© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

1 SUMMARY

1.1 *The following report summarises the results of an archaeological watching brief undertaken by AOC Archaeology Group between the 21st July 2003 and 17th October-2003 at 17 King Street, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, on behalf of Lattimore Associates.*

1.2 *The proposed works included the construction of a new two storey glazed conservatory with a courtyard and swimming pool to the rear of the property. The external development work was put on hold indefinitely after some of the groundworks had been completed. The swimming pool area was backfilled and the additional works were not carried out.*

1.3 *The excavations revealed ditches dating to the medieval period. A number of rubbish pits and postholes were identified. These are thought to be associated with a building pre-dating the existing 18th century building. The features which contained pottery and building material dated to the late 16th and early 17th century. Some of this material may have been derived from the demolition of the 16th century Friary which was located to the north. A number of structural features, including culverts and walls thought to relate to subsequent developments of the site since the 18th century, were also revealed.*

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 SITE LOCATION (Figs 1-2)

2.1.1 The site is located at 17 King Street, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. An 18th century house is located in the north-east corner of a roughly rectangular area, with the garden to the south-west. The site occupies an area of approximately 250m^2 and is centred on NGR TQ 17680 74810. The site is bounded to the north by King Street itself, by 16 King Street to the east, a Hall to the south and a house known as Oak House to the north.

2.2 PLANNING BACKGROUND

2.2.1 The site lay within an Area of Archaeological Constraint as designated by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and contained no Scheduled Ancient Monuments. 17 King Street is a Grade II Listed building, dating to the late 18th century (TQ 1774 NE 20A/50).

2.2.2 The proposed works included the construction of a new two storey glazed conservatory with a courtyard and swimming pool to the rear of the property. Due to the potential for archaeological remains to be present on the site an archaeological condition has been attached to the planning consent. Following a desk based assessment (AOC Archaeology Group, 2002) a watching brief was carried out in 2003. The watching brief involved the monitoring of geotechnical investigations and the removal of an oil tank (AOC Archaeology Group, 2003). AOC Archaeology Group was commissioned by Lattimore

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Associates to undertake a further archaeological watching brief on this phase of works.

2.3 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

2.3.1 The British Geological Survey maps (BGS Sheet 270) indicated that the site is situated upon first river terraced gravels, close to a geological transitional area, where the gravels meet alluvium from the River Thames to the south-west of the site.

2.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

2.4.1 A review of documentary, geological, archival and cartographic sources (AOC Archaeology Group, 2002) indicated that the site lay in an area known to have archaeological potential. What follows is extracted from that report.

2.4.2 The proposed development site contained a Grade II Listed building, but no Scheduled Ancient Monuments. It existed within an Area of Archaeological Constraint as designated by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. There were numerous references in the Greater London Sites and Monuments Record (GLSMR) to sites within a 300m radius of the development, relating in particular to the prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval periods.

2.4.3 The river terraced gravels upon which the site lies has yielded a number of prehistoric artefacts; the earliest of these isolated finds was dated to the Bronze Age. They included a Bronze Age barbed flint arrowhead found near Richmond Bridge, a Bronze Age socketed gouge from the Surrey bank of the River Thames, prehistoric worked flints and an Iron Age pot sherd discovered during an excavation in 1981.

2.4.4 The main focus for Roman settlement in the London area was *Londinium,* where the City of London is now situated. Little evidence exists for such Roman settlement in the vicinity of the site. Richmond's original name of *Shene* is thought to be Anglo-Saxon in origin. However, little is known of Anglo-Saxon Richmond and there are no references to Anglo-Saxon finds within the vicinity of the site.

2.4.5 During the medieval and post-medieval period the site lay in close proximity to a medieval manor (later Richmond Palace) and 16th century friary. The manorial map of Richmond dating to 1771 shows the site of the current house occupied by a building, with associated yards or gardens, numbered plot '29'. This was probably an earlier structure; the layout, as indicated by the 18th century map was quite different from that of the existing property. Whilst it is not clear when the new house superseded the old structure, it is stylistically dated to the late 18th century and the site has continued to be developed ever since.

3 STRATEGY

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

3.1 AIMS OF THE INVESTIGATION

3.1.1 The aims of the investigation set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation (AOC Archaeology Group, 2003) were as follows:

- To determine the presence of any archaeological features and finds within the development area.
- To record and sample excavate any such archaeologically important material.
- To record any historic fabric and features of the Grade II Listed building as revealed during the development work.
- To make available to interested parties the results of the investigation subject to any confidentiality restrictions.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 A unique site code (KNR 03) was obtained from the Museum of London prior to the monitoring of the geotechnical pits and removal of the oil tank; this code was continued into this phase of watching brief.

3.2.2 The watching brief involved the monitoring of a machine and hand dug rear extension and outflow service pipe which was excavated by the clients' groundwork contractors. A small mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket was used for the works.

3.2.3 Surviving archaeological remains were investigated, identified and recorded prior to their removal. Features below the 18th and 19th century remains were excavated archaeologically by AOC Archaeology Group.

3.2.4 It was proposed that the building works be completed in 3 stages:

Stage 1 – excavation of the main swimming pool area
Stage 2 – excavation of the area adjacent to the house and the outflow pipe
Stage 3 – excavation and underpinning of the party walls and main supporting walls in the basement.

3.2.5 During this stage seven underpinning trenches were excavated:

- Trenches 1 and 2 on the western side of the garden under the party wall.
- Trenches 3 and 4 against the rear of the basement at the base of the original light well.
- Trenches 5 and 6 on the eastern side of the garden under the party wall
- Trench 7 inside the basement, below the supporting wall, near to the bottom of the staircase.

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

3.2.6 The alterations to the rear of the building were monitored and recorded by photograph and description.

3.2.7 After the completion of some of the groundworks comprising Stage 3 the external development work was put on hold indefinitely. The swimming pool area was backfilled and the additional groundworks were not carried out.

4 RESULTS (Figs 3-4)

The results are described by period below, for detail on the finds recovered please refer to the specialist appendices (Appendix B).

4.1 NATURAL DEPOSITS

4.1.1 The natural stratum, a light brownish yellow sand (116) was exposed at 7.66m OD (maximum). This changed to reddish yellow, sandy gravel at approximately 6.85m OD where it was exposed in the base and edges of several features. Cut into these natural deposits were a number of features including rubbish pits, postholes and several ditches.

4.2 PREHISTORIC TO SAXON

4.2.1 Three sherds of possibly prehistoric pottery were found. These finds were however all residual, that is, not associated with features contemporary to their period of use. Two sherds were found in the fill of ditch [111]. The first was a small coarse sherd, probably from the neck of a jar or bowl. The suggested date for this piece was middle Neolithic (3400-2750 BC). The second sherd could have been Iron Age or Saxon in date; Early Saxon pottery has also been found at Mortlake and so the sherd was provisionally recorded as Saxon. The third sherd was from a thick-walled jar and found in layer [117]; this piece may have been of Iron Age or Middle Saxon date.

4.3 MEDIEVAL PERIOD

4.3.1 A number of postholes [115], [138], [140], [121] & [119] were recorded within the development area. These were fairly shallow, ranging from 0.07m to 0.35m in depth, and none of them contained post pipes. A base sherd from a London ware jug, dated to *c*.AD1270-1350, was found in posthole [119]. Two of the postholes, [138] and [140], were truncated by pit [126]. This indicates that the sequence of postholes, despite containing only one dateable find, preceeded the rubbish pit, which was dated to the latter half of the 16th century.

4.3.2 If these features were contemporary with one another then the postholes can be interpreted as two sides of a rectilinear structure with [119] at the apex. This would mean that the posthole structure lay on an alignment deviant to the recorded buildings within and around the development area. This would suggest that it was a much earlier feature, established prior to the street system that determined the orientation of those buildings. However the fact that the

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

development area was within a garden makes it equally likely that the posts were the result of horticultural activities.

4.3.3 Two ditches, [111] & [113], were excavated which contained pottery whose subsequent analysis suggested a medieval date for these features. Ditch [111] was a shallow ditch that crossed the southern end of the trench from east to west. It had a single sandy silt fill (110) that contained pottery sherds and animal bones. Two sherds of pottery were recovered from this feature that dated it to the 12th or earlier 13th century. Several sherds of pottery dating to the Neolithic (3400-2750 BC) and Saxon periods were also found in this feature. However, these finds were almost certainly residual.

4.3.4 On the same alignment, slightly to the north, lay the terminus of ditch [113]; a shallow linear feature that continued beyond the western limit of the excavation. The fill of the ditch (112) also contained medieval pottery sherds, which were dated to AD 1230–1350. It is possible that these ditches denoted property boundaries dating back to the medieval period as they ran parallel to the street and building indicated by the 1771 manorial map of Richmond.

4.3.4 Two sherds of pottery dating to between c.1270-1350 were also recovered from a small squared pit towards the north of the development area [144].

4.4 POST-MEDIEVAL

4.4.1 In the central area of the trench were a series of intercutting rubbish pits. The first pits to have been dug in this sequence appear to have been [150] and [152]. These were later recut to make a larger, squared rubbish pit [126] and to the south, a rounded pit [125]. The assemblages of pottery yielded from within their respective fills were very similar containing large and frequent pottery sherds, glass fragments, occasional fragments of copper, and the remnants of possible metal working.

4.4.2 Overwhelmingly the pottery found within the fills of these features was dated to the second half of the 16th century. The pottery consisted mainly of utilitarian vessels used for storage and cooking, rather than finer tablewares and vessels used for display. This would suggest that these pits were for the disposal of synthetic waste. Furthermore the dating evidence indicates that their period of use must have been, if not contemporary, then closely linked, for the assemblages recovered were markedly similar even to the point that sherds of pottery from the same vessels were found within different fills.

4.4.3 Two more pits were excavated further to the north of the development area. These features, [142] and [159], were smaller in plan than the rubbish pits. Their fills contained comparatively high frequencies of ceramic building materials, pottery sherds, small plaster fragments and brick fragments. From within pit [142] a number of peg tiles and a floor tile (dated to AD 1580-1600) were recovered, the floor tile appeared to be a reject as its shape was distorted by a stone. The ceramic materials, roof tiles and brick, were dated to between AD 1480–1630 and the overall assemblage was deemed typical of post-medieval brick and tile assemblages excavated in the London area .

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

4.4.4 It is possible that the relatively large quantities of building materials discovered in these features represent debris from the demolition of 16th century structures present at or nearby the site, for instance the Friary. The dating of these finds and location of the features towards the north of the plot, and therefore in close proximity to the site of these earlier structures, would also support such a theory.

4.4.5 To the east, at the limit of the excavation, a rectangular rubbish pit, whose function was probably quite different was observed [127]. This feature, despite being similar in size and shape to [126], contained a very high frequency of animal bone and little in the way of pottery and glass within the fills. The bone assemblage was dominated by sub-adult ox vertebrae with occasional sheep, goat, chicken and rabbit bones. It would appear therefore that pit [127] was reserved for the disposal of organic refuse. Pit [148] also contained a fairly large quantity of chicken, ox and adult rabbit bones. This assemblage was typical of medieval and post-medieval sites in Greater London. The large quantity of ox bones was comparable with an 18th century bone assemblage from Wimbledon Village.

4.4.6 Overlying the archaeological features was a layer of sandy silt, recorded as (117) & (155), which was interpreted as a buried subsoil. The underlying pits were well dated to the post-medieval period but this deposit was very similar to the underlying ditch fill (112) and like that feature contained residual pottery. The similarities between this layer (117), and the ditch fills (110) & (112), along with the presence of residual pottery dating to earlier periods in both, suggests that the underlying features may have survived until the deposition of this layer, probably during the 18th century, and that subsequently the soil was well worked and mixed, possibly as a result of landscaping.

4.5 MODERN

4.5.1 Two layers of made ground, (101) & (103), with a mortar dump (102) sandwiched between them, overlay the buried subsoil layer at the southern end of the area. The uppermost layer (101) extended across the whole trench. It was truncated by a rectangular pit filled with 18th or 19th century building material (104). This would indicate that these layers were deposited subsequent to the disuse of the securely dated post-medieval pits and prior to the digging and backfill of the rectangular pit. The cut of this pit may in fact have been part of the structural cut [105] for a pre-existing building which was subsequently demolished and backfilled with the resulting debris.

4.5.2 Traversing the trench from west to east was a brick built rectangular culvert with a stone slab roof [160]. This was flanked by two walls [160] & [163]. Lying directly below the culvert, at the western limit of excavation, a wall was observed that was thought to constitute the back or sidewall of a structure continuing westwards beyond the section [162].

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

4.5.3 Lying to the north of these features was a low wall, one brick in width. It was not clear whether this feature was contemporary with the culvert described above. The wall was founded on the same level as those features, suggesting a similar date for its construction, but the bricks from which it was built appeared to be of a more modern type than those used for the culvert and associated walls. These features were overlain by a mixed layer of made ground (166). The whole trench was subsequently covered by a layer of topsoil (100) at 8.75m OD.

4.5.4 Further to the south of the development area another culvert, built entirely of bricks and with a curved roof, was observed lying on a north-west to south-east alignment [109]. Its construction and position in the stratigraphic sequence suggested that this was a Victorian feature and the earlier of the two culverts.

4.5.5 The excavation of the underpinning pits (seven in total), revealed made ground overlying the natural sands and gravels. Trench 1 revealed a small rubbish pit [168], probably dating to the 17th or 18th century whose fill (167) contained flints, charcoal lumps, oyster and cockle shells. A number of structural elements from the existing structure occupying 17 King Street were observed in Trenches 3 and 4. This included; red brick walls, 0.94m in height, and thought to be part of the foundation structure; the southern limit of a cavity wall [173]; and a layer of floor bricks which formed the base of a light well that previously extended from the rear of the property. A layer of made ground (174), interpreted as a continuation of make up layer (166) exposed during Stage 2, was also observed. This was overlain by two brick drains [172] of red brick construction.

4.5.6 Underpinning Trenches 5 and 6 revealed modern deep made ground above the natural. Overlying these trenches was a concrete slab which formed the base for a modern brick built casing structure that had previously housed an oil tank. Two layers of made ground, overlying natural clayey sand, were exposed in Underpinning Trench 7. The lower layer was devoid of finds but from the upper layer a moderate number of fragments of building debris and animal bones were recovered. The concrete floor for the basement sealed this layer.

4.5.7 A modern brick built extension attached to the rear entrance of the house was removed as part of the works constituting Stage 2. The structure was a 2m x 1m rectangle.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The watching brief excavations revealed a number of rubbish pits and postholes associated with a building standing on the site prior to the construction of the current house during the late 18th century. Much of the pottery and building material found within these features dated to the second half of the 16th and first quarter of the 17th century.

6.2 The ceramic building material recovered from the rubbish pits was of particular interest as despite its similarity to other post-medieval brick and tile

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

assemblages excavated in the London area, it is possible that this material was derived from the 16th century friary which was located close to the northern limit of the excavation.

6.3 Other finds included ditches, probably dating to the medieval period, and structural features, including culverts and walls thought to relate to subsequent developments of the site since the 18th Century.

6.4 The watching brief successfully demonstrated the presence of human activity at the site from the prehistoric period onwards. This was particularly enlightening with regards to our understanding of the development of this part of Richmond and the nature of its occupation during the medieval and early post-medieval period.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

AOC Archaeology Group (2002) A Cultural Heritage Desk Based Assessment for 17 King Street, Richmond.

AOC Archaeology Group (2003) A Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Evaluation at 17 King Street, Richmond.

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

APPENDIX A – CONTEXT REGISTER

Context No.	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
100	Topsoil	Trench	Trench	0.45m
101	Post Medieval make up	Trench	Trench	0.35m
102	Mortar/building debris dump	1.00m	0.50m	0.10m
103	Post Medieval make up	1.00m	1.60m	0.30m
104	Fill	2.75m	2.11m	1.15m
105	Cut	2.75m	2.11m	1.15m
106	Dump Deposit	3.20m+	-	0.20m
107	Dump Deposit	0.65m+	-	0.10m
108	Dump Deposit	0.50m+	1.00m+	0.20m
109	Culvert	-	-	-
110	Ditch fill	5.00m+	0.74m	0.44m
111	Ditch cut	5.00m+	0.74m	0.44m
112	Ditch fill	1.10m	0.40m	0.10m
113	Ditch cut	1.10m	0.40m	0.10m
114	Fill of post hole	0.35m	-	0.08m
115	Cut of post hole	0.35m	-	0.08m
116	Natural	Trench	Trench	-
117	Occupation Layer	Trench	Trench	0.10m
118	Fill of post hole	0.24m	0.20m	0.28m
119	Cut of post hole	0.24m	0.20m	0.28m
120	Fill of post hole	0.20m	-	0.07m
121	Cut of post hole	0.20m	-	0.07m
122	Upper fill of pit	1.50m	1.70m	0.15m
123	Upper fill of pit	1.18m	1.10m	0.12m
124	Fill of pit	1.00m	1.75m	0.40m
125	Rubbish Pit	1.50m	1.70m	0.45m
126	Rubbish Pit	1.18m	1.10m	0.45m
127	Rubbish Pit	1.00m	1.75m	0.40m
128	Fill of pit	0.90m	0.50m	0.10m
129	Fill of pit	1.00m	1.10m	0.23m
130	Fill of pit	0.80m	-	0.30m
131	Fill of pit	1.00m	-	0.30m
132	Fill of pit	0.90m	-	0.15m
133	Fill of pit	0.70m	0.60m	0.01m
134	Fill of pit	-	-	-
135	Voided		-	-
136	Voided	-	-	-
137	Fill of post hole	0.40m	0.33m	0.30m
138	Cut of post hole	0.40m	0.33m	0.30m

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Context No.	Context Description	Length	Width	Depth
139	Fill of pit	0.29m	0.05m	0.35m
140	Cut of pit	0.29m	0.05m	0.35m
141	Fill of pit	1.20m	0.70m	0.50m
142	Cut of pit	1.20m	0.70m	0.50m
143	Fill of pit	0.60m	0.60m	0.32m
144	Cut of pit	0.60m	0.60m	0.32m
145	Fill of pit	1.50m	0.20m	0.10m
146	CBM dump in pit	-	-	0.15m
147	Fill of pit	-	-	0.10m
148	Cut of pit	1.50m	0.20m	0.40m
149	Fill of pit	-	-	-
150	Cut of pit	-	-	-
151	Fill of pit	-	-	-
152	Cut of pit	-	-	-
153	Voided	-	-	-
154	Voided	-	-	-
155	Trample layer	-	-	-
156	Fill of pit	0.50m	0.90m	0.30m
157	Cut of pit	0.50m	0.90m	0.30m
158	Fill of pit	0.80m	0.70m	0.40m
159	Cut of pit	0.80m	0.70m	0.40m
160	Masonry, Culvert	-	-	-
161	Masonry, Wall	-	-	-
162	Masonry, Wall	-	-	-
163	Masonry, Wall	-	-	-
164	Masonry, Wall	-	-	-
165	Masonry, Wall	-	-	-
166	Layer of made ground	-	-	-
167	Fill of pit	1.05m	0.53m	0.34m
168	Cut of pit	1.05m	0.53m	0.34m
169	Concrete floor	-	-	-
170	Made ground with demolition rubble	-	-	-
171	Made Ground	-	-	-
172	Double drain structure	-	-	-
173	Cavity wall	-	-	-
174	Dump layer	-	-	-
175	Wall	-	-	-

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

APPENDIX B – FINDS REPORTS

ARCHIVE REPORT ON THE POST-ROMAN POTTERY FROM 17 KING STREET, RICHMOND, LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES (KNR03)

Museum of London Specialist Services **MoLSS ref:AOC/KNR03**

Nigel Jeffries (post-medieval) and Lyn Blackmore (Prehistoric and medieval)

Quantification

Introduction and methodology

The post-Roman pottery assemblage from 17 King Street, Richmond upon Thames was recovered under watching brief conditions and comprises 212 sherds from up to 121 vessels filling one skeleton-sized box. The assemblage derives from 29 contexts, of which 28 contain fewer than 30 sherds; the one medium-sized group (defined as 30 to 100 sherds) contains 33 sherds but these are from only 11 vessels. The pottery was recorded on paper and on an Excel spreadsheet, using standard Museum of London codes for fabric, form and decoration. Minimum quantification by sherd count, estimated number of vessels (ENV) and weight was carried out (the assemblage weighs 8245 grammes giving an average weight per sherd of 38.89 grammes). The bulk of the material was recorded by Nigel Jeffries, while a few comments on the prehistoric, possible Saxon and medieval sherds were added by Lyn Blackmore, who edited the text.

The overall condition of the pottery is generally good; the assemblage is characterised by large quantities of joining sherds from substantially complete vessels and profiles (which helped in the identification of forms) that are closely datable, with no evidence of intrusive or residual material. Although no complete vessels could be reconstructed, some profiles were found, with contexts [126], [130], [131] and [134] in particular yielding the substantial remains from a small number of vessels. Sherd links are noted below.

Prehistoric and possible Saxon pottery

Three sherds are, or may be, or prehistoric date, all residual. The most definite find is a small (5gm) coarsely flint-tempered sherd from fill [110] of ditch [111] that would appear to be from the neck of a jar or bowl with two large, slightly oblique impressions in outer surface. It is not impossible that these are accidental, but one has slight traces of a cord impression, suggesting that they represent decoration (e.g. in the Peterborough, Ebbsfleet or Mortlake style). Dating is thus uncertain, but given the proximity of Richmond to Mortlake, where decorated pottery of Ebbsfleet and Mortlake style has been found, a middle Neolithic date is likely (3400-2750 BC). Peterborough/Mortlake ware has also been found on other sites in west London, notably at Staines and in the Heathrow area (Cotton et al 1986, 36).

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

The other sherd from ditch [111] is clearly later in date. The fabric contains abundant very fine sand with sparse coarser sand (up to 0.5mm but mainly less than this) and moderate to abundant organic inclusions up to 5mm in length. This sherd could be Iron Age or Saxon in date; given that Early Saxon pottery has also been found at Mortlake (Cowie and Blackmore in prep) the latter cannot be ruled out and the sherd has provisionally been recorded as Saxon fabric CHSF.

The third sherd, from a thick-walled jar and found the sandy silt [117], is equally difficult to date. The fabric is coarser than the above, and would appear to comprise a brickearth matrix with moderate to abundant quartz sand up to 0.7mm across and sparse organic matter; this has been provisionally recorded as fabric ESANCO, although it could date to the Middle Saxon, rather than the earlier Saxon period (or, indeed, be of Iron Age date).

Medieval pottery

Eleven sherds of medieval pottery were recovered from seven features, mostly sealed by the sandy silt [117]/[155]. Of these, fill [110] of ditch [111] contained two sherds. One is in a fine silty fabric containing fossil shell that is the Surrey equivalent of the London fabric EMSH (dating 1050-1150). The other of is in a coarse handmade sandy ware with flint that is the precursor of south Hertfordshire greywares (ESHER) and dated to 1050-1200. This feature, therefore, would appear to date to the late 12th or earlier 13th century. Fill [112] of ditch [113] yielded two sherds of Kingston-type ware (Pearce and Vince 1988) and one sherd from a London-type ware jar (Pearce et al 1985) which point to a date of 1230 and 1350 for this feature. Pit [144] contained one sherd of London-type ware and one of coarse Surrey/Hampshire border ware, which point to a date of c.12670-1350 for the fill of this feature. Posthole [119] contained a base sherd from a London war jug, probably of conical form and dating to 1270-1350. The three other sherds are all residual. They were found in [122] (fill of rubbish pit [125]), the rectangular rubbish pit [124], and in rubbish pit [168].

The post-medieval pottery

The good condition of the pottery meant it was possible to closely date the recorded sequence from the second half of the 16th to the first quarter of the 17th century (see Excel spreadsheet).

Much of the assemblage was recovered from a series of inter-cutting rubbish pits. The presence of sherds from the same vessels found among the different fills suggests this material was discarded either as one event or as a series of closely linked events, thereby representing a wider disuse of this particular land use and phase. The assemblage is dominated by products of the Surrey/Hampshire border industries (BORDG, BORDO and BORDY; see Pearce 1992), which amount to 34% of the post-medieval sherds. In second place are early London area post-medieval redwares (PMRE) together with its slip-decorated derivatives (PMSRY and PMSRG). The coarser redware (PMR), that is typical of the 17th century and later, is confined to three sherds only, all from [103]. Together with the paucity of tin-glazed wares, this suggests that deposition mainly occurred during the second half of the 16th century. The pottery from these groups contains utilitarian vessels used for storage and cooking, rather than including finer tablewares and those used for display (for example tin-glazed ware chargers).

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

The most significant vessels include a PMSRG deep flared bowl found in [131] (complete profile), a BORDG flared bowl with single handle from context [126], a two-handled carinated porringer and flared dish in BORDY from [134] and a deep flared bowl in PMRE from the same context. The most unusual pottery from this site comprises two imported wares, both tentatively identified as products of kilns from northern France, probably Beauvais (Hurst et al 1986, 106-8). The first is a polychrome jug found in contexts [122], [129], [134], and [149] (recorded as BEAU POLY). This has a buff brown fabric and is externally decorated to the waist with a thin tin-glazed like slip and marbled green glaze; it is internally covered with an overall olive/green glaze. The second vessel is a soapy white fabric (similar to pipe clay in both appearance and texture), the form being either a ceramic horn or the upper part of a flared beaker. A small heraldic (?) stamp is located just below the rim. These two vessels merit further research.

Three groups of sherd links were identified. The first provided by the Beauvais-type polychrome jug, sherds of which were found in contexts [122], [129], [134], and [149]. The second is between contexts [128] and [129], where the same early post-medieval redware (PMRE) dish sherds are found, while the third is between contexts [131], [149] and [151], which contained sherds from a substantially complete Midland Purple jar (MPUR).

Bibliography check

Cotton, J, Mills, J, and Clegg, G, 1986 *Archaeology in West Middlesex*

Cowie, R, and Blackmore, L, in prep *Early and Middle Saxon rural settlement in the London region*, for MoLAS monograph series

Hurst, J G, Neal, D S, and van Beuningen, H J E, 1986 *Pottery produced and traded in north-west Europe 1350-1650*, Rotterdam Papers VI.

Pearce J E, Vince, A, and Jenner A 1985 *A Dated Type Series of London Medieval Pottery part 2: London-type ware*, LAMAS special paper 6

Pearce, J E, and Vince, A, 1988 *A Dated Type Series of London Medieval Pottery part 4: Surrey Whitewares*, LAMAS special paper 10

Pearce, J E, 1992 *Post-medieval pottery in London, 1500-1700, volume 1: Border Wares,* HMSO

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Report on the animal bones from 17 King Street, Richmond, London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (KNR03)

Museum of London Specialist Services **MoLSS ref:AOC/KNR03**

Alan Pipe

Introduction and methodology

This report quantifies, describes and interprets the hand-collected animal bone assemblage from 19 contexts at 17 King Street, Richmond upon Thames. Each bone was recorded onto an Excel spread sheet (see bontab01.xls) in terms of weight (g), species, skeletal element, side, sex, fragmentation, epiphysial fusion, dental eruption and wear, and modification. When definite identification to species level was impossible due to excessive fragmentation, fragments were allocated to the approximate categories 'unidentified fish', 'sheep-sized mammal', sheep/goat and 'ox-sized mammal' as appropriate. The bones from each feature are discussed in terms of their implications for local human diet and activity.

The bones

Animal bone was recorded from ditch fills [110] and [112]; pit fills [122], [130], [132], [133], [141], [145], [146], [149] and [158]; rubbish pit fills [123], [124], [126], [129]; posthole [137]; and deposits [135], [156], and [167].

A total of 119 fragments, 2.051 kg, was recovered. The bones were generally in moderate or good preservation with insufficient surface damage to obscure surface morphology or tool marks. Fragmentation was severe with the bulk of the assemblage only 25-50% complete; only four complete bones, a chicken coracoid and ulna, and a rabbit femur and metapodial, were recovered from the whole group.

The recovered taxa were plaice/flounder Pleuronectidae, cod *Gadus morhua*, chicken *Gallus gallus*, ox *Bos taurus*, sheep *Ovis aries,* horse *Equus caballus* and rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus.* Ox, including ox-sized, and to a lesser extent, sheep/goat, including sheep-sized, bones dominated the assemblage in terms of weight and fragment count; the remaining fish, birds and mammals occurred only as occasional finds. There was no evidence for burning, working, gnawing or pathological change.

Medieval

The only context that can be dated to the medieval period is the fill [112] of a ditch [113]. This deposit included only a single fragment of 'ox-sized' longbone. No butchery marks were recorded.

Post-medieval pottery

Well-preserved pottery has closely dated the recorded sequence from the second half of the 16th to the first quarter of the 17th century. The bulk of the assemblage was recovered from a series of inter-cutting pits and rubbish pits.

Ditch [111]

Fill [110] produced three fragments, 0.340 kg, of bone derived from ox radius and metatarsal, and horse mandible. All the teeth on the horse mandible were worn

 © AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

indicating an old animal. The ox radius had been chopped at the proximal end indicating disarticulation at the 'elbow' joint.

Pit [125]

Fills [122], [130], [132] and [133] and produced ten fragments, 0.665 kg, of bone, including a unidentified fish caudal vertebra, a juvenile chicken coracoid, ox humerus, subadult ox-sized cervical vertebra, ox-sized thoracic vertebra, ox humerus and radius, and sheep-sized rib. A fragment of cod cleithrum was recovered from [133]. An ox vertebra had been been cleaved down the midline and transversely chopped indicating division of the carcase into 'sides' and subsequent sub-division. The radius had been chopped at the distal end indicating disarticulation at the 'wrist' joint.

Rubbish pit [126]

Fills of this feature, including [123] and [129], produced eight fragments, 0.145 kg, of bone derived from chicken tibia, ox scapula, humerus and ox-sized rib, and sheep/goat tibia and subadult sheep-sized vertebra.

Rubbish pit [127]

Fill [124] produced the largest group of bones, 59 fragments, 0.448 kg, from the whole assemblage. The group was dominated by ox subadult vertebrae from the neck, thorax and lower back, with occasional recovery of fragments of skull, rib and metacarpal. There were also occasional finds of sheep/goat maxilla, humerus, innominate, femur and tibia; sheep metacarpal; chicken coracoid and femur; and rabbit tibia. The bulk of the fragments were from adults or at least subadults, with a few examples of juvenile ox and ox-sized vertebra. Some of the vertebrae had been split; chop marks were present on ox vertebrae and ox-sized ribs, and on the sheep-sized femur. The chicken femur showed clear development of medullary bone and was therefore from a hen 'in-lay'.

Deposit [135]

This produced seven fragments, 0.105 kg, of bone derived from ox mandible and calcaneum, sheep/goat humerus and radius and fragments of ox-sized longbone and sheep-sized vertebra.

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Posthole [138]

Fill [137] produced two fragments, 0.030 kg, of bone from ox innominate and juvenile sheep/goat tibia.

Pit [142]

Fill [141 produced two fragments, 0.025 kg, of bone from ox scapula and calf metatarsal.

Pit [148]

Fill [145] produced nine fragments, 0.045 kg, of bone derived mainly from juvenile chicken skull, ulna, tibiotarsus and tarsometatarsus with single fragments of ox tibia, ox-sized rib and lumbar vertebra and adult rabbit femur.
Fill [146] produced a fragment, 0.005 kg, of calf femur.

Pit [150]

Fill 149] produced three fragments, 0.031 kg, of bone from a plaice or flounder cleithrum, and two ox vertebrae.

Deposit [156]

This produced two fragments, 0.055 kg, of bone from ox axis vertebra and femur.

Pit [159]

Fill [158] produced a fragment, 0.065 kg, of ox cervical vertebra.

Deposit [167]

This produced 11 fragments, 0.090 kg, of bone, mainly from ox-sized and sheep-sized rib with single fragments of cod cleithrum, sheep/goat innominate and femur, and ‘sheep-sized lumbar vertebra.

Discussion

This small and heavily fragmented assemblage derives largