

# INDUSTRIAL MONUMENTS SURVEY

PAUL CARTER

SOME YEARS AGO the Council for British Archaeology initiated a National Survey of Industrial Monuments, with the intended purpose of locating and providing data on threatened industrial monuments. On discovery of a site field-workers were asked to fill in a standard record card which had been designed by the C.B.A. Research Committee on Industrial Archaeology, and then forward their completed cards to the Council, who passed them on to Mr. Rex Wailes, the then Consultant on Industrial Monuments for the Ministry of Public Building and Works. By 1965, however, it became urgent that a system for recording and classifying the information sent in be established, and ensuring that the original cards sent in were safely re-

turned to their senders. In November 1965, at the suggestion of Mr. Wailes, the Centre for the Study of History of Technology, Bath University of Technology agreed to undertake this work, under the charge of the Centre's Director, Dr. R. A. Buchanan. And so the National Record of Industrial Monuments (N.R.I.M.) came into being.

Since its initiation in 1965, the total number of cards processed by the N.R.I.M. approaches 7,000. On arrival at the Record, the cards are sorted and copied in triplicate. One copy is forwarded to the C.B.A. for use by Mr. Wailes (now C.B.A. consultant on Industrial Archaeology); one copy goes to the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments, to be housed at the National Monuments Record<sup>1</sup>; and one copy goes into the N.R.I.M. collection. For various reasons it is doubtful if the purpose for which the Survey was originally initiated has ever been achieved. Many reporters, on discovering a site, undertake much fieldwork before a card is finally filled in and forwarded to the N.R.I.M. with the result that the time-lag between the discovery and the placing of the card in the N.R.I.M. is frequently so great that the site has been destroyed in the meantime. Information cannot therefore be relied upon to be up to date. Also the coverage so far shows a wide variation in the standard of reporting; the significance of the items reported; and an uneven coverage from region to region. Many of the 'Meccas' of the industrial archaeologist have yet to be included in the N.R.I.M. collection. Indeed as far as our own area is concerned neither Tower Bridge nor St. Pancras Station are included, for until now there has been no real attempt to provide a systematic coverage of the region. This being the case, does the N.R.I.M. and the Survey as a whole have any purpose? I think it does.

## What are its future uses?

Undoubtedly although the Survey has as yet not been of value in providing data for the preservation of industrial monuments, the interest aroused in the subject, due to the promotion of the Survey has led several local Societies or Groups to fight to save threatened monuments from destruction. Additionally, in the long term the N.R.I.M. could form the basis of a national archive on past industry, which could be consulted when compiling local histories.

## London Bridge—continued

proach road from the south should cross over the bridge and then stop at the south gate of the Forum rather than being a through route. On the south side of the river, an upstream bridge fits in much better with what we know of the pattern of settlement. For example, the Montague Close road would go through the middle of the area of Roman settlement rather than along one side of it as the downstream road does. Three of the four known Roman stone buildings in Southwark (Winchester Palace<sup>9</sup>, Southwark Cathedral<sup>10</sup> and Borough Market<sup>11</sup>) are nearer the Montague Close road than the downstream bridge and two (the latter two) would actually seem to front onto it. The fourth building could front onto the downstream road but further south a flimsy wattle and daub one would indeed do so (discovered by Kenyon at King's Head Yard<sup>12</sup>). Thus if there are two roads in Southwark, the Montague Close one would be the one leading to the bridge (on the assumption that the wealthier houses would be along the main road).

9. Preliminary Report on Excavations at Winchester Palace.

10. *Archaeologia* 24. 198.

11. Preliminary Report on Excavations at 4 Southwark Street.

12. K. M. Kenyon. *Excavations in Southwark* (1959). 20-21.

All preliminary reports available at the Cuming Museum, Walworth Road, S.E.17.

distribution maps, etc. Dr. Buchanan says the construction of a really comprehensive and integrated National Record should retain a high priority in the endeavours of serious industrial archaeologists<sup>2</sup>.

