

64 Front Street, East Boldon, Tyne and Wear

Report on an Archaeological Watching Brief

Prepared for:	Mr John Connolly
Prepared by:	Chris Scott BA (Hons), MA, MCIfA Solstice Heritage Crabtree Hall Business Centre Little Holtby Northallerton North Yorkshire DL7 9LN
Checked by:	Jim Brightman BA (Hons), MLitt, MCIfA
Project Ref:	SOL1516-39
Document Ref:	DOC1617-1
Dates of Fieldwork:	March 2016
Date of Report:	April 2016



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Solstice Heritage would like to thank Mr John Connolly for commissioning the monitoring and this resultant report. Thanks are also extended to Jennifer Morrison of Newcastle City Council who provided the specification and local authority monitoring for the work.



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	2
1.1 Project Background	2
1.2 Site Location	2
1.3 Potential Significance	2
1.4 Aims and Objectives	2
2. Policy and Guidance Framework	5
2.1 Legislation	5
2.2 Policy	5
2.2.1 National	5
2.2.2 Local	6
2.3 Guidance	7
2.3.1 National	7
2.3.2 Regional	8
3. Methodology	9
3.1 Fieldwork	9
3.2 Post-Fieldwork	9
3.3 Chronology	9
3.4 Assumptions and Limitations	910
3.5 Copyright	10
4. Results	11
4.1 General Stratigraphy	11
5. Glass and Ceramic Vessels	14
5.1 Introduction	14
5.2 Method	14
5.3 Distribution	14
5.4 Glass Vessels	14
5.4.1 Stout Bottle (SF5)	14
5.4.2 Smaller Bottle (SF6)	15
5.5 Ceramic Vessels	16
5.5.1 Dairy Jars (SF1-3)	16
5.5.2 Preserve Jar	17
5.5.3 Bottle	17
5.6 Discussion	18
6. Discussion	20
7. Sources	21
Bibliography	21
7.1	21
Appendix 1 – Specification	22



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Site Location	4
Figure 2 Extent of area of monitoring.....	12
Figure 3 Stripped area looking south, showing weathered and disturbed upper surface of natural limestone bedrock	13
Figure 4 Deposit sequence encountered on the site. Topsoil 001 overlying landscaping layer 002, with mid-brown clay 003 visible above natural bedrock 004 at base. Scale 1x1m	1413
Figure 5 Vaux's Stout bottle (SF5)	15
Figure 6 Cumberland Dairy cream jar (SF1).....	17
Figure 7 Stoneware ginger beer bottle (SF7).....	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning	5
Table 2 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology)	6
Table 3 Key policies of South Tyneside Local Development Framework in relation to the current project.....	7
Table 4 National guidance documentation consulted	8
Table 5 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice	8
Table 6 Tabulated assemblage information	19



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An archaeological watching brief was undertaken in March 2016, monitoring groundworks in advance of the construction of a new dwelling in the former rear garden of 64 Front Street, East Boldon, Tyne and Wear. The watching brief was undertaken in response to a condition placed on planning permission (ST/0171/15/FUL), against the potential disturbance of previously unidentified archaeological remains relating to the medieval and post-medieval village of Boldon.

Other than a small assemblage of late 19th-century artefacts from a levelling or landscaping deposit, no significant archaeological or palaeoenvironmental features or deposits were identified or recovered.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

This report has been commissioned by Mr John Connolly to outline the findings of a programme of archaeological monitoring (watching brief) on groundworks in advance of the construction of a new dwelling to the rear of 64 Front Street, East Boldon, Tyne and Wear. The monitoring was undertaken to fulfil a condition of planning permission (ST/0171/15/FUL).

Preceding the redevelopment works, an archaeological historic building recording was undertaken of the northern boundary wall of the garden (Scott 2015). This archive report provided a description of the boundary wall and a detailed photographic recording before a new opening was created through a rebuilt section of the wall as a part of the development.

