors are deeper with cast iron balustrading. The ends project and there is a built-in canted bay observation post to the second floor. The lower balconies were designed to be used as display platforms for up to 800 people to watch weekly public drill displays. The building diminishes in depth above 3rd storey level.

1980s rear extension is not of special interest.

INTERIOR: Main (south) entrance hall has marble cladding and a geometrical frieze. Doors have elaborate geometrical patterned grilles. On the right-hand rear (east) side, set in an alcove, is a memorial by Gilbert Bayes presented to the LFB by Lloyds underwriters and dedicated 'to the memory of the officers and men of the London Fire Brigade who throughout the years lay down their lives whilst doing their duty'. The central marble relief depicts a contemporary fire-fighting scene, set within a bronze frame with opening panels to either side bearing the names of 62 men. The top bears the motto "FINIS CORONAT OPUS", surmounted by a statuary group with a steam fire engine drawn by galloping horses. Set in the walls to either side are bronze grilles depicting billhooks and historic fire-fighting equipment, below which are bas-relief panels of modern appliances. In front of the memorial is a circular floor mosaic depicting the Great Fire of London. On the left rear wall is an elaborate tablet commemorating the establishment of the London Fire Brigade in 1865. This has a marble relief by Gilbert Bayes dated 1938 depicting an 18th century firefighting scene, set in a bronze frame with relief figures to either side and the inscription 'OMNIUM RERUM PRINCIPIA PARVA SUNT' at the top. A circular early 1950s sgraffito floor panel on the right (W) side depicts the areas of the London Civil Defence Region Fire Services. Memorial tablet against central pier to LCC staff who died in the two World Wars, with gilded key pattern. The smaller north entrance hall has similar doors and frieze to main entrance; marble cladding is 1980s. Open-well modern style stairs with bronze balustrades. First-floor mess room with beamed coffered ceiling and some original timber fittings. Second floor has rear conference room faced in polished wood veneer with a fluted frieze; the sliding partitions have gone. The upper residential floors have largely been stripped of domestic fittings, although many original doors survive and a few fireplaces. Other features include original wood-veneer post boxes, and doors to pole houses. The basement has a generator which is thought to date from WWII.

Lambeth Fire Station and the former drill tower to the rear form a group.

The former training school and workshops to the rear of the main building in Lambeth High Street are not of special interest.

DRILL TOWER TO THE EAST OF 8 ALBERT EMBANKMENT (List entry number: 1392338)

Drill tower 1937 designed by LCC's architect E P Wheeler FRIBA, assisted by D Weald FRIBA as part of the London Fire Brigade Headquarters scheme. Square structure in brown brick in

English bond 100 feet high. Nine storeys with two window openings to each floor. The top two floors of the front elevation are recessed with stone cornices. There is a stone band above the rusticated ground floor. There are two flat-arched windows to each floor, now with metal grilles, and the rear elevation has smaller openings to the lower five floors. This drill tower is set an angle to the main building on the edge of the former parade ground. The drill tower was used for training and the balconies at the back of the main Headquarters building were designed to be used as display platforms to enable over eight hundred people to watch weekly public drill displays.

4.2.44 The Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1950 (Fig 13) shows no changes within the West and Central Sites, although in the East Site the terraced houses have been demolished and subsequently replaced with four small buildings, three along the northern boundary of the East Site and 1 in the south-east corner of the East Site. By the time of the Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1958 (Fig 14) the three buildings along the northern edge of the East Site have been replaced with a building which covers almost the entire East Site with the exception of the southern-central area. The West and Central Sites show no change.

4.2.45 The Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1978 (not reproduced) also shows no change within either the West Site or Central Site, but in the East Site all buildings have been demolished and the area has been left empty.

4.2.46 The Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map of 1985 (not reproduced) shows the sites as it is today (see Fig 1 and Figs 15–17). In the early 1980s the original 1930s single-storey south-east wing of the Fire Brigade Headquarters building in the West Site was demolished and a new, larger extension was built which is still there today (see Fig 15).

4.2.47 Today the former Fire Brigade Headquarters building and drill tower, still used by the fire brigade, still occupy approximately half of the West Site, with the rest of the site used by the Fire Brigade for car parking. A single-storey basement occupies the entire footprint of the former Headquarters building and part of car park, extending across approximately two-thirds of the site. The north-eastern part of the site does not possess a basement (see Fig 20). The Central Site is still primarily occupied by the former maintenance depot (approximately two-thirds of the Central Site), whose single storey basement is located towards the centre of its southern side and occupies approximately 5% of the Central Site. The East Site remains undeveloped and used as a community space, with a tarmac surface and a small number of raised planters. It is surrounded by a wire fence on two sides (south and east), while a wall and steel fence belonging to the neighbouring property bound it on its west and north sides.

5 Statement of significance

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The following section discusses past impacts on the site: generally from late 19th and 20th century developments which may have compromised archaeological survival, eg, building foundations or quarrying, identified primarily from historic maps, the site walkover survey, and information on the likely depth of deposits. It goes on to consider factors which are likely to have compromised asset survival.

5.1.2 In accordance with the NPPF, this is followed by a statement on the likely potential and significance of buried heritage assets within the site, derived from current understanding of the baseline conditions, past impacts, and professional judgement. Determination of Significance within the HEA is detailed in Section 10.

5.2 Factors affecting archaeological survival

Natural geology

5.2.1 Based on geotechnical data, the level of natural geology within the site is as follows:

- Street level at the West Site ranges between 4.0m OD and 4.6m OD, at the Central Site street level is 4.2m OD and at the East Site between 4.5m OD and 4.8m OD;
- The top of the untruncated natural Gravel at the West Site is likely to be *c* 2.3mbgl (2.0m OD), though this may vary as it does in the Central Site. In the Central Site, the top of the untruncated natural Gravel is likely to be 1.2–2.0mbgl (0.7–2.2m OD). The top of the untruncated natural Gravel in the East Site is not known but may be at a similar level or higher than the Central Site.

5.2.2 Between the top of the natural and the current ground level are thick deposits of modern made ground and undated made ground. In places, the natural Gravel is directly overlain by modern made ground, but elsewhere the lower deposits may potentially contain remains of archaeological interest.

Past impacts

5.2.3 Each site will be discussed separately in term of past impact on any archaeological remains. In addition to the impacts particular to each site, it is anticipated that services will have caused some disturbance. Each service or drainage trench would have removed archaeological remains down to a maximum depth of *c* 1.0–1.5mbgl. In most cases this will have only extended into modern made ground and so there would have been be little or no impact.

<u>West Site</u>

5.2.4 The impacts of past land use within the site means that archaeological survival is likely to be low across two-thirds of the site, which has a basement, and high elsewhere.

5.2.5 The existing single storey basement covers around two-thirds of the site; only the north-east corner of the site is unbasemented (Fig 18). The top of the main basement floor level lies between *c* 3.0mbgl and *c* 3.6mbgl, while the floor level of the below ground (bunkered) secure Control Room in the north-west corner of the site, (originally the Stiff's Dock) lies at *c* 5.0mbgl. It is likely that the basement slabs will have caused further truncation of about *c* 0.5m, resulting in the top of the natural gravels being truncated by up to *c* 1.3m by the main basement and up to *c* 2.8m by the Control Room. Archaeological remains including those of the 18th- and 19th-century buildings will have been completely removed from within the basement footprints, although it is possible that the bases of deep cut features (eg pottery waster pits or refuse pits) survive below the basement slab. It is also possible that (parts of) the dock wall belonging to the 19th century Stiff's Dock in the north-west corner of the West Site may still survive between the existing Control Room and the rest of the basement to the south and the site boundary to the north (see Fig 18). The Drill Tower in the north-east corner of the site is likely to be built on concrete pad foundations which will have completely removed any archaeological remains

from within the foundation footprints, causing localised truncation of 18th- and 19th-century buildings in this part of the site.

