

1 SUMMARY

A watching brief was conducted on excavations for new foundations to the northeast of 16 Suffolk Street, City of Westminster. The earliest features were brick foundations of 19th century date, part of a property demolished by bombing action in World War II. No other evidence of activity was recorded, except for ground disturbance associated with the erection of the current building. Much of the potential archaeological horizon had been removed in the post-medieval period by the foundations of the previous property on the site and the basement of the current structure.

2 INTRODUCTION

Site location

- 2.1 The site is centred on NGR (National Grid Reference) TQ 2978 8058, and is located at 16 Suffolk Street, approximately 100m west of Trafalgar Square, in the City of Westminster (Fig. 1 & 2). The site area, approximately 2,000m² (0.2 hectares), is a roughly rectangular plot of land containing a standing building with a basement and a small garden area to the rear. It is bounded by Haymarket immediately to the west, Pall Mall directly south, Whitcomb Street to the east and Orange Street to the north. The site is located in the heart of the City of Westminster.

The Development Proposal

- 2.2 The development proposed additions to the standing building.
- A stepped terrace extension with foundations likely approximately 3m in depth.
 - The addition of stairs adjacent to the above construction. Foundations are expected to be relatively shallow in nature (approx. 0.60m to 0.80m depth).
 - Basement infill. The only proposed build at this level had relatively shallow foundations (approx. 0.60m to 0.80m)

Planning Background

- 2.3 Planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of the site (Planning Application Numbers PT/05/01561/LBC & PT/05/01560/FULL). An archaeological condition was imposed on the planning consent requiring that:

“No development take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work.”

- 2.4 The local planning authority is the London Borough of Westminster. Archaeological advice to the council is provided by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS).
- 2.5 In accordance with *Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning* (PPG 16) issued by the Department of the Environment in 1990 (DoE, 1990) and the recommendations of GLAAS, an archaeological investigation was carried out.
- 2.6 In the first instant, a Desk-Based Assessment was produced (*AOC Archaeology 2005*), which highlighted the undeveloped nature of the site until the post-medieval period. A Brief for an Archaeological Investigation was prepared by GLAAS. To fulfil the requirement for a detailed archaeological

project design, a Written Scheme of Investigation was produced (AOC 2006).

- 2.7 The site lies on the border of an Archaeological Priority Zone.
- 2.8 The design involved the use of strip foundations. This means that the impact affected a considerable proportion of the footprint of the building, in the upper part of the profile.

3 GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Geology and Topography

- 3.1 The 1:50000 Geological Survey of Great Britain (England and Wales) covering the area (Sheet 256 – ‘North London’) indicates the site to be underlain by Taplow Gravel deposits (essentially Thames River Terrace deposits composed of gravel, sand and clay). The surrounding geology indicates alluvial deposits immediately south of the site along the banks of the river Thames (Kempton Park Gravel). To the west, an area of Kempton Park Gravel and Langley Silt (brickearth) can be found. Lynch Hill Gravel (river terrace deposits) is located to the north.

4 HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Prehistoric (before c.AD 43)

- 4.1 No evidence for prehistoric activity was found within 100m of the site, and generally the evidence for prehistoric activity in the vicinity has been sparse. In prehistory, rivers and river banks were the main arteries of transport and trade and it is likely that trackways existed along the banks of the Thames, particularly after c. 1500 BC when the London region gradually became an important centre for both the production of metal objects and the controlling of their trade (Merriman, 1990). Flint implements, structural features and fragments of pottery are representative of the archaeological remains for this period.

Roman (c. AD 43 - 450)

- 4.2 It was the geographical and topological features of the area that brought about the foundation of Roman London. *Londinium* stood at the lowest convenient bridging point of the Thames. There was a way through the marshes from the south and on the north side stood two gravel hills (now St Paul’s and Cornhill) above the flood plain and gave a firm foothold. The combination of these elements gave the site a military importance in the eyes of the Roman surveyors. Once founded, London’s commercial vitality depended upon its port facilities, and the waterfront lay about 100m north of its present position. The site lies outside the fortified Roman city.
- 4.3 Three sites are located within 100m of the site. A road can be traced from Ludgate to join Silchester Road possibly at Brentford. A burial urn and jar (2)

containing bones was found in Cockspur Street to the south of the site. Other Excavations revealed a few sherds of Roman pottery in the vicinity of the National Gallery, 100m east of the site.