1.2 SITE LOCATION

The site is located in the former rear garden of Boldon House, Front Street, East Boldon, Tyne and Wear (NHLE 1355101), to the south of North Road. The development site is centred at NZ 36264 61388 (Figure 1). The development site also lies within the East Boldon Conservation Area.

1.3 POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANCE

The potential archaeological significance of the site, and hence the reason for the monitoring works, lies principally in the possible presence of remains relating to the medieval to post-medieval village of Boldon. The adjacent 64 Front Street is a Grade II listed building (NHLE 1025217), formerly an extension to the Grade II listed Boldon House (NHLE 1355101).

1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

An archaeological watching brief is defined as:

“A formal programme of observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons. This will be within a specified area or site on land, intertidal zone or underwater, where there is a possibility that archaeological deposits may be disturbed or destroyed. The programme will result in the preparation of a report and ordered archive” (ClfA 2014b, 2).

The overarching aim of the watching brief was:

- To ensure that significant archaeological remains were not destroyed without first being adequately recorded.

The objectives of the watching brief were:

- To record, excavate and environmentally sample any archaeological deposits of significance observed during the groundworks
- To establish the date, character and significance of any archaeological and palaeoenvironmental deposits, including in relation to other similar features within the area
- To ensure there is a permanent record of the work undertaken deposited with the local Historic Environment Record (HER) and made available online

- To ensure all work is undertaken in compliance with the Code of Conduct of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) (2014a), the CIfA Standard and Guidance for Watching Briefs (revised 2014b), and the Regional Statement of Good Practice.

Figure 1 Site Location

2. POLICY AND GUIDANCE FRAMEWORK

2.1 LEGISLATION

National legislation that applies to the consideration of cultural heritage within development and the wider planning process is set out in [Table 1](#) below.

Title	Key Points
Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002)	Scheduled Monuments, as defined under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1979), are sites that have been selected by a set of non-statutory criteria to be of national significance. Where scheduled sites are affected by development proposals there is a presumption in favour of their physical preservation. Any works, other than activities receiving class consent under The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1981, as amended by The Ancient Monuments (Class Consents) Order 1984, which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering-up a Scheduled Monument require consent from the Secretary of State for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990	Buildings of national, regional or local historical and architectural importance are protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Buildings designated as 'Listed' are afforded protection from physical alteration or effects on their historical setting.
Hedgerows Regulations 1997	The Hedgerow Regulations (1997) include criteria by which hedgerows can be regarded as historically important (Schedule 1 Part III).

Table 1 Legislation relating to cultural heritage in planning

2.2 POLICY

2.2.1 NATIONAL

The principal instrument of national planning policy within England is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (CLG 2012) which outlines the following in relation to cultural heritage within planning and development:

Paragraph	Key Points
7	Contributing to protecting and enhancing the historic environment is specifically noted as being a part of what constitutes 'sustainable development' – the "golden thread" which, when met, can trigger presumption in favour.
17	A core planning principle is to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for the contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".
128	During the determination of applications "local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting". This information should be proportionate to the significance of the asset and only enough to "understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance".
129	Paragraph 129 identifies that 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.
132	It is noted that significance – the principal measure of inherent overall heritage worth – can be harmed or lost through development within its setting. Heritage assets are

	an irreplaceable resource and any adverse effects require “clear and convincing justification” relative to the significance of the asset in question.
135	At paragraph 135 it states that 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 affect directly or indirectly 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.
139	At paragraph 139 it states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.
141	In paragraph 141 amongst other matters it states that 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 accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Table 2 Key passages of NPPF in reference to cultural heritage (archaeology)

2.2.2 LOCAL

The local policies governing the conservation of the historic environment are contained within the South Tyneside Local Development Framework (LDF) (2007) and its associated development management policies, which remains the principal tool of local development management until the implementation of the new Local Plan.