Central Site

5.2.6 The survival of archaeological remains (especially those associated with the 19th century Doulton Lambeth pottery) is thought to be high across the whole of the Middle Site.

5.2.7 The existing building covers approximately two-thirds of the Middle Site. The type of foundations used for this building is unknown, but in all likelihood they are likely to comprise concrete pad foundations. These will have removed any archaeological remains locally from within their footprint, although there is the potential for the survival of archaeological remains between the foundations and possibly beneath. There is a small basement along the southern edge of the Site (Fig 20), occupying approximately 5% of the Middle Site and extending to a depth of 0.1–1.2m OD (The Gordon Tomalin Partnership, dwg ref: 8901.01, August 2009, Fig 19). Assuming a *c* 0.5m thick basement slab, would give a formation level of –0.6 to 0.7m OD, or 3.5–4.8mbgl. This will have removed any archaeological remains from within its footprint, although the bases of very deep cut features (eg pits and wells) may potentially survive below. Elsewhere, several vehicle inspection pits lie within the workshop, while below ground petrol or oil tanks probably lie within the eastern part of the site (see Fig 19). Both will have removed archaeological remains from within their footprint, to the depth of their excavation, although the impact from these is thought to be low.

East Site

5.2.8 Archaeological survival is expected to be high. Four 1940s and 1950s buildings formerly on the site will have potentially been constructed on strip foundations which would have locally removed any archaeological remains from within their footprint. There do not appear to have been associated basements. Archaeological remains are likely to survive between and beneath these impacts.

Likely depth/thickness of archaeological remains

5.2.9 In the West Site, archaeological remains will have been heavily truncated by the existing basement under which no survival of archaeological remains is expected. The greatest potential for survival is in the north-east corner of the site. Here, archaeological remains would potentially be found across a 900m^2 area, between any modern made ground (potentially 0.5m thick) and the top of the gravels which lies at *c* 2.3mbgl. There is also potential for remains of the 19th century dock wall of Stiff's Dock in the north-west corner of the site.

5.2.10 In the Central Site, the survival of archaeological remains is thought to be relatively good, although there is likely to have been localised truncation caused by the basement, vehicle inspection pits and below ground petrol/oil tanks. Archaeological remains would potentially survive across a 5000m^2 area between any modern made ground (0.3–1.7m thick) and the top of the natural gravels which lies at 1.2–3.5mbgl (5.9mbgl in the south-east corner).

5.2.11 In the East Site, due to the mid 20th-century development, archaeological survival is thought to be localised rather than extensive across the site. Any archaeological remains present would potentially be found below any modern made ground which is thought to extend *c* 2.0mbgl or less.

5.3 Archaeological potential and significance

5.3.1 The nature of possible archaeological survival in the area of the proposed development is summarised here, taking into account the levels of natural geology and the level and nature of later disturbance and truncation discussed above.

5.3.2 *The site has a low potential for palaeoenvironmental remains.* Although the site is primarily located over the Gravel terrace and has been subjected to deep truncation, a small area in the north-west of the site produced some potential for the survival of thin band of alluvial deposits. These deposits may containing preserved pollen and other organic material (eg insects, plants and molluscs) which could provide evidence of past fluvial regimes and environments within which prehistoric and later people lived. Such remains would be mostly of **low** significance unless extensive strata with layers of peat, or other organic material survive which would

potentially be of **medium** significance, derived from the evidential value of the remains.

5.3.3 *The site has low potential for in situ archaeological remains dating to the prehistoric period*. Despite the location of the site on a-well draining gravel close to the predictable resource of the River Thames, little evidence of prehistoric activity or occupation has been recorded within the study area. In all likelihood the sites was open fields or woodland on the banks of the Thames. There is the possibility that residual prehistoric finds may be found, of **low** significance, based on potential evidential value.

5.3.4 *The site has low potential for archaeological remains dating to the Roman period.* As with the prehistoric period the location of the site on gravels and close the Thames would have been ideal for occupation, although no evidence of occupation or other activities have been recorded within the study area which probably remained open fields or woodland away from the main settlements.

5.3.5 *The sites has low potential for archaeological remains dating to the Saxon period*. During this period the site probably was located in open fields outside the main settlement of Lambeth Water.

5.3.6 *The West and Central Sites have a moderate potential for archaeological remains dating to the medieval period, while the Rear Site has a low potential*. The Front and Middle Sites were located on the edge of the settlement of Lambeth Water, which was starting to spread south along the Thames embankment during this period, although later truncation has probably removed any evidence of the settlement. Truncated remains such as these would be of **low** or **medium** significance, derived from the potential evidential value. The Rear Site probably still lay outside the settlement.

5.3.7 *West Site has high potential for archaeological remains dating to the post-medieval period*. Whilst any remains within two-thirds of the site will have been heavily truncated or completely removed by the construction of the existing basement, outside the basement footprint there is potential for the Lambeth High Street Pot House, dating to the early/mid 18th century. This was established on the former residence of the Bishop of Hereford and produced tin-glazed ('delftware') pottery. Remains of manufactory, kilns, wasters and evidence of industrial processes would be of **medium** or **high** significance, depending on the nature and extent of the remains. There is also the potential for similar remains associated with the subsequent, mid 19th century, Stiff's London Pottery building and kilns, of **medium** or **high** significance. Buried remains of the dock wall belonging to the 19th century Stiff's Dock in the north-west corner of the West Site would be of **low** or **medium** significance. The significance of any such remains would be derived from evidential and historical values.

5.3.8 *The Central Site has high potential for archaeological remains dating to the post-medieval period.* This includes the remains of the early 19th century Doulton Lambeth Pottery manufactory, kilns and wasters, of **medium** or **high** heritage significance, depending on the nature and extent of the remains, and a late 18th century Starch/Mustard Manufactory, which would be of **medium** significance. There is also a high potential for other evidence of mid- to late-post-medieval Lambeth pottery production and tenement buildings, which would be of **medium** or **high** significance (**low** for any surviving tenement building foundations), based on evidential and historical value.

5.3.9 *The East Site has high post-medieval remains.* The potential is for dumps of waster material from adjacent pot houses, and possibly pot house structures that are not shown on historic maps. The significance of such remains would depend on their nature, date and extent but might be **medium** or **high**, if present. By the end of the 19th century the site became tenement houses and rear yards, and footings of these buildings, along with associated yard surfaces and cess pits, would be of **low** significance.

6 Impact of proposals

6.1 Proposals

6.1.1 The scheme comprises the demolition of the majority of the existing buildings, although the Grade II listed buildings, the former London Fire Brigade Headquarters and Drill Tower, will be retained. Following the demolition of these buildings, new mixed-use buildings comprising residential, office, hotel and services space would be constructed. The development includes the construction of basement levels including:

- *West Site:* deepening the eastern extent of the existing basement a further 2.0m (down to –1.0m OD) and the extension of this basement northwards by 16% to the same depth (–1.0m OD) into an unbasemented area;
- *Central Site:* The excavation of a new two level basement across the area footprint which extends to a depth of *c* 10m below ground level (mbgl) (FFL –4.8m OD including a 1.0m thick basement slab; WSP 2017, 17) across *c* 80% pf the site and to a depth of *c* 11mbgl (FFL –5.8m OD including a 1.0m thick basement slab; WSP 2017, 17) in the remaining *c* 20% (but which may be deeper depending on the final depth of the pool);
- *East Site:* The excavation of a new lower ground floor level across 50% of the area footprint. The excavation would extend up to 2.0mbgl (Shane Lincoln, GVA Second London Wall, pers. comm. 19/12/2017). A slab thickness of 1.0m is assumed for the purposes of assessment (WSP 2017, 17). This would comprise a total level of impact of 3.0m below ground level (1.5m OD).