Anglo-Saxon (c.451-1065)

- 4.4 During the 5th century, Saxons from across the North Sea established a trading settlement in the area, and is referred to in documents as *Lundenwic*. The site lies beyond the main settlement which was focused towards the Thames nearer Aldwych, but evidence of Saxons has been found in the vicinity, including Saxon pottery and a gravel pit on the site of the National Gallery and three quarries and pits were discovered in Excel Court. By the end of the Saxon period Westminster had begun to develop with the building of the Palace and Minster by Edward the Confessor.

Medieval (c.1066 - 1485)

- 4.5 In Domesday Book of 1086, it was recorded that there was meadow for eleven ploughs, pasture for livestock, woodland for a hundred swine, four vineyards newly-planted, and twenty-five houses of the knights of the abbot and other men. The King's palace was a building of the greatest splendour, with outwork bastions; 'everywhere without their houses the citizen's gardens side by side, yet spacious and splendid set about with trees (Hunting, 1981).
- 4.6 Fragments of medieval pottery have been recovered from excavations at the National Gallery and 5 Excel Court. In addition, a number of features, possibly tree-pits, were cut into the upper fills of one of several gravel pits providing evidence of 11th and 12th century activity. A road in existence in the reign of Henry VIII, but probably of much earlier date, can be located at Whitcomb Street to the east of the site.

Post-Medieval (c.1485 - modern)

- 4.7 In 1585, Suffolk Street and Suffolk Place are recorded as being in the tenure of Widow Golightly. The land can be traced as a separate entity at least from the time of Henry VIII. It can almost certainly be identified with the 'crofte...lyinge in the parisshe of Sainte Margaret in the lane next the King's Muse' which John Norris, 'yeoman' in 1513 left to his wife...and with the close of 3 acres of pasture which was soon purchased by Henry VIII. This indicates the land to be undeveloped at that time.
- 4.8 The earliest cartographic sources indicate that in 1598 the site was undeveloped land occupying a largely rural landscape of field systems. By 1682, the site was an integral part of the highly urbanised landscape of London. By the beginning of the 19th century Suffolk Street and Little Suffolk Street had fallen into decay and disrepute and a plan for their redevelopment was included in the scheme for the extension of Pall Mall (Survey of London, 1940). John Nash was the chief architect responsible for many of the existing buildings in Suffolk Street today. Comparison of the maps for 1938 and 1951 suggest that the area was the focus for German bombing during WWII. The present building was constructed on the ruined ground sometime after 1957 replacing the previous building on the site.

5 STRATEGY

5.1 The evaluation and watching brief was designed to target various phases of work on site.

- Engineering test pits and new foundation trenches were monitored to the east of the property, in a yard area bound by adjacent buildings.
- A watching brief was carried out during ground reduction on the site. Scope for reviewing the scale of the watching brief was available, in the light of the ongoing results.
- Monitoring for improvements to existing services in the yard area was identified as a necessity.
- The evaluation phase of the archaeological works was to comprise the excavation of a single 4m x 1.5m manually excavated trench. The trial trench was to be situated within the basement area.
- The archaeological works were monitored by GLAAS for London Borough of Westminster, and Mark Beasley for AOC Archaeology.

Aims of the Investigation

- To establish the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the site.
- To determine the extent, condition, nature, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains encountered.
- To record and sample excavate any archaeological remains encountered.
- To assess the ecofactual and environmental potential of any archaeological features and deposits.
- To determine the extent of previous truncations of the archaeological deposits.
- To enable GLAAS to make an informed decision on the status of the condition on the planning permission, and any possible requirement for further work in order to satisfy that condition.
- To make available to interested parties the results of the investigation in order to inform the mitigation strategy as part of the planning process.
- Assess the degree and extent of truncation of earlier deposits by the phases of late post-medieval buildings on the site.
- The final aim is to make public the results of the investigation, subject to any confidentiality restrictions.