Policy	Text
DM6	<p>“We will support development proposals that protect, preserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character and heritage, visual appearance and contextual importance of our heritage assets and their settings, including:</p> <p>A; the following Scheduled Ancient Monuments/World Heritage Sites: i) Arbeia Roman Fort (and Vicus as part of the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site); ii) Marsden Lime Kilns; and iii) St. Paul’s Monastery and the site of the former Village of Jarrow.</p> <p>B; the following Conservation Areas, including their historic settlement cores, distinctive open spaces and boundary walls: i) Cleadon; ii) Cleadon Hills; iii) East Boldon; iv) Hebburn Hall; v) Mariners’ Cottages; vi) Mill Dam; vii) Monkton Village; viii) St. Paul’s, Jarrow; ix) West Boldon; x) Westoe Village; and xi) Whitburn;</p> <p>C; listed buildings and structures, non-listed buildings and structures included on the council’s list of locally significant heritage assets, significant landscape features of local heritage and archaeological value and archaeological deposits and remains.</p> <p>Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Conservation Areas are shown on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Archaeological deposits and remains, below ground and on the surface should be recorded, and where possible, preserved in situ. Proposals for built development on: i) previously undeveloped sites; or ii) previously developed sites where archaeological interest has been established by a previous find recorded in the Historic Environment Record; will not be determined until the potential impact of the proposed development on archaeological deposits and remains has been adequately assessed and evaluated, and any adverse impacts will be avoided, minimised or mitigated, or in the absence of adequate information, will be refused.</p> <p>Planning permission will be refused if the impact of development on heritage assets and archaeological remains is unacceptable. Where appropriate, we will use Article 4 directions, planning conditions and planning obligations to secure mitigation measures to</p>

	ensure that development is acceptable in planning terms.
--	--

Table 3 Key policies of South Tyneside Local Development Framework in relation to the current project

2.3 GUIDANCE

2.3.1 NATIONAL

During the assessment and preparation of this document, the following guidance documents have been referred to, where relevant:

Document	Key Points
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (CLG 2014)	The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) released the guidance to NPPF in March 2014 in a 'live' online format which, it is intended can be amended and responsive to comment, particular as case law develops in relation to the implementation of NPPF. In relation to cultural heritage the NPPG follows previous guidance in wording and 'keys in' with, in particular, extant English Heritage guidance documents. The NPPG references many similar terms to the previous PPS5 Practice Guidance.
Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance (HE 2008)	This sets out the guiding principles of conservation as seen by Historic England and also provides a terminology for assessment of significance upon which much that has followed is based.
Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief (ClfA 2014b)	This document represents non-statutory industry best practice as set out by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. This work has been undertaken to these standards, as subscribed to by Solstice Heritage.

Table 4 National guidance documentation consulted

2.3.2 REGIONAL

Archaeological work on Tyneside is often required to comply with *Yorkshire, The Humber and The North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process* (SYAS 2011). The key principles in relation to the monitoring work undertaken are summarised in the table below:

Principle	Key Points
2	Archaeological work should be undertaken by professionally qualified and appropriately experienced archaeologists and organisations.
3	All archaeological work will have a scope agreed in advance with the archaeological curator (this document), and any changes to the scope or methodology will be agreed in writing with the archaeological curator.
4	Monitoring of archaeological work by the local archaeological curator will be the norm, and reasonable notice of commencement of fieldwork will be given.
5	Archaeological work will be undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidance of English Heritage and the IfA.
6	The local Historic Environment Record should be consulted prior to the commencement of fieldwork.
7	Archaeological work in the planning process should have regard to national and local published research agenda (see section 4.2 below)
9	Reports and required data will be submitted to the archaeological curator and local HER in a timely fashion and in accordance with the agreed WSI.
10	Any comments made by the archaeological curator on reports and outputs will be made within a reasonable timetable of receipt.
11	Where appropriate significant archaeological findings will be submitted for publication in a suitable journal or journals.
12	Any archive produced will be deposited in an ordered and acceptable fashion within a reasonable timetable, the details of which will be given in the report.
13	During the course of archaeological work arrangements will be made, where possible, for disseminating information about the site to the general public.