6.1.2 It has been assumed for the purposes of this assessment that new foundations would comprise piles to be inserted after the construction of the basement levels. It is assumed that these new piled foundations would be moderately spaced with associated pile caps and ground beams.

6.2 Implications

6.2.1 The identification of physical impacts on buried heritage assets within a site takes into account any activity which would entail ground disturbance, for example site set up works, remediation, landscaping and the construction of new basements and foundations. As it is assumed that the operational (completed development) phase would not entail any ground disturbance there would be no additional archaeological impact and this is not considered further.

6.2.2 It is outside the scope of this archaeological report to consider the impact of the proposed development on upstanding structures of historic interest, in the form of physical impacts which would remove, alter, or otherwise change the building fabric, or predicted changes to the historic character and setting of historic buildings and structures within the site or outside it.

6.2.3 As outlined in Section 5 the Central and East Sites have a high survival potential for post-medieval remains associated with pottery manufactory in the Lambeth area. The West Site has a low survival potential within the area of the existing basement level here, although there is likely to be high survival in the north-eastern third of the site where there is no current basement.

Basements

6.2.4 In the Central and East Sites the construction of new basement levels would entirely remove any remains within their footprints to the new formation level. Within the Central Site this would extend to a new FFL to at least –4.8m OD, extending well into natural geologies. In the East Site, the bases of very deep cut features such as deep pits or wells may survive in a highly truncated state beneath the new basement.

6.2.5 In the West Site the deepening of the existing basement a further 2.0m would entirely remove any surviving remains here and extend into the underlying natural geology. The extension of the basement would remove all remains, particularly those of Stiff's London Pottery works.

New Piled Foundations

6.2.6 As stated in 6.1 it assumed that piled foundations would be inserted after the construction of the new basement levels. Across a majority of the three sites this would constitute an impact as remains would have already been removed. In the West Site, one building (A1) would extend beyond the footprint of the existing basement. Any new piled foundations beneath this would remove archaeological remains within the footprint of each pile as it is driven downwards. The size and density of the proposed foundations are not currently known, although as indicated in 6.1 it is assumed these are moderately spaced, and remains would survive between the piles.

6.2.7 The insertion of new ground beams and pile caps here would remove any remains from within their footprints to a standard depth of 1.5m below ground level. Given the shallow deposits on the site, this is likely to severely truncate any remains present.

Dewatering

6.2.8 The excavation of any small diameter dewatering wells, if lowering of the water table is proposed, would be a minor impact in locally removing any archaeological remains within each drilled well. The main implications in terms of archaeological remains however would be the resulting change to the existing anaerobic environment in which waterlogged organic remains, including peat and timber, are potentially preserved. These would dry out rapidly and would have a considerable impact on their heritage significance.

7 Conclusion and recommendations

7.1.1 The majority of the site (West and Central Site) lies within the North Lambeth Archaeological Priority Area (APA) while the entire site lies within the Albert Embankment Conservation Area (CA57) as designated by the London Borough of Lambeth.

7.1.2 The West Site contains two early 20th century Grade II listed buildings, the former London Fire Brigade headquarters and the Drill Tower, both built in the 1930s. The site does not contain any further nationally designated (protected) heritage assets, such as scheduled monuments or registered parks and gardens.

7.1.3 Archaeological survival is anticipated to be low across two-thirds of the West Site, which has a basement, and high across the remainder of the three sites as these are largely without basements. The greatest archaeological potential is in the West and Central Sites, particularly for the remains of 18th and 19th century pottery manufactories and associated waster dumps: the Doulton and Watts, later Doulton and Company, Pottery established in the 1820s in the Central Site; Stiff's London Pottery established in the mid 19th century in the West Site; and the Lambeth High Street Pot House (formerly the Bishop of Hereford residence) established on the West Site in the early/mid 18th century. There is also some potential at the East Site for dumps of waster material from adjacent pot houses, and possibly pot house structures that are not shown on historic maps. The West Site also has high potential for the remains of the dock wall belonging to the 19th century Stiff's Dock, while the Central Site also has a high potential for the remains of the late 18th century Starch/Mustard manufactory. In the West and Central Sites there is potential for features (eg buildings, refuse pits etc) related to the late medieval settlement of Lambeth Water, while the Rear Site probably lay outside the settlement. All three Sites have low potential for earlier archaeological remains.

7.1.4 The deepening of the east of the existing basement level on the West Site a further 2.0m is unlikely to have any further impact to archaeological remains, which have likely already been removed. The extension of the basement into the unbasemented area to the same depth would remove all remains and cut into the natural geology. The construction of new basement levels to a finished floor level of at least –4.8m OD in the Central Site would entirely remove any archaeological remains present and extend well into the natural geologies. The excavation of a new lower ground floor in the East Site would remove any remains that may be present, although the bases of very deep cut features may survive.

7.1.5 The insertion of new piled foundations would not have any further impact to archaeological remains within the extents of the basement areas. One proposed building (A1) extends beyond the footprint of the existing basement on the West Site. The new piled foundations in this area, along with pile caps and ground beams would severely truncate any remains that may be present.

7.1.6 Table 3 summarises the known or likely buried assets within the site, their significance (see Section 10), and the impact of the proposed scheme on asset significance.

Table 3: Impact upon heritage assets (prior to mitigation)

Asset	Asset Significance	Impact of proposed scheme
Early/mid 18th century Lambeth High Street Pot House (formerly the Bishop of Hereford residence) and associated remains in the West Site (High potential)	High	Insertion of new piled foundations with associated pilecaps and ground beams would severely truncate any remains in the north of the site outside the existing basement. Asset significance would be reduced, although remains may survive in a highly truncated state.
Early 19th century Doulton Lambeth Pottery Building and waster dumps in the Central Site and possibly the East Site (High potential)	High	Middle Site: Excavation of new basement levels would entirely remove any remains present. Asset significance reduced to *nil* Rear Site: Excavation of new basement levels would remove any remains within the footprint of the basement to the new formation level. The bases of very deep cut features may survive in a highly

Asset	Asset Significance	Impact of proposed scheme
		truncated state. Asset significance would be reduced to Low.
Mid 19th century Stiff's London Pottery and waster dumps in the West Site and associated dock wall (High potential)	High (Medium for dock wall)	Insertion of new piled foundations with associated pilecaps and ground beams would severely truncate any remains in the north of the site outside the existing basement. Asset significance would be reduced, although remains may survive in a highly truncated state. The extension of the basement into the unbasemented area would remove all remains to the depth of new basement construction. The deepening of the existing basement level would entirely remove any highly truncated remains surviving beneath it. Asset significance would be reduced to *nil*
Various waster and dump pits relating to pottery manufactory from the 18th century onwards on the Central and East sites (High potential)	Medium	Middle Site: Excavation of new basement levels would entirely remove any remains present. Asset significance reduced to *nil* Rear Site: Excavation of new basement levels would remove any remains within the footprint of the basement to the new formation level. The bases of very deep cut features may survive in a highly truncated state. Asset significance would be reduced to Low.
Late18th century Starch/Mustard manufactory in the Central Site (High potential)	Medium	Excavation of new basement levels would entirely remove any remains present. Asset significance reduced to *nil*
Domestic evidence relating to the medieval and later settlement of Lambeth Water in the West and Central Sites (Moderate potential)	Low	West Site: Insertion of new piled foundations with associated pilecaps and ground beams would severely truncate any remains in the north of the site outside the existing basement. Asset significance would be reduced, although remains may survive in a highly truncated state. The deepening of the existing basement level is not likely to have any further impact on archaeological remains. Middle Site: Excavation of new basement levels would entirely remove any remains present. Asset significance reduced to *nil*

7.1.7 Owing to the generally high survival potential on the site for remains of up to High significance the local authority will ask for further site specific work to clarify the nature and extent of remains. This could comprise a targeted evaluation of test pits or trenches on the site, and would be used to inform the local authority's advisor of a suitable mitigation strategy.

