

don boroughs. On the committees a range of 'interested parties' should meet -- representatives of the planning authorities (professional and councillor), museums, local history libraries and societies plus English Heritage and archaeological contractors. The idea is that local archaeological arrangements and problems can be discussed: problems with a London-wide implication can be brought to SCOLA's attention. SCOLA also chairs the Greater London Local Societies meetings to which active societies from the whole of London are invited.

Operating these committees has presented problems. Planning officers are not always happy to attend yet another evening meeting; local society members may find daytime meetings impossible. With the growth of competitive tendering, contractors' staff cannot always speak freely in front of one another. English Heritage overload prevents them from being represented at every meeting. Not all of these problems have yet been overcome.

Happily, English Heritage and the Museum of London have co-operated with SCOLA, even where opinions have differed. SCOLA commissioned a review of the working of PPG16 in Greater London and the document contained sixteen recommendations for future action<sup>3</sup>. This review has been influential (in part, at any rate) with both English Heritage and the Museum of

3. S. McCracken and C. Phillpotts *Archaeology and Planning in London -- Assessing the effectiveness of PPG16* SCOLA (1995).  
4. See H. O'Sullivan '82-90 Park Lane, Croydon: a Planning case-study' *London Archaeol* 7 no. 16 (1996) 424-431.

London. The London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre, moreover, is something which SCOLA urged and to which it provided some funds.

One area where there has been disagreement between SCOLA and English Heritage has been that of mitigation strategies. This came to a head in respect of the threat from development to the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Croydon. English Heritage maintained that sealing the graves beneath a protective layer and the tarmac of a car park would be sufficient but SCOLA saw this as a high risk strategy. SCOLA argued that the uncertainties surrounding some mitigation strategies were greater than English Heritage was prepared to acknowledge<sup>4</sup>. Several subsequent papers, including the recent study by Kenward and Hall<sup>5</sup>, seem to reinforce SCOLA's fears.

With the changes in London Government, SCOLA has been involved in a lengthy, behind the scenes, lobbying campaign. At first this was with civil servants but later, as the mayoral candidates became known, SCOLA wrote directly to the five main candidates, seeking their views on 'heritage' matters. Only the Liberal Democrat and Green Party candidates made considered replies.

The Greater London Authority Act provides for there to be a Cultural Strategy Group for London with the duty to formulate and submit to the

5. H. Kenward and A. Hall 'Decay of delicate organic remains in shallow urban deposits: are we at the watershed?' *Antiquity* 74 (2000) 519-525.

---

## Letter

---

### Reigate Stone at Battersea

FASCINATING ASI found Tim Tatton-Brown's article 'Reigate Stone at Battersea' (*London Archaeol* 9, no. 6, 160), it contained some comments on the 1996 and 1998 archaeological evaluations at Prices Candle Factory, York Road, Battersea (Duncan Hawkins 'The Archbishop of York's Battersea Mansion', *London Archaeol* 9, no. 5, 129-136) which require an answer.

First I am pleased to assure Tim Tatton-Brown that not a single piece of Reigate Stone was recovered during the 1996 and 1998 archaeological evaluations. The professional team of archaeologists from Pre-Construct Archaeology who undertook the evaluation were perfectly capable of distinguishing chalk from Reigate Stone and would have spotted it had it been present. All the chalk from the site was recovered from post-medieval contexts.

Unfortunately, Mr Tatton-Brown appears to have misunderstood the purpose of the 1996 evaluation. This work, undertaken within the standing and fully operational buildings of Prices Candle Factory, was specifically designed to identify the

extent of York House and its ancillary buildings, so that they could be avoided by any new development. Building remains encountered in the 1996 trial trenching were recorded and left *in situ*.

Only the area of the 1998 evaluation trenches 7, 8 and 9, which had been heavily disturbed by post-depositional impacts, and a block of land to the north and west that had been occupied by a deep 1930s basement cut into natural subsoil, has been impacted by redevelopment.

The remains of York House and its ancillary buildings survive *in situ* beneath the still operational late 19th- and early 20th-century Candle Factory buildings, and an extensive area of surface parking to the north. If Tim Tatton-Brown is right, and the plot of land at 'Bruges' granted to the Canons of Waltham Abbey in 1218 falls within the Prices Candle Factory site, then its recorded dimensions would suggest that it too has been unaffected by the recent development.

Duncan Hawkins  
CgMs Consulting  
7th Floor, Newspaper House,  
8-16 Great New Street,  
London, EC4A 3BN