Table 5 Key principles of the Regional Statement of Good Practice

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 FIELDWORK

The footprint of the proposed new dwelling, covering the majority of the site area, was excavated to the natural bedrock between 10th and 14th March 2016. All groundworks were monitored by a suitably qualified archaeologist, and a toothless ditching bucket was used for all excavations.

Where archaeological features and deposits were encountered, these were recorded to the standards outlined in the relevant ClfA Standard and Guidance (2014b). All features and deposits were recorded on *pro-forma* record sheets, drawn in plan and section at a suitable scale and photographed. No deposits with palaeoenvironmental potential were noted. In addition to any specific features or deposits, a general record of the trench stratigraphy was made on a *pro-forma* record sheet.

3.2 POST-FIELDWORK

The primary site archive was compiled, comprising site records and digital photography. This has been used to compile this report, which will be deposited with the local HER as the principal record of the monitoring work undertaken. If considered to be of sufficient significance following discussion with the Tyne and Wear County Archaeologist, the documentary archive will be deposited with a suitable local collections museum within six months of the submission of this report. A suitable OASIS record will be completed for this work, including a digital version of the report uploaded, within the same timescale.

A number of glass and ceramic vessels were recovered from deposit (002); these have been catalogued, processed and assessed (see Section 4.2 below).

3.3 CHRONOLOGY

Where chronological and archaeological periods are referred to in the report, the relevant date ranges are broadly defined as follows:

- Palaeolithic (Old Stone Age): 1 million – 12,000 BP (Before present)
- Mesolithic (Middle Stone Age): 10000 – 4000 BC
- Neolithic (New Stone Age): 4000 – 2400 BC
- Chalcolithic/Beaker Period: 2400 – 2000 BC
- Bronze Age: 2400 – BC
- Iron Age: BC – AD 70
- Roman/Romano-British: AD 70 – 410
- Anglo-Saxon/Anglo-Scandinavian: AD 410 – 1066
- Medieval: AD 1066 – 1540
- Post-medieval: AD 1540 – 1750
- Industrial: AD 1750 – 1900
- Modern: AD 1900 – Present

3.4 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Data and information obtained and consulted in the compilation of this report has been derived from a number of secondary sources. Where it has not been practicable to verify the

accuracy of secondary information, its accuracy has been assumed in good faith. All statements and opinions arising from the works undertaken are provided in good faith and compiled according to professional standards. No responsibility can be accepted by the author/s of the report for any errors of fact or opinion resulting from data supplied by any third party, or for loss or other consequence arising from decisions or actions made upon the basis of facts or opinions expressed in any such report(s), howsoever such facts and opinions may have been derived.

3.5 **COPYRIGHT**

Solstice Heritage will retain the copyright of all documentary and photographic material under the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act (1988).

4. RESULTS

4.1 GENERAL STRATIGRAPHY

The monitored excavation of the site removed all deposits down to the natural, weathered yellow limestone bedrock (004) (Figure 3), which was encountered across the entire site at an average depth of 0.5m below existing ground level. The bedrock horizon sloped downward from south to north, creating a slight north-facing slope to the site.

Sitting above the natural bedrock (004), and encountered mainly at the southern extent of the site, was a thin, truncated layer of mid-brown clay with regular inclusions of small limestone pebbles (003) (Figure 4). This layer (003) survived to an average thickness of 0.15m and was interpreted as a naturally deposited clay substrate overlying the bedrock. This layer (003) appeared to survive in patches across the site and seemed to have been truncated by modern landscaping activity, which had in turn formed the overlying deposit (002). The upper surface of (002) was encountered at an average depth of c. 350mm below the existing ground level and consisted of a compacted black soil containing broken pantile, ash, brick fragments and a number of ceramic and glass vessels (discussed below). This mixed layer, including discrete dumps of demolition material and waste, appeared slightly thicker at the northern extent of the site, where the bedrock was lower and thinner at the southern extent of the site, where the bedrock was higher. On average, the deposit was between 0.1m and 0.2m in thickness. Deposit (002) was therefore interpreted as a late Victorian or early Edwardian levelling/landscaping layer, which most likely indicates a short period of clearance or alteration of the gardens around Boldon House, including an attempt to level the naturally sloping ground.