In addition, the standard record cards could form the basis of an excellent local index of monuments throughout a region, or district. No doubt several such collections already exist around the country, although often these have not been sent to the N.R.I.M. for copying, which is a pity. On the whole the standard Report card designed by the C.B.A. is excellent for this purpose; the blank reverse can be put to additional uses. In our own area there is considerable need for such a local index, which can easily be consulted by research workers.

The establishment of such an index has long been one of the aims of the Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society. Indeed it is one of the functions the Society was formed for, as the index could provide both a guide to the wealth of material the area contains, and also a record of field and research work carried out. GLIAS have decided to try and establish such an index, and on the back of the GLIAS Index Cards will be added details of work carried out, by whom, and where the published or material results of their work can be found. Recently Surrey Archaeological Society have expressed interest in trying to promote a similar scheme for Surrey.

#### **Compiling a London index**

The success or failure of such a venture depends upon the willingness of people to undertake the tedious but important task of filling in one of the Report Cards, as a preliminary to further activity. Indeed on discovery of a site this should be their first task. In many cases no further recording work need be carried out, as a considerable amount of information can be got from a well completed card. Small items such as street furniture, boundary markers, etc., are adequately dealt with in this way. To encourage people to assist in compiling the Index, GLIAS are willing to supply anyone interested in helping with batches of 24 cards, free (but include 6d. stamp when applying), on the understanding that they complete TWO cards for each item, one which they retain for themselves, and one copy which they return to GLIAS, for forwarding to Bath to be copied and then for inclusion in the GLIAS collection. On receipt of the completed cards, GLIAS will, before dispatching the batches of cards to Bath, make TWO further copies, these being intended to form collections housed at the London Museum and the Passmore Edwards Museum, Stratford. No doubt Surrey Archaeological Society will devise some similar arrangement, with at least one collection housed at the Guildford Museum. In addition to a supply of cards, prospective reporters will receive a leaflet giving guidance on how to fill in the cards. Cards may however be purchased directly from the C.B.A.,

8 St. Andrew's Place, London, N.W.1., price 30p per 100 plus postage.

#### **The current position**

The cards already housed with the N.R.I.M. are classified under Counties. Of those in South-East England, only Hertfordshire has received anything like systematic coverage<sup>3</sup>. Below is a table of the position as at May 1970<sup>4</sup>.

Buckinghamshire	100
Essex	28
Greater London	53
Hertfordshire	616
Kent	85
Surrey	54
Sussex	44

It is to be hoped that this time next year will see the South-East much better represented in the National Collection. At least half those included in the totals above are of minor items, and many of them badly out of date. GLIAS have agreed to revise all the Greater London entries as a start towards forming a Greater London Index.

Alas, the writer of this article, when compiling a survey of industrial monuments in the area,<sup>5</sup> with two colleagues, did not fill in a report card for each item included in the survey, due both to lack of time, and the fact that to do justice to the N.R.I.M. Survey, the site has actually to be visited before filling in the card. Unfortunately it was impossible at the time to visit every site, when compiling this survey, but it does form the nucleus on which a Greater London Index could be based. At least one local society<sup>6</sup> have taken the items listed in their London Borough as a starting point, and in addition several GLIAS members currently engaged in research projects are also helping, but the position is far from satisfactory.

#### **Filling in the report card**

The problem with any survey of this kind is mainly the varying standards in which people make out their reports. If the proposed London Index is to be of any use, there must be a certain amount of standardisation of the way information is presented. Although much of what is required is basic common sense, the contributions so far to the N.R.I.M. collection so vary, that below are listed a few basic hints and suggestions:

- 1) When filling in the card either use a typewriter (Black ribbon) or use a black pen. Coloured inks or pencil do not copy well.
- 2) If using the pen print the card. Many already in the N.R.I.M. collection are almost undecipherable due to the poor handwriting.
- 3) For large sites, containing much of interest, including buildings and machines, fill in one card for the whole site, with additional cards for any individual items of special interest.
- 4) For COUNTY, if within Greater London put

NATURE OF SITE (Factory, mine, etc.) <b>RAILWAY VIADUCT</b>		COUNTY <b>GLC - EALING</b>	REF.No.
Grid Reference or Location <b>TQ 150 804</b>	Industry <b>RAILWAY</b>	Dating <b>1838</b>	Parish/Township <b>HANWELL</b>
		Date of Report <b>OCT. 1970</b>	

DESCRIPTION: dimensions; present condition; architectural features etc.

**WHARNCLIFFE VIADUCT. 1/4 mi. N. UXBRIDGE ROAD. HANWELL.  
SUPERB SIMPLE EIGHT-ARCH YELLOW BRICK VIADUCT DESIGNED BY  
I. K. BRUNEL TO CARRY THE GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY ACROSS THE  
VALLEY OF THE RIVER BRENT. DOUBLE TRACK WHEN BUILT, BUT  
QUADRUPED 1877. AT PRESENT IN GOOD CONDITION.**

(Further remarks or photo/sketch may be recorded on the back) **PHOTO ON BACK BY REPORTER.**

Machinery and Fittings **WHARNCLIFFE COAT OF ARMS ON CENTRE PIER, SOUTH  
SIDE.**

Danger of Demolition or Damage **NONE.**

Printed, Manuscript or Photographic Records

**SOI:- BRITISH RAILWAY BRIDGES D. WALTERS (IAN ALLAN 1983)**

Reporter's name and address:- **PAUL CARTER  
20 CHESTNUT GROVE, SUDBURY,  
WEMBLEY. HAO 2LX.**

Return to:-

Institution or Society:- **GLIAS.**

C.B.A. Industrial Archaeology Report Card.

GLC and then the Borough, e.g. GLC/BAR-  
NET. Items in the old Counties of Essex, Kent,  
Middx. or Surrey now within Greater London  
should be listed under GLC/—.

- 5) On the card returned to GLIAS leave REF. No. space blank. This is used by the N.R.I.M. and GLIAS will introduce a numbering system to suit its own Index.
- 6) GRID REFERENCE OR LOCATION. If possible use the standard NGR six figure reference, with a space between the Easting and Northing, e.g., TQ 465 779.
- 7) INDUSTRY. State the actual industry concerned. The original categories suggested by the C.B.A. (i.e. Power, Transport, etc.) have proved difficult, with duplication, and the system is not used by the N.R.I.M.
- 8) DESCRIPTION. This is the most difficult item to give guidance on, but a number of points will, I hope, guide would be reporters. Firstly, in urban areas, items may be difficult to locate without a full address, so if necessary, state it here. Secondly the description should be as detailed, but as short as possible. Many reporters have fallen into the pitfall of writing a short history in this space. This is not the place to do it. (See Example Card).
- 9) PHOTOGRAPHS. If included, they should be secured firmly to the back of the card. It is hoped as many people as possible will include

an illustration with the card they return to GLIAS, but note that a written description is necessary as well, as photographs do not copy well.

- 10) Leave the space RETURN TO blank.

The other items on the card are purely a matter of common sense, but study the example DESCRIPTION to note just how much it tells you about the Wharncliffe Viaduct, without going into irrelevant detail.

#### Can I help?

If the Greater London Index of Industrial Monuments is to be of any use, it must be comprehensive, and to achieve this, much help is needed. If every reader of *the London Archaeologist* just completed one report and returned it to GLIAS, the effect on the South-East's representation in the N.R.I.M. would be staggering. We have an industrial heritage all around us of which we should be proud, and it is up to all of us, if we call ourselves archaeologists, to see that this heritage does not disappear almost totally unrecorded. It is to be hoped that the interest at last being shown in Greater London and Surrey will awaken other areas in the South-East before it is too late.

For further information about the GLIAS scheme contact Paul Carter, 20 Chestnut Grove, Sudbury, Wembley, HAO 2LX. For details of Surrey Archaeological Society scheme contact Mr. R. M. Hall, 14 Adecroft Way, East Molesey, Surrey.