7.1.8 Whilst the decision would ultimately lie with the LPA's archaeological advisor based on the results of the evaluation, it is likely that for extensive, well preserved remains, an archaeological excavation of impact areas would be requested to ensure that no archaeologically sensitive material is removed without prior recording. For areas of poorly preserved remains, it is likely that no more than a watching brief on impact areas would be required.

7.1.9 The programme of preservation by record could be secured under the terms of an archaeological condition attached to planning consent. Prior to the start of each phase of archaeological work, its scope and methodology would be set out in a Written Statement of Investigation (WSI) to be approved by the LBL's archaeological advisor.

8 Gazetteer of known historic environment assets

8.1.1 The table below represents a gazetteer of known historic environment sites and finds within the 200m-radius study area around the site. The gazetteer should be read in conjunction with Fig 2.

8.1.2 The GLHER data contained within this gazetteer was obtained on 30/11/2016 and is the copyright of Historic England 2016.

8.1.3 Historic England statutory designations data © Historic England 2016. Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2016. The Historic England GIS Data contained in this material was obtained in October 2016. The most publicly available up to date Historic England GIS Data can be obtained from http://www.historicengland.org.uk.

Abbreviations
MoLAS – Museum of London Archaeology Service (now named MOLA)
DGLA - Department of Greater London Archaeology (Museum of London)
HER – Historic Environment Record
CA – Compass Archaeology
SLAEC – Southwark and Lambeth Archaeological Excavation Committee

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
1a	**8 Albert Embankment.** An archaeological watching brief on site investigation works was carried out by MOLA in 2017. Remains of the dock walls were found to survive behind the existing north and south basement walls. A trial pit to the east of the dock found the remains of a building that may be a former warehouse associated with the pottery. Several ceramic vessels were recovered from the infill. One vessels was identified by its marking as a product of the Stiff Pottery and the other vessels were probably also from the pottery	ATE17
1b	**Lambeth Fire Station.** Grade II listed fire station (former Brigade Headquarters of the London Fire Brigade). Built 1937 by the London County Council to the design of EP Wheeler, Architect to the LCC, assisted by G Weald.	1392337
1c	**Drill Tower to the East of 8 Albert Embankment.** Grade II listed drill tower, built in 1937 and designed by LCC's architect E P Wheeler, assisted by D Weald, as part of the London Fire Brigade Headquarters scheme.	1392338
1d	**8 Albert Embankment.** The site of an 18th-century kiln waster dump found in the 1930s.	090632
1e	**Lambeth High Street Pot House and former residence of the Bishop of Hereford.** The manufactory produced tin-glazed wares (1732–58) and was previously the residence of the Bishop of Hereford. The GLHER provides an incorrect address outside the site. The GLHER marks this as the site of the chance find of a sherd of 18th-century pottery.	090112
1f	**Lambeth Palace Road.** The site of a 17th-century watch house. The location is uncertain since the GLHER locates this within the site, but the address suggests it was outside the site.	090060
1g	**Lambeth High Street.** The site of an 18th-century kiln waster dump found in the 1930s.	090636
1h	**Off Millbank.** The chance find of a late Neolithic to late Bronze Age spearhead. The location is uncertain since the GLHER locates this within the site, but the address suggests it was outside the site.	MLO8888
2	Location of a gravel spit found during the Thames Discovery Programme,	A101
3	**Whitgift Street.** The site of an 17th-century kiln waster dump found in the 1930s.	090635
4	**Salamanca Place, SE1**. An archaeological evaluation by MoLAS in 2006. Agricultural soil of 18th-19th-century date was recorded above the natural brickearth, sealed by made-ground associated with the construction of nearby houses during the late 18th or early 19th century. Evidence for these buildings, including a brick-lined soakaway and a drain, were recorded. The buildings were demolished probably during the 1840's to allow construction of the nearby railway viaduct. Several 19th-century pits were recorded; these had been covered by dumps of broken salt-glazed sewer pipes from a local 19th-century pot house. The area seems to have remained as open ground, possibly as rear gardens to the demolished buildings.	SCE05 ELO6721 MLO98129

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
5	**Newport Street, SE1.** Archaeological watching brief by DGLA in 1986. No further details available.	357/86 ELO1921 092318
6	**Albert Embankment.** The site of the 18th-century "White Hart" river stairs.	090000
7	**20–21 Albert Embankment, SE1.** An archaeological evaluation and geoarchaeological investigation by MOLA in 2010. The evaluation found a kiln, flues and a building all associated with the 19th century Henry Doulton terracotta works.	ELO11491
8	**Albert Embankment.** The site of an 18th-century kiln waster dump found in the 1930s.	90633
9	**Bridge House, Albert Embankment, 9–14 Lambeth High Street, SE1**. An archaeological watching brief by SLAEC in 1978. Medieval pottery and a post-medieval kiln flue were recorded.	L76/78
10	**Lambeth High Street.** The site of the Saxon and medieval Lambeth (Lambeth Water) village. The term Lambeth is Saxon for harbour or quay and this would fit with the location of the Saxon settlement at Lambeth Water. It is also said to derive from the Saxon meaning 'landing place of the lambs'.	090957
11	**Whitgift Street.** The site of an 18th-century windmill.	090174
12	**Lambeth Walk, Black Prince Road, Newport Street, SE1**. An archaeological watching brief by DGLA in 1983. Only the natural topography was recorded.	L554/83
13	**19 Albert Embankment, SE1**. An archaeological excavation by DGLA in 1988. The excavation recovered prehistoric flint tools, including small blades and flint cores. Field boundaries and cultivation soils of medieval date were recorded, and quantities of dumped wasters and kiln furniture from nearby delftware kilns and a later stoneware factory were found, together with a 19th-century kiln probably involved in pottery manufacture. A later archaeological excavation by MoLAS in 2000 revealed natural gravel overlaid by a soil deposit sealed at the west of the site by substantial dumps of pot house material dating to the 18th century (kiln furniture, biscuit ware and glazed wasters, including the first complete saggars of the London tin-glazed industry. The dumps appear to have provide the base for the construction of the first buildings on the site, with brick foundations. All had associated cess pits containing 19th century household material. Also the site of a post-medieval well and a post-medieval gravel pit.	ALA88 ELO828 ELO1554 091101–3 MLO76300 MLO77134–39 ELO1549
14	**Black Prince Road/Albert Embankment.** The line of a medieval road, the site of the 17th-century "Princes River Staires" and the site of the 19th-century "Princes Dock".	090466 090120 090121
15	**Albert Embankment.** The site of the 16th-century "Horseferry".	090937
16	**Albert Embankment.** The site of the post-medieval "Old George" public house.	090099
17	**Lambeth Bridge House, Lambeth Road.** An archaeological evaluation in 1997 and archaeological excavation in 1998 by PCA. Found prehistoric worked flints and a single sherd of Roman pottery. The site was quarried for sand and gravel in the medieval period. Extensive evidence for a pottery works located in the 19th century, including a kiln, wall and floor. A medieval ditch, 17th-century foundations and a 17th-century pottery assemblage also found.	092704–09 ELO1421 ElO619 MLO76120 MLO77125–31
18	**Lambeth Road (junction of).** The site of the 17th-century Rectory of St Mary.	090001
19	**Lambeth High Street Recreation Ground.** The site of the 18th-century "Paradise Row Burial Ground". Also a locally listed designated space and landscape as designated by the London Borough of Lambeth. The site includes the Grade II listed 18th century walls of the former graveyard.	090944 Basil Holmes 1896, 188 1080371
20	**11–21 Old Paradise Street, SE11**. An archaeological evaluation by CA in 2005. The earliest features were two large pits, possibly for gravel extraction, which are dated to 17th - mid-18th century. Most evidence related to residential development between the late 18th and early 19th century, and it is likely that, before this, the site was open land. Cellars of the former terraced houses in the south of the site were cut into the natural gravels. Pottery included residual medieval sherds and a few sherds which probably derived from the nearby 18th-century sugar refinery.	OPI05 ELO6678 MLO98182
21	**9 Newport Street, SE11**. An archaeological watching brief by DGLA in 1985. The watching brief observed medieval deposits cut into natural sands and gravels.	L571/85 ELO1702 191886
22	**206–208 Lambeth Walk, Black Prince Road, Newport Street, SE11**. An archaeological watching brief by SLAEC in 1978. Evidence of natural topography only.	L370/78 ELO1539 ELO1695 091880