6 RESULTS

- 6.1 Seven pits within the rear courtyard were monitored for archaeological survival during excavations to provide stronger foundations around the eastern edge of the standing building, within the garden area. A simple sequence with no complex stratigraphy or significant archaeological deposits was found. Each deposit was individually numbered, the first number denoting the pit number. Where deposits are equated, the earliest number is used. The garden level at the start of the project was 13.2m OD, and was mostly a concrete surface.
- 6.2 The lowest deposits noted in the watching brief within the yard area were of geological rather than anthropogenic origin. The lowest was dense gravel in a light brownish yellow sandy matrix (115). This represents the terrace gravels that are the underlying geology of the area, and the surface of the gravel dropped slightly from north to south. This was sealed by a layer of very compact brownish yellow silty clay (114) 0.8m thick, which is interpreted as of alluvial origin, thus laid down by river action. The third naturally-lain deposit was a layer of pale green clayey sand (111), also thought to have been laid down by river action. The final naturally deposited layer was yellowish brown sandy clay (106), defined as brickearth. This was up to a metre thick, and was recorded at a maximum height of 12.4m OD. The natural deposits were truncated to 11.75mOD in the yard area where post-medieval foundations had been established, and to 10.04mOD where a 19th century brick cellar had been built. The current basement is at a similar level cut the natural deposits to over 10.00m OD. There were no signs of cultural inclusions within the brickearth, so it is interpreted as being undisturbed.
- 6.3 The earliest evidence of activity on the site was a cut through the brickearth almost to its base (116) which featured several partial wall foundations and a scatter of brick rubble. These are a part of a previous structure on the site and survived in limited form within the back garden area. These are parts of a building immediately preceding the standing structure, elements of a brick-built vaulted cellar.
- 6.4 The structure of the cellar was built using red bricks 220mm by 101mm by 59mm with a smooth finish. They were bonded with fine sandy lime mortar indicative of an early 19th century date. That part of the cellar seen was oriented north-south: the vaulting, effectively a barrel vault ran north-south, and the vaulted roof was constructed of a single width of bricks: 0.22m wide, with bricks laid in alternate directions. There was one end wall of the cellar seen, towards the northern edge of Pit 2; this south-facing wall was briefly exposed (213). The wall was constructed using stretcher bond, the build appearing functional rather than built in a specific style. Part of the eastern wall of the cellar was also identified (313), but most lay beyond the limit of excavation, and is retained *in situ*. The upper surface of the cellar floor was concrete (314), its surface at 10.07m OD. The concrete was not considered original to the building, but a late 19th or early 20th repair/ resurfacing. The original form of the floor was not seen, since the building contractor

determined that this was solid enough to support the new foundations.

- 6.5 Two short lengths of brickwork (104 and 107) north of the cellar wall were considered to be evidence of slight buttressing beyond the wall, to help keep structural stability. These were both made from identical bricks to the vaults. One nearer to the standing building had been truncated by the cut for new foundations (104), and stood only five courses high. The other stood for 14 courses, a height of 0.98m. There were also two layers of unmortared brick: these are thought to have been unused, and left at the base of the construction cut (116). These low footings were sealed by a layer of redeposited brickearth (117).
- 6.6 To the east of the yard area, a foundation running north-south was of a single brick's width, 0.25m wide, and was bonded with lime mortar (406). This stood 0.80m high and was founded on brickearth. No cut was apparent, so it must have been built free-standing and the ground redeposited afterwards. Part of a second foundation was also observed; it was seen to run east-west and was also made of brick, bonded with lime mortar (411). A short length of similar wall (1/009), oriented north-south was seen to the east of the yard, but was truncated by foundations of the current building. It too measured 0.25m wide and only survived to a thickness of 0.27m. A small area of brick rubble next to these walls was suggestive of a floor surface (1/006). It was comprised of large fragments of both red and yellow brick, laid in no discernable pattern, to form a roughly even surface.
- 6.7 A third brick structure was indicated by two courses of brickwork laid on the stretcher side [3/007]. It seemed to be a small feature, possibly a pad foundation for a brick column.
- 6.8 Sealing the vaulted cellar and packed against the other contemporary foundations was a layer of brown sandy clay 0.21m thick (105), like a reworked version of the underlying brickearth and containing occasional fragments of building material. This, in turn was sealed by very dark brown sandy clay silt that resembled a garden soil (102), and is thought likely to be a remnant of such. Neither of these soils contained any significant artefacts.
- 6.9 The 'garden soil' (102) was cut by the construction cut for the adjacent property to the south (405) The foundations (410) within the cut were over 3.00m deep, and such depth is indicative of a probable basement or cellar beyond. The cut was backfilled with loose mixed rubble within a soil matrix that resembled reworked brickearth (403)
- 6.10 The top of the cellar vault had been broken through, but it is not clear whether this was the result of bomb damage or the result of the construction of the standing house. The vaulted cellar had then been backfilled with demolition material (212): brick, slate and mortar were all present, as were softer materials such as window frames and door handles.
- 6.11 The standing building at 16 Suffolk Street is a five-storey brick building with