Above (002) lay a clean, black loamy topsoil (001), 0.35m in thickness. This deposit contained only very modern rubbish within its upper horizons and has been interpreted as an imported garden soil, most likely spread in the early 20th century. (001) formed the uppermost deposit observed on the site. No *in-situ* subsoil was identified, further indicating the modern alteration of deposits on the site.

Figure 2 Extent of area of monitoring



Figure 3 Stripped area looking south, showing weathered and disturbed upper surface of natural limestone bedrock



| Figure 4 Deposit sequence encountered on the site. Topsoil 001 overlying landscaping layer 002, with mid-brown clay 003 visible above natural bedrock 004 at base. Scale 1x1m

5. GLASS AND CERAMIC VESSELS

Jim Brightman

5.1 INTRODUCTION

A sample of complete and largely complete vessels was assessed and catalogued. The assemblage comprised seven whole or partial vessels including: two glass bottles, one stoneware bottle, three stoneware dairy pots and one stoneware preserve jar.

5.2 METHOD

All individual artefacts were cleaned (depending on condition and suitability to various cleaning methods), bagged and assigned individual small find numbers. The bags were marked with site code, small find number, context number, trench number and general artefact type. Each artefact was examined on a clean working surface in natural light by both eye and using a x10 and x20 magnification hand lens. Metrical data relevant to the artefact type in question were captured using digital calipers with plastic tines, accurate to 1/10 mm but rounded to the nearest mm as a level of accuracy suitable for this assessment. Weight was measured with a digital balance accurate to 0.1g. Each artefact was logged into a spreadsheet as it was examined.

5.3 DISTRIBUTION

All the assessed artefacts were recovered from a single context (002).

5.4 GLASS VESSELS

5.4.1 STOUT BOTTLE (SF5)

SF5 is the lower half of a cylindrical, olive-green glass bottle, mouth-blown using a post-mould, with the neck and finish missing. Some diagonal seeds and stretch marks are visible within the main body of the fabric. The bottle measures 3¼" (83mm) diameter at its widest point and is mould-embossed with the front legend 'VAUX STOUT'. The base is also mould-embossed with the maker's mark 'IL02 A', though a rapid search could not tie this to a known local bottling plant.

Vaux was a prominent Sunderland-based brewery, first established in 1837 on the corner of Matlock Street and Cumberland Street. The principal brewery was moved in 1844 and then again in 1875 to the site it occupied until the company sold its brewing concerns in 1999 (Bougord 2010). The inclusion of Cuthbert Vaux, grandson of the founder, into the partnership in the 1880s has been linked to an unsubstantiated claim that Vaux was one of the first British companies to provide bottled ales and stouts (*ibid.*). This is erroneous given that commercially bottled ale was known since at least the 17th century, for example being mentioned by Samuel Pepys (Cornell 2010); it may, however, be a 'fact' which has become attached in error to the expansion of bottled ale made possible by the extended use-life afforded by the pasteurisation process discovered in the 1870s. Although not definitive, the form and manufacturing of the

bottle, as well as the known history of the Vaux Breweries, suggests a date for the piece of c. 1880-1900.



Figure 5 Vaux's Stout bottle (SF5)

5.4.2 SMALLER BOTTLE (SF6)

SF6 is a complete, cylindrical, colourless glass bottle with convex shoulder to a vertical neck; it measures 2 1/8" (54mm) diameter at its widest point and 5 5/8" (144mm) in height from base to finish. The vessel is mouth-blown using a cup/post mould with a thin, flared, applied finish to fit a cork or similar stopper. There are no embossed markings to indicate original function or maker. In terms of form of the vessel it would suit either a medicinal or table/kitchen (sauce or similar) use. As with SF5, the manufacturing methods used suggest a date for the piece toward the end of the 19th century.