HEA No.	Description	Site code/ HER No.
23	**9 Albert Embankment, 87 Black Prince Road, 5 Salamanca Street, SE1**. An archaeological evaluation and excavation by MoLAS in 2001. Ploughsoil above natural gravels had been cut by a number of cesspits, postholes and gravel extraction pits dating to the late 18th century. Features associated with Doulton's pot manufactory, known at the site from c 1890-1923, were uncovered. Five pottery kilns were recorded, with two phases of use. A series of flues linked to a chimney were recorded in the south of the site; the deposit within the flues suggested that this was a colour preparation area.	AEB01 ELO622 ELO823 MLO76295 MLO77140
24	**Land at Junction Of Salamanca Place And Black Prince Road, Lambeth, SE1 7SZ.** Archaeological watching brief in 2012 by CgMs. Natural sandy gravels were sealed by a layer of 15th–19th century re-deposited brickearth with late 19th–20th century made ground above.	SAL12
25	**Southbank House**. Grade II Listed Building. Built in 1878 and is the former headquarters of Doulton and Company.	204000 MLO8540
26	**Land at Black Prince Road/Salamanca Place, Lambeth, SE1 7SJ.** Archaeological watching brief in 2012 by PCA. Reworked brickearth was recorded above natural brickearth and below the 19th and 20th century made ground. An earlier excavation at Salamanca Place in 1963 recorded kiln dump material including wasters from the manufacture of London redwares, wasters of course earthenware and a nearly complete bottle dating to the late 16th century.	BPN12 ELO12487 ELO2236 090933
27	**Lambeth High Street, near Whitgift Street, SE1.** Archaeological investigation by SLAEC in 1966. The layout and position of the 18th century dwelling fronting the High Street were revealed. It had a cellar which had destroyed earlier remains. Away from the High Street frontage was a late 18th century building and a late 17th/early 18th century furnace in a tiles workshop area. Also a system of 18th century cess pits and an 18th century warehouse wall were found. Also site of an 18th century kiln waster dump found in the 1930s.	LHS66 ELO1868 MLO105487 090637
28	**71 Black Prince Road**. Locally listed former Queen's Head public house, built in 1890.	
29	**44 Lambeth High Street.** Locally listed mid 19th century Windmill public house.	
30	**Lambeth High Street/Albert Embankment, Lambeth.** The modern roads run along the line of a medieval road according to the GLHER.	MLO13562
31	**Lambeth Road/St George's Road, Lambeth.** The modern roads run along the line of a medieval road according to the GLHER.	MLO13563

9 Planning framework

9.1 Statutory protection

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

9.1.1 The *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* sets out the legal requirements for the control of development and alterations which affect buildings, including those which are listed or in conservation areas. Buildings which are listed or which lie within a conservation area are protected by law. Grade I are buildings of exceptional interest. Grade II* are particularly significant buildings of more than special interest. Grade II are buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them.

9.2 National Planning Policy Framework

9.2.1 The Government issued the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) in March 2012 (DCLG 2012) and supporting *Planning Practice Guidance* in 2014 (DCLG 2014). The 2012 NPPF has been revised and a new NPPF was published in July 2018 (MHCLG 2018).

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

9.2.2 The NPPF section concerning "Conserving and enhancing the historic environment" (section 12 of the NPPF 2012) has been replaced by NPPF 2018 Section 16, reproduced in full below:

> **Para 184.** Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.
>
> **Para 185.** Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account:
>
> - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
> - b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
> - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
> - d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.
>
> **Para 186.** When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.
>
> **Para 187.** Local planning authorities should maintain or have access to a historic environment record. This should contain up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area and be used to:
>
> - a) assess the significance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to their environment; and
> - b) predict the likelihood that currently unidentified heritage assets, particularly sites of historic and archaeological interest, will be discovered in the future.
>
> **Para 188.** Local planning authorities should make information about the historic environment, gathered as part of policy-making or development management, publicly accessible.
>
> **Proposals affecting heritage assets**
>
> **Para 189.** In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more

than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Para 190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Para 192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

Para 193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Para 194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Para 195. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Para 196. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Para 197. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Para 198. Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

Para 199. Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a

manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible64. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Para 200. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

Para 201. Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 195 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 196, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

Para 202. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

9.3 Regional policy

The London Plan

9.3.1 The overarching strategies and policies for the whole of the Greater London area are contained within the *London Plan of the Greater London Authority* (GLA March 2016).

9.3.2 Policy 7.8 of the adopted (2016) London Plan relates to Heritage Assets and Archaeology:

A. London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.

B. Development should incorporate measures that identify, record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.

C. Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.

D. Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

E. New development should make provision for the protection of archaeological resources, landscapes and significant memorials. The physical assets should, where possible, be made available to the public on-site. Where the archaeological asset or memorial cannot be preserved or managed on-site, provision must be made for the investigation, understanding, recording, dissemination and archiving of that asset.

F. Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London's environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London's ability to accommodate change and regeneration.

G. Boroughs, in consultation with English Heritage [now named Historic England], Natural England and other relevant statutory organisations, should include appropriate policies in their LDFs for identifying, protecting, enhancing and improving access to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings where appropriate, and to archaeological assets, memorials and historic and natural landscape character within their area.

9.3.3 Para. 7.31 supporting Policy 7.8 notes that 'Substantial harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset should be exceptional, with substantial harm to or loss of those assets designated of the highest significance being wholly exceptional. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use. Enabling development that would otherwise not comply with planning policies, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset should be assessed to see of the benefits of departing from those policies outweigh the disbenefits.'

9.3.4 It further adds (para. 7.31b) 'Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of and/or damage to

a heritage asset the deteriorated state of that asset should not be taken into account when making a decision on a development proposal'.

9.3.5 Para. 7.32 recognises the value of London's heritage: '…where new development uncovers an archaeological site or memorial, these should be preserved and managed on-site. Where this is not possible provision should be made for the investigation, understanding, dissemination and archiving of that asset'.