a basement below, and was built within a deep cut over 2.91m deep (104), the base around 10.30m OD. This was a steep sided cut, and had the basement wall and therefore foundation of the standing building within it (113). The wall was built upon a concrete base and was made of brick. The cut was backfilled with demolition material of similar character (109) to the fill of the broken-through cellar. The top fill (103) of the backfilled construction cut was far less compacted than the lower

- 6.12 The sequence was sealed by a thick layer of crushed brick and topped with concrete that formed the extant yard surface at the time of recording, at 13.2m OD
- 6.13 To the southeast of the yard property, part of the standing building was demolished. Its construction had disturbed the potential stratigraphy by 0.85m, to a height of 12.35mOD. Two internal floor surfaces were identified. One was formed by a layer of made ground containing brick fragments (1/005) which was the base for a decorative floor of black and white tiles laid in a geometric pattern (1/004). The second surface was formed by another dump of rubble-rich silty sand (1/002), topped by a concrete slab (1/001).

7 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The underlying geology of the site has been proved to be correctly identified from the British Geological Survey as Taplow Gravel deposits. These are Thames River Terrace deposits composed of gravel, sand and clay), and they are present across the site where not truncated by foundations for current and previous buildings on site. These geological deposits were recorded at a maximum height of 12.4m OD, and had been truncated by over 2m to 10.2m OD where the current basement lies, and by nearly 2.5m to 10.00m OD where the brick cellar of a previous property on the site stood.
- 7.2 Above the naturally-lain deposits was a patchy layer of sandy clay a shade darker than brickearth, which may be a remnant developed soil. It produced no dating evidence. The site in the medieval period seems to have been given over to horticulture, so no medieval features were expected.
- 7.3 If there had been remains of prehistoric, Roman, Saxon or medieval date on the site, they had been truncated by later activity. The earliest features dated to the post-medieval period, and were structural.
- 7.4 All the foundations and elements of previous buildings on site seem to belong to the same structure, and a 19th century date seems the most likely. The cartographic evidence does not give good details of the site until the production of the 1875 Ordnance Survey Map. This shows a large building occupying around 60% of the site, that is entitled 'Hotel'. By the 1916 map, virtually the whole site is covered by a single building, and it is tempting to ascribe this to the same property. This building would have been raised during the 19th century: the documentary sources indicate that earlier post-medieval

buildings on the site were falling into decay, so it seems likely that the foundations seen during the current works on site are a remnant of the John Nash development of the 19th century.

- 7.5 The scant building evidence suggests a structure with a cellar, its foundations made of brick. There were no clues as to the form of its façade. The basement of the current building is some 0.50m lower than the deepest part of the 'Nash' foundations identified, so all evidence of the rest of the property was taken away during the post-war rebuild.
- 7.6 In association with the foundations was evidence that the site may have been cleared to geological deposits when the Nash building was erected. Large amounts of brickearth, subsoil and topsoil were shifted to enable construction of the vaulted cellar and other associated foundations; a significant building programme.
- 7.7 The small area of black-and white tiled floor seen to the southeast of site is also likely to be part of the Hotel building. The 1916 Ordnance Survey Plan shows a bigger building than in 1875, so perhaps the Hotel was extended. A black and white geometric-patterned floor would not be out of keeping with a late 19th or early 20th century date.

8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

AOC Archaeology (2005): *An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of 16, Suffolk Street, City of Westminster, London*

Department of the Environment (DOE) (1990): *Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning* (PPG 16)

Geological Survey of Great Britain: (England and Wales) *North London sheet 256*

Hunting, P. (1981): Royal Westminster. Penhurst Press Ltd

Institute of Field Archaeologists (1994): *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-based Assessments*

Survey of London Vol. XX (1940): *Survey of London Vol. XX, Parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields (Part III, Trafalgar Square)*. London County Council.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

APPENDIX A: Context Register

Context	Description	Length	Width	Depth
<i>(TP 10)</i>		<i>2.00m</i>	<i>2.00m</i>	<i>2.00m</i>
1/001	Concrete floor	2.00m	2.00m	0.16m
1/002	Made Ground	2.00m	2.00m	0.20m
1/003	Internal wall foundation	2.00m	0.25m	0.30m
1/004	Floor Surface	2.00m	2.00m	0.15m
1/005	Made ground	2.00m	2.00m	0.13m
1/006	Yard surface?	2.00m	2.00m	0.10m
1/007	Made ground	2.00m	2.00m	0.08m
1/008	Foundation	2.00m	0.05m	NFE
1/009	Wall	0.25m	0.25m	0.27m
1/010	Garden soil	2.00m	2.00m	0.30m
1/011	Subsoil	2.00m	2.00m	0.30m
1/012	Brickearth?	2.00m	2.00m	>0.55m
<i>TP1A</i>		<i>1.50m</i>	<i>1.50m</i>	<i>1.00m</i>
2/001	Concrete floor	1.50m	1.50m	0.16m
2/002	Made Ground	1.50m	1.50m	0.20m
2/003	Modern footings	1.50m	0.25m	0.30m
2/004	Geometric-patterned floor	1.50m	1.50m	0.12m
2/005	Made ground	1.50m	1.50m	0.14m
2/006	Yard Surface	1.50m	1.50m	0.12m
2/007	Made Ground	1.50m	1.50m	0.10m
2/008	Buried Ground Surface	1.50m	1.50m	>0.15m
<i>TP9</i>		<i>1.50m</i>	<i>1.50m</i>	<i>1.00m</i>
3/001	Concrete floor	1.50m	1.50m	0.16m
3/002	Made Ground	1.50m	1.50m	0.22m
3/003	Wall footing	1.50m	0.30m	0.35m
3/004	Made Ground	1.50m	1.50m	0.47m
3/005	Modern footing	1.50m	0.35m	0.26m
3/006	Brick foundation	1.50m	0.24m	0.22m
3/007	Brick pad	1.50m	1.50m	0.22m
3/008	Concrete slab	1.50m	1.50m	NFE
<i>Trench 1</i>		<i>2.08m</i>	<i>1.80m</i>	<i>3.00m</i>
101	Yard surface	2.80m	1.80m	0.40m
102	Garden soil	2.00m	1.20m	0.21m
103	WWII demolition	2.80m	0.80m	0.40m
104	Cut for standing Building	2.80m	0.80m	2.60m
105	Subsoil	2.00m	1.20m	0.21m
106	Brickearth	2.00m	1.50m	1.00m
107	Foundation	0.22m	0.10m	1.00m
108	Construction deposit	0.84m	0.20m	0.40m
109	Fill of 104	2.80m	0.70m	1.50m
110	Fill of 104	2.80m	0.60m	0.80m
111	Alluvium	2.00m	1.20m	0.40m
112	Buttress	0.22m	0.20m	0.65m
113	Fill of 104	1.80m	0.50m	0.40m
114	Brickearth	2.00m	1.20m	0.80m
115	Gravel	2.00m	1.20m	NFE
116	Cut for 107 and 112	0.84m	0.20m	1.00m
117	Redeposited brickearth	0.84m	0.20m	0.85m

Context	Description	Length	Width	Depth
<i>Trench 2</i>		<i>1.80m</i>	<i>1.80m</i>	<i>2.50m</i>
211	Yard Surface	1.80m	1.80m	0.70m
212	Loose fill of cellar	1.80m	1.80m	1.80m
213	Cellar walls	1.80m	0.22m	1.80m
214	Cellar floor	1.80m	1.80m	NFE
<i>Trench 3</i>		<i>1.80m</i>	<i>1.80m</i>	<i>2.50m</i>
311	Yard Surface	1.80m	1.80m	0.70m
312	Loose fill of cellar	1.80m	1.80m	1.80m
313	Cellar walls	1.80m	0.22m	1.80m
314	Cellar floor	1.80m	1.80m	NFE
<i>Trench 4</i>		<i>2.00m</i>	<i>1.50m</i>	<i>2.50m</i>
401	Yard Surface	2.00m	1.50m	0.25m
402	Demolition deposit	2.00m	1.50m	0.45m
403	Fill of 405	2.00m	0.65m	2.30m
404	Garden soil	2.00m	0.85m	0.80m
405	Cut for adjacent property	2.00m	0.65m	2.30m
406	Brick foundation	2.00m	0.25m	0.80m
407	Brickearth	2.00m	0.85m	0.50m
408	Alluvium	2.00m	0.85m	0.50m
409	Terrace Gravel	2.00m	0.85m	0.50m
410	Wall of adjacent property	2.00m	0.65m	>3.00m
411	Brick Foundation	1.80m	0.10m	0.80m