5.5 CERAMIC VESSELS

5.5.1 DAIRY JARS (SF1-3)

Three of the seven vessels are small, stoneware, shouldered jars, typically used for the dairy products prior to the advent of more convenient mass-produced containers and refrigeration in the early 20th century. All three vessels are clear-glazed over a buff fabric, with one (SF2) also having a brown slip beneath the glaze. The vessels have rounded shoulders with convex sides tapering to a smaller base; their design is both utilitarian and also aesthetically pleasing in order to appeal to the urban upper working and middles classes of the late 19th century.

The largest of the three, measuring 4¼" (108mm) in height and 2¾" (70mm) diameter at its widest point, features a large, blue, transfer print crest to the front with the text: 'Carricks Cumberland Dairy Co. Ltd. Pure Thick Cream. Fresh Daily. Low Row. Aspatria'. The Cumberland Dairy was founded in 1881 in Low Row near Brampton, Cumbria and very rapidly became a considerable concern with wide export reach among towns in the North (Brennan 2008). The Aspatria Dairy was founded by the former manager of the Low Row Dairy, only to be later acquired by Cumberland as the business expanded, and the presence of both names on the crest suggests a date for the vessel of after c. 1885. After c. 1905, labelling of jarred cream often included a note on the presence of boron-derived preservatives, and the lack of such on this vessel suggests it was manufactured prior to this (*City-Data Forum* 2013).

The other two examples of small dairy jars do not carry any company branding, though the larger of the two (SF2) has an embossed potter's stamp of 'GG' on the base. A search of prominent maker's marks returned a number of potteries that used a 'GG' stamp at various points, though none which appear to have manufactured small utilitarian stoneware towards the close of the 19th century (Godden 1964). In terms of date, dairy jars such as these are relatively common from the invention of a practical centrifugal cream separator in 1879 through to the enforcement of a ban on boron-derived preservatives in 1925 (*City-Data Forum* 2013).



Figure 6 Cumberland Dairy cream jar (SF1)

5.5.2 PRESERVE JAR

SF4 is a complete, cylindrical, stoneware preserve jar measuring 3 3/8" (85mm) external diameter by 4" (100mm) height, in a buff fabric with clear glaze. It has indented panel decoration typical of this type of vessel and, although there are no stamped marks on the piece, it fits well within a late 19th- or early 20th-century context.

5.5.3 BOTTLE

SF7 is a stoneware bottle for carbonated beverages, in a buff fabric with brown slip to the finish, neck and shoulder and a clear glaze. It measures 8 1/4" (209mm) in height and has a maximum external diameter around the body of 2 3/4" (69mm). The finish is partially pierced on opposite sides to accommodate a swing-top cap, a closure most popular between c. 1880-1920 (Lindsey 2016). The bottle is stamped with the mark of the Buchan Pottery based in Portobello, Edinburgh, who were a prominent producer of utilitarian stoneware, amongst other finer wares. Comparison with other Buchan-produced items suggests a likely date of manufacture for the piece of c. 1890-1900. (*Buchan Pottery Kitchenalia* n.d.). The front of the bottle features a black transfer print logo including the text: 'Reavley's Jarrow. Stone Ginger Beer. Rob't Reavley Trademark'. Other than a number of local oral history extracts providing anecdotes of early 20th-century soft drinks companies on Tyneside, a rapid search provided no detailed information about the history or operations of the Reavley's company in Jarrow.



Figure 7 Stoneware ginger beer bottle (SF7)

5.6 DISCUSSION

All the pieces examined sit well within a typical domestic assemblage of a late 19th-century middle or upper working class household. They provide a window into the c. fifty-year period in which technological advances first allowed for the large-scale delivery of fresh produce to affluent urban families before such processes were themselves rendered obsolete by the increasing availability of refrigeration and consumer glassware in the early 20th century.

Vessel SF No.	Material	Colour	Vessel Type	Vessel Use	Total Weight (g)	Markings/Text	Finish/Rim Height (mm)	Rim Diam (mm)	Body Diam 1 (mm)	Vessel Height (mm)	Base Diam (mm)
1	Stoneware Ceramic	Buff and clear glaze	Shouldered Jar	Cream Pot	327.0	Blue Transfer crest: 'Carricks Cumberland Dairy Co. Ltd. Pure Thick Cream. Fresh Daily. Low Row. Aspatria'	13.0	56.0	70.0	108.0	48.0
2	Stoneware Ceramic	Buff with brown slip and clear glaze	Shouldered Jar	Cream Pot	250.0	GG' stamp on base	9.0	54.0	66.0	89.0	51.0
3	Stoneware Ceramic	Buff and clear glaze	Shouldered Jar	Cream Pot	137.0		9.0	44.0	52.0	78.0	37.0
4	Stoneware Ceramic	Buff and clear glaze	Cylindrical Jar	Preserve Jar	416.0		10.0	83.0	85.0	100.0	81.0
5	Glass	Olive Green	Bottle	Beer Bottle	499.0	Vaux's Stout' on front. 'IL02 A' on base. All mould embossed.			83.0		75.0
6	Glass	Clear	Bottle		136.0	'6' base embossed.	3.0	25.0	54.0	144.0	51.0
7	Stoneware Ceramic	Buff with light brown slip to neck and finish and clear glaze	Bottle	Ginger beer	526.0		31.0	29.0	69.0	209.0	67.0

Table 6 Tabulated assemblage information

6. **DISCUSSION**

The archaeological monitoring undertaken indicates that the immediate area around Boldon House has been truncated by later landscaping works. The presence of a late Victorian to Edwardian landscaping layer indicates that older features may have been lost given the later truncation caused within the gardens. The vessels which have been used to date this layer are considered to be of no further research value, and it is recommended that they are disposed of rather than retained.

No earlier archaeological features or finds were noted, including any associated with the medieval settlement of Boldon.

7. SOURCES

7.1 BIBLIOGRAPHY

7.27.1

Bougord, N. n.d. *The Sunderland Site – Vaux Breweries*. Available at: <<http://www.searlecanada.org/sunderland/sunderland207.html>>. [21st March 2016].

Brennan, P. 2008. *Whatever Happened to Carrick's?*. Available at: <http://www.donmouth.co.uk/local_history/carricks/carricks.html>. [21st March 2016].

Buchan Pottery Kitchenalia. n.d. Available at: <<http://scottishpottery.weebly.com/buchan-pottery-kitchenalia.html>>. [21st March 2016].

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. 2014a. *Code of Conduct*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. 2014b. *Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief*. Reading, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

City-Data Forum. 2013. Available at: <<http://www.city-data.com/forum/collecting-antiques/1814127-could-why-i-call-myself-potty1.html>>. [21st March 2016].

Cornell, M. 2010. *A Short History of Bottled Beer*. Available at: <<http://zythophile.co.uk/2010/01/15/a-short-history-of-bottled-beer/>>. [21st March 2016].

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2012. *National Planning Policy Framework*. London, The Stationery Office.

Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). 2014. *National Planning Practice Guidance*. London, The Stationery Office.

English Heritage (EH). 2008. *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance*. London, English Heritage.

South Tyneside Council 2007. *Local Development Framework*. South Shields, South Tyneside Council.

Lindsey, B. 2016. *Types of Bottle Closures*. Available at: <<https://www.sha.org/bottle/closures.htm#General%20Closure%20Types>>. [21st March 2016].

Scott, C. 2015. *64 Front Street, Boldon: Photographic Recording of North Wall of Plot*. Unpublished report, Solstice Heritage.

South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS). 2011. *Yorkshire, The Humber and the North East: A Regional Statement of Good Practice for Archaeology in the Development Process*.

APPENDIX 1 – SPECIFICATION

Prepared by Tyne and Wear Specialist Conservation Team