9.3.6 The current 2016 consolidation Plan is still the adopted Development Plan. However, the Plan is under revision and a *Draft New London Plan* for public consultation was issued 2017/2018. Consultation closed in March 2018 and changes based on the consultation have been incorporated and a *Draft New London Plan with recommended minor changes* was issued in August 2018. The draft is a material consideration in planning decisions (GLA website, 2017).

9.3.7 Policy HC1 "Heritage conservation and growth" of the *Draft New London Plan* relates to London's historic environment:

> A Boroughs should, in consultation with Historic England and other relevant statutory organisations, develop evidence that demonstrates a clear understanding of London's historic environment. This evidence should be used for identifying, understanding, conserving, and enhancing the historic environment and heritage assets, and improving access to, and interpretation of, the heritage assets, landscapes and archaeology within their area.
>
> B Development Plans and strategies should demonstrate a clear understanding of the historic environment and the heritage values of sites or areas and their relationship with their surroundings. This knowledge should be used to inform the effective integration of London's heritage in regenerative change by:
>
> - 1) setting out a clear vision that recognises and embeds the role of heritage in place-making
> - 2) utilising the heritage significance of a site or area in the planning and design process
> - 3) integrating the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with innovative and creative contextual architectural responses that contribute to their significance and sense of place
> - 4) delivering positive benefits that conserve and enhance the historic environment, as well as contributing to the economic viability, accessibility and environmental quality of a place, and to social wellbeing.
>
> C Development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings, should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.
>
> D Development proposals should identify assets of archaeological significance and use this information to avoid harm or minimise it through design and appropriate mitigation. Where applicable, development should make provision for the protection of significant archaeological assets and landscapes. The protection of undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest equivalent to a scheduled monument should be given equivalent weight to designated heritage assets.
>
> E Where heritage assets have been identified as being At Risk, boroughs should identify specific opportunities for them to contribute to regeneration and place-making, and they should set out strategies for their repair and re-use.

9.3.8 Para. 7.1.8 adds 'Where there is evidence of **deliberate neglect** of and/or damage to a heritage asset to help justify a development proposal, the deteriorated state of that asset should not be taken into account when making a decision on a development proposal'.

9.3.9 Para 7.1.11 adds 'Developments will be expected to avoid or minimise harm to significant archaeological assets. In some cases, remains can be incorporated into and/or interpreted in new development. The physical assets should, where possible, be made available to the public on-site and opportunities taken to actively present the site's archaeology. Where the archaeological asset cannot be preserved or managed on-site, appropriate provision must be made for the investigation, understanding, recording, dissemination and archiving of that asset, and must be undertaken by suitably-qualified individuals or organisations.

9.3.10 The recommended minor changes have been incorporated where applicable.

9.4 Local planning policy

9.4.1 Following the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Planning Authorities have replaced their Unitary Development Plans, Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance with a new system of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). UDP policies are either 'saved' or 'deleted'. In most cases archaeology policies are likely to be 'saved' because there have been no significant changes in legislation or advice at a national level.

9.4.2 The London Borough of Lambeth's Local Plan was adopted in September 2015.

9.4.3 http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/lambeths-local-plan-guide#lambeth-local-plan-2015

9.4.4 Policy Q18 covers the borough's historic environment strategy and states:

Policy Q18 – Historic Environment Strategy

In order to ensure that heritage assets continue to play a key role in the quality of Lambeth's environment, the council will prepare an Historic Environment Strategy, which will assist developers and other interested parties in understanding the justifications behind its approach to development management policies Q19, Q20, Q21, Q22, Q23, Q24, Q25 and Q26 and the wider local issues relating to the historic environment.

10.69 Through the Lambeth Historic Environment Strategy (HES) and through its decision making prior to preparation of the HES, the council will:

(i) use its planning powers (including enforcement powers) to ensure that special regard is paid to sustaining and enhancing the historic environment;

(ii) use, where appropriate, statutory powers (including non-planning legislation) to sustain or enhance the historic environment; especially where they might address issues preventing heritage at risk from being brought back to viable use/good repair;

(iii) support initiatives to sustain or enhance the historic environment and bring heritage at risk back to viable use/good repair (such as the national 'heritage at risk' initiative);

(iv) continue the identification of local heritage (undesignated) assets with the input of local people, groups and national amenity societies to ensure that Lambeth's historic environment gains the recognition it deserves;

(v) prepare appraisals, guidance documents and SPDs, securing the input and support of local people, local groups and other parties, and use these in decision making to help guide development in a positive manner;

(vi) request that copies of significant heritage statements, desk based assessments and record documents are submitted to the London Historic Environment Record (HER);

(vii) appoint an historic environment champion to raise the profile of built heritage within the council and across Lambeth;

(viii) use established best-practice guidance from Historic England, national amenity societies and other organisations, the British Standard publication BS7912:2013 'Guide to the Principles of the Conservation of Historic Buildings' and locally prepared SPD documents to deliver best practice in relation to management and alteration of heritage assets; and

(ix) encourage, contribute to and facilitate research and publication on Lambeth's historic environment – particularly where there are gaps in knowledge/understanding.

(x) The council will work in partnership with Historic England, neighbouring boroughs and other relevant groups on heritage issues.

10.70 The historic environment is an irreplaceable resource which contributes significantly to Lambeth's local distinctiveness, economy and quality of life. Lambeth, in turn, as an inner London borough, makes a significant contribution to the distinctiveness of central London. The historic environment is key to delivering sustainable development and is the main component of Lambeth's distinctiveness and is of interest to residents and visitors alike.

10.71 The borough's most historic areas are also its most desirable and thus it pays financially to maintain assets in good condition. Generally Lambeth's historic environment is well maintained and in a viable use as a result of the care and attention of asset owners and managers. Other than development pressure, the greatest threats

to heritage assets are generally incremental change, poorly considered alterations and poor workmanship. The council will prepare a Heritage Strategy document to define, and keep under review, the priorities for sustaining the historic environment of the borough.

10.72 West Norwood Cemetery is one area where a better understanding of the significance of funereal monuments would be of value to parties involved in the management and conservation of the site.

10.73 The work of Lambeth Council's in-house architects (1960 – 1990) is another area where greater understanding would benefit/inform the borough's estate renewal programme.

10 Determining significance

10.1.1 'Significance' lies in the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Archaeological interest includes an interest in carrying out an expert investigation at some point in the future into the evidence a heritage asset may hold of past human activity, and may apply to standing buildings or structures as well as buried remains. Known and potential heritage assets within the site and its vicinity have been identified from national and local designations, HER data and expert opinion. The determination of the significance of these assets is based on statutory designation and/or professional judgement against four values (EH 2008):

- *Evidential value*: the potential of the physical remains to yield evidence of past human activity. This might take into account date; rarity; state of preservation; diversity/complexity; contribution to published priorities; supporting documentation; collective value and comparative potential.
- *Aesthetic value*: this derives from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from the heritage asset, taking into account what other people have said or written;
- *Historical value*: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through heritage asset to the present, such a connection often being illustrative or associative;
- *Communal value*: this derives from the meanings of a heritage asset for the people who know about it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory; communal values are closely bound up with historical, particularly associative, and aesthetic values, along with and educational, social or economic values.