APPENDIX B: Digital Photograph Register

Image	Date	View	Comments
01	10-01-2006	W	Site location
02	10-01-2006	W	Site location
03	10-01-2006	S	Detail, geometric floor surface TP1A
04	10-01-2006	S	Test Pit 10
05	10-01-2006	S	Test Pit 10
06	10-01-2006	SE	Test Pit 10
07	10-01-2006	S	Test Pit 1A
08	10-01-2006	S	Test Pit 1A
09	10-01-2006	NE	Test Pit 9, broken out
10	10-01-2006	E	Test Pit 9
11	10-01-2006	E	Test Pit 9
12	10-01-2006	N	Test Pit 9
13	10-01-2006	N	Working shot
14	11-04-2006	SW	Trench 3, Wall 313
15	11-04-2006	W	Trench 3, Wall 313
16	11-04-2006	E	Trench 3, Wall 313
17	11-04-2006	S	Trench 3, Wall 313
18	11-04-2006	S	Trench 3, Wall 313
19	11-04-2006	S	Trench 3, general
20	06-04-2006	W	Trench 2, infill
21	06-04-2006	W	Trench 2, infill
22	06-04-2006	W	Trench 2, general
23	06-04-2006	NE	Trench 2, 213 core
24	06-04-2006	NE	Trench 2, 213 core
25	11-04-2006	W	Mini-digger
26	11-04-2006	W	Trench 4, Foundation 411
27	11-04-2006	W	Trench 4, Foundation 411
28	11-04-2006	N	Trench 4, South-facing section
29	11-04-2006	N	Trench 4, South facing section
30	11-04-2006	E	Trench 4, general
31	11-04-2006	E	Trench 4, general

OASIS ID: aocarcha1-15763

Project details

Project name	16 Suffolk Street
Short description of the project	A Watching Brief was conducted on excavations for new foundations to the northeast of the property. The earliest features were 19th century brick foundations, part of a property demolished by bombing action in World War II. No other evidence of activity was recorded.
Project dates	Start: 10-01-2006 End: 11-04-2006
Previous/future work	No / No
Any associated project reference codes	SFK06 – Site code
Any associated project reference codes	PT/05/01561/LBC - Planning Application No.
Any associated project reference codes	PT/05/01560/FULL - Planning Application No.
Type of project	Recording project
Site status	None
Current Land use	Other 2 - In use as a building
Monument type	CELLARED BUILDING Post Medieval
Investigation type	'Watching Brief'
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16

Project location

Country	England
Site location	GREATER LONDON CITY OF WESTMINSTER CITY OF WESTMINSTER 16, Suffolk Street
Postcode	SW1Y 4HG
Study area	0.20 Hectares
National grid reference	TQ 297 805 Point
Height OD	Min: 10.00m Max: 11.75m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	AOC Archaeology
Project brief originator	English Heritage/Department of Environment
Project design originator	AOC Archaeology
Project director/manager	Mark Beasley
Project supervisor	Les Capon

Sponsor or funding body	Developer
Project archives	
Physical Archive recipient	n/a
Physical Archive Exists?	No
Digital Archive recipient	Museum of London
Digital Archive ID	SFK06
Digital Media available	'Database', 'Images raster', 'Images vector', 'Spreadsheets', 'Text'
Digital Archive notes	Held at AOC until transfer
Paper Archive recipient	Museum of London
Paper Archive ID	SFK06
Paper Contents	'Stratigraphic'
Paper Media available	'Context sheet', 'Drawing', 'Matrices', 'Microfilm', 'Photograph', 'Plan', 'Report', 'Unpublished Text'
Paper Archive notes	Held at AOC until transfer

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Archaeological Monitoring at 16 Suffolk Street, City of Westminster, LONDON
Author(s)/Editor(s)	'Capon, L'
Date	2006
Issuer or publisher	AOC Archaeology
Place of issue or publication	AOC Archaeology
Description	A4, ten pages, 3 illustrations
<hr/>	
Entered by	les capon (lescapon@aocarchaeology.co.uk)
Entered on	19 June 2006
<hr/>	