10.1.2 Table 4 gives examples of the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Table 4: Significance of heritage assets

Heritage asset description	Significance
World heritage sites Scheduled monuments Grade I and II* listed buildings Historic England Grade I and II* registered parks and gardens Protected Wrecks Heritage assets of national importance	Very high (International/ national)
Historic England Grade II registered parks and gardens Conservation areas Designated historic battlefields Grade II listed buildings Burial grounds Protected heritage landscapes (e.g. ancient woodland or historic hedgerows) Heritage assets of regional or county importance	High (national/ regional/ county)
Heritage assets with a district value or interest for education or cultural appreciation Locally listed buildings	Medium (District)
Heritage assets with a local (ie parish) value or interest for education or cultural appreciation	Low (Local)
Historic environment resource with no significant value or interest	Negligible
Heritage assets that have a clear potential, but for which current knowledge is insufficient to allow significance to be determined	Uncertain

10.1.3 Unless the nature and exact extent of buried archaeological remains within any given area has been determined through prior investigation, significance is often uncertain.

11 Non-archaeological constraints

11.1.1 There is a risk of asbestos within the basements of both the Middle and West Sites. There are also a couple of upstanding oil tanks in the Middle Site together with possible oil tanks within the basement of the Middle Site and below ground in the eastern part of the Middle Site (J Richmond, WSP, *email comm.,* 21.12.2016 & Fig 19). It is anticipated that live services will be present on the site, the locations of which have not been identified by this archaeological report. Other than this, no other non-archaeological constraints to any archaeological fieldwork have been identified within the site.

11.1.2 Note: the purpose of this section is to highlight to decision makers any relevant non-archaeological constraints identified during the study, that might affect future archaeological field investigation on the site (should this be recommended). The information has been assembled using only those sources as identified in section 2 and section 13.4, in order to assist forward planning for the project designs, working schemes of investigation and risk assessments that would be needed prior to any such field work. MOLA has used its best endeavours to ensure that the sources used are appropriate for this task but has not independently verified any details. Under the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974 and subsequent regulations, all organisations are required to protect their employees as far as is reasonably practicable by addressing health and safety risks. The contents of this section are intended only to support organisations operating on this site in fulfilling this obligation and do not comprise a comprehensive risk assessment.

12 Glossary

Alluvium	Sediment laid down by a river. Can range from sands and gravels deposited by fast flowing water and clays that settle out of suspension during overbank flooding. Other deposits found on a valley floor are usually included in the term alluvium (eg peat).
Archaeological Priority Area/Zone	Areas of archaeological priority, significance, potential or other title, often designated by the local authority.
Brickearth	A fine-grained silt believed to have accumulated by a mixture of processes (eg wind, slope and freeze-thaw) mostly since the Last Glacial Maximum around 17,000BP.
B.P.	Before Present, conventionally taken to be 1950
Bronze Age	2,000–600 BC
Building recording	Recording of historic buildings (by a competent archaeological organisation) is undertaken *'to document buildings, or parts of buildings, which may be lost as a result of demolition, alteration or neglect',* amongst other reasons. Four levels of recording are defined by Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and Historic England. Level 1 (basic visual record); Level 2 (descriptive record), Level 3 (analytical record), and Level 4 (comprehensive analytical record)
Built heritage	Upstanding structure of historic interest.
Colluvium	A natural deposit accumulated through the action of rainwash or gravity at the base of a slope.
Conservation area	An area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Designation by the local authority often includes controls over the demolition of buildings; strengthened controls over minor development; and special provision for the protection of trees.
Cropmarks	Marks visible from the air in growing crops, caused by moisture variation due to subsurface features of possible archaeological origin (i.e. ditches or buried walls).
Cut-and-cover [trench]	Method of construction in which a trench is excavated down from existing ground level and which is subsequently covered over and/or backfilled.
Cut feature	Archaeological feature such as a pit, ditch or well, which has been cut into the then-existing ground surface.
Devensian	The most recent cold stage (glacial) of the Pleistocene. Spanning the period from *c* 70,000 years ago until the start of the Holocene (10,000 years ago). Climate fluctuated within the Devensian, as it did in other glacials and interglacials. It is associated with the demise of the Neanderthals and the expansion of modern humans.
Early medieval	AD 410–1066. Also referred to as the Saxon period.
Evaluation (archaeological)	A limited programme of non–intrusive and/or intrusive fieldwork which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified area.
Excavation (archaeological)	A programme of controlled, intrusive fieldwork with defined research objectives which examines, records and interprets archaeological remains, retrieves artefacts, ecofacts and other remains within a specified area. The records made and objects gathered are studied and the results published in detail appropriate to the project design.
Findspot	Chance find/antiquarian discovery of artefact. The artefact has no known context, is either residual or indicates an area of archaeological activity.
Geotechnical	Ground investigation, typically in the form of boreholes and/or trial/test pits, carried out for engineering purposes to determine the nature of the subsurface deposits.
Head	Weathered/soliflucted periglacial deposit (ie moved downslope through natural processes).
Heritage asset	A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are the valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).
Historic environment assessment	A written document whose purpose is to determine, as far as is reasonably possible from existing records, the nature of the historic environment resource/heritage assets within a specified area.
Historic Environment Record (HER)	Archaeological and built heritage database held and maintained by the County authority. Previously known as the Sites and Monuments Record
Holocene	The most recent epoch (part) of the Quaternary, covering the past 10,000 years during which time a warm interglacial climate has existed. Also referred to as the 'Postglacial' and (in Britain) as the 'Flandrian'.
Iron Age	600 BC–AD 43
Later medieval	AD 1066 – 1500

Last Glacial Maximum	Characterised by the expansion of the last ice sheet to affect the British Isles (around 18,000 years ago), which at its maximum extent covered over two-thirds of the present land area of the country.
Locally listed building	A structure of local architectural and/or historical interest. These are structures that are not included in the Secretary of State's Listing but are considered by the local authority to have architectural and/or historical merit
Listed building	A structure of architectural and/or historical interest. These are included on the Secretary of State's list, which affords statutory protection. These are subdivided into Grades I, II* and II (in descending importance).
Made Ground	Artificial deposit. An archaeologist would differentiate between modern made ground, containing identifiably modern inclusion such as concrete (but not brick or tile), and undated made ground, which may potentially contain deposits of archaeological interest.
Mesolithic	12,000 – 4,000 BC
National Record for the Historic Environment (NRHE)	National database of archaeological sites, finds and events as maintained by Historic England in Swindon. Generally not as comprehensive as the country HER.
Neolithic	4,000 – 2,000 BC
Ordnance Datum (OD)	A vertical datum used by Ordnance Survey as the basis for deriving altitudes on maps.
Palaeo-environmental	Related to past environments, i.e. during the prehistoric and later periods. Such remains can be of archaeological interest, and often consist of organic remains such as pollen and plant macro fossils which can be used to reconstruct the past environment.
Palaeolithic	700,000–12,000 BC
Palaeochannel	A former/ancient watercourse
Peat	A build-up of organic material in waterlogged areas, producing marshes, fens, mires, blanket and raised bogs. Accumulation is due to inhibited decay in anaerobic conditions.
Pleistocene	Geological period pre-dating the Holocene.
Post-medieval	AD 1500–present
Preservation by record	Archaeological mitigation strategy where archaeological remains are fully excavated and recorded archaeologically and the results published. For remains of lesser significance, preservation by record might comprise an archaeological watching brief.
Preservation in situ	Archaeological mitigation strategy where nationally important (whether Scheduled or not) archaeological remains are preserved *in situ* for future generations, typically through modifications to design proposals to avoid damage or destruction of such remains.
Registered Historic Parks and Gardens	A site may lie within or contain a registered historic park or garden. The register of these in England is compiled and maintained by Historic England.
Residual	When used to describe archaeological artefacts, this means not *in situ,* ie Found outside the context in which it was originally deposited.
Roman	AD 43–410
Scheduled Monument	An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and protected under the Ancient Monuments Act.
Site	The area of proposed development
Site codes	Unique identifying codes allocated to archaeological fieldwork sites, eg evaluation, excavation, or watching brief sites.
Study area	Defined area surrounding the proposed development in which archaeological data is collected and analysed in order to set the site into its archaeological and historical context.
Solifluction, Soliflucted	Creeping of soil down a slope during periods of freeze and thaw in periglacial environments. Such material can seal and protect earlier landsurfaces and archaeological deposits which might otherwise not survive later erosion.
Stratigraphy	A term used to define a sequence of visually distinct horizontal layers (strata), one above another, which form the material remains of past cultures.
Truncate	Partially or wholly remove. In archaeological terms remains may have been truncated by previous construction activity.
Watching brief (archaeological)	An archaeological watching brief is '*a formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non–archaeological reasons.*'

13 Bibliography

13.1 Published and documentary sources

Blair J, 1991 *Early medieval Surrey: landholding, church and settlement before 1300*, Stroud.

Bloice, B & Thorn, J 1969 'London tin-glazed pottery' *London Archaeol* Vol 1 No 3, 57-9

CIfA [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists] Dec 2014a, *Standards and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*, Reading.

CIfA [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists] Dec 2014b, *Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*, Reading

DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*

DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2014 *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment: Planning Practice Guide*

Densem, R & Doidge, A 1979, *The topography of north Lambeth* in London Archaeologist, Vol. 3, No 10, 265-9.

Draper, J. 2001 *Post-medieval Pottery 1650–1800*.

Edwards, R. 1973 *Lambeth Stoneware: The Woolley Collection including Doulton Ware and products of other British Potteries*. London Borough of Lambeth.

Edwards R 1974, *London Potters 1570 – 1710* Jour. Ceramic Hist, 6

EH [English Heritage], 2008 *Conservation principles, policies and guidance.* Swindon

EH [English Heritage], 2015, *The setting of heritage assets*. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3.

Eyles, D. and Irvine, R. 1978 *The Doulton Lambeth Wares*. Shepton Beauchamp.

Garner, FH 1937 'Lambeth earthenware' *Trans ECC* 4 43-66

GLA [Greater London Authority], March 2016 *The London Plan. Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London.*

GLAAS [Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service], 2015 *Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London.*

Gower G and Tyler K, 2003 *Lambeth Unearthed – An archaeological history of Lambeth.* London: Museum of London Archaeology Service

Holmes, Basil (Mrs) 1896 *The London Burial Grounds: Notes on their history from the earliest to the present day (1896).* New York: MacMillan & Co

Humphery-Smith C, 1984 *The Phillimore Atlas and Index of Parish Registers*.

Imber, D. 1979 *Lambeth Lost and Found: A Survey of Archaeological and Historical Sites*. Southwark and Lambeth.

London Topographical Society, 2005 *The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps, 1939–1945*.

MoLAS [Museum of London Archaeology Service], 2000 *The archaeology of Greater London: an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area covered by modern Greater London.* London

Renier, H, 2006. *Lambeth Past*. London: Historical Publications

Roberts, H and Godfrey, WH (eds), 1951. *Survey of London: volume 23 - Lambeth: South Bank and Vauxhall.*

Sheppard F (ed), 1956. *Survey of London: volume 26 – The Parish of St Mary Lambeth*, *Pt 2 Southern Area.* London: Athlone Press.

Spurr, G 2017, *8 Albert Embankment*, Unpublished MOLA Geoarchaeologicall Deposit model

TBAOG 1964 Thames Basin Archaeological Observers' Group, March/April 1964, *Newsletter*, New Ser, 21

Tyler, K., Brown, J., Smith, T. P. and Whittingham, L. 2005 *The Daulton stoneware pothouse in Lambeth: Excavations at 9 Albert Embankment, London*. A MOL Monograph Series 15.

Tyler, K., Betts, I., and Simpson, R. 2008 *London's delftware industry: The tin-glazed pottery industries of Southwark and Lambeth*. A MOL Monograph Series 40.

VCH (Victoria County History) *A History of the County of Surrey: Volume 4* H.E. Malden (editor) (1912)

Weinreb B Hibbert C, Keay J, Keay J (eds), 2008 *The London encyclopaedia.* Macmillan. London

WSP, 2017 *8 Albert Embankment: Basement Impact Assessment*, client report, December 2017

13.2 Other Sources

British Geological Survey online historic geology borehole data and digital drift and solid geology data
British National Copyright Library, London
Greater London Historic Environment Record
Historic England designation data
Internet – web-published sources
London Metropolitan Archives
London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre
MOLA Deposit Survival Archive

13.3 Cartographic sources

Goad, C E, 1886 *Insurance plan of London*, http://collage.cityoflondon.gov.uk/collage

Greenwood, C, and Greenwood, J, 1827 'Map of London from an Actual Survey', reproduced in Margary 1982, '*Map of London from an Actual Survey' by C and J Greenwood, 1827,* Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Margary, H, 1985 *The A–Z of Regency London (Horwood's map of 1799),* Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Rocque, J, 1746 'A Plan of the Cities of London Westminster and Southwark with contiguous buildings from an actual survey' by John Rocque, reproduced in Margary, H, 1971 '*A Plan of the Cities of London Westminster and Southwark' by John Rocque, 1746,* Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Stanford, E, 1862 'Stanford's Library Map of London', reproduced in Margary, H, 1980, '*Stanford's Library Map of London' 1862,* Margary in assoc Guildhall Library, Kent

Vauxhall Manor Estate map of 1681

Ordnance Survey maps

Ordnance Survey 1st edition 25" map (1871)
Ordnance Survey 2nd edition 25" map (1894)
Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25" map (1914)
Ordnance Survey 3rd edition 25" map (1935)
Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map (1950)
Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map (1958)
Ordnance Survey 1:1250 scale map (1978)

Engineering/Architects drawings

Existing basement plan in the Front Site (The Gordon Tamalin Partnership; dwg. No. 8575.02; November 2007)
Existing basement plan in the Middle Site (The Gordon Tamalin Partnership; dwg. No. 8901.01; August 2009)
Pilbrow and Partners Drawings

West site	Basement Plan No 1528-PP-A0-B1-DR-A-10-0098, Rev P0 05/10/2018
	Section plan No 1528-PP-A0-XX-DR-A-12-2100, Rev P0 05/10/2018
	Section plan No 1528-PP-A0-DR-A-12-2101, Rev P0 05/10/2018
	Section plan Drwg No 1528-PP-A0-XX-DR-A-12-2104, Rev P0 05/10/2018
Central site	Basement Plan Level 2 Drwg No 1528-PP-B0-B2-DR-A-10-0097, Rev P0 18/07/2018
	Section plan No 1528-PP-B0-XX-DR-A-12-2200, Rev P0 05/10/2018
	Section plan No 1528-PP-B0-XX-DR-A-11-2205, Rev P0 05/10/2018
East Site	Lower Ground plan No 1528-PP-C0-00-DR-A-10-0099, Rev P0, 05/10/2018
	Section plan No 1528-PP-C0-XX-DR-A-12-2300, Rev P0, 05/10/2018

13.4 Available site survey information checklist

Information from client	Available	Format	Obtained
Plan of existing site services (overhead/buried)	not known		N
Levelled site survey as existing (ground and buildings)	Y	pdf/CAD	Y
Contamination survey data ground and buildings (inc. asbestos)	Y	pdf	Y
Geotechnical report	Y	pdf	Y
Envirocheck report	not known		N
Information obtained from non-client source	**Carried out**	**Internal inspection of buildings**	
Site inspection	Y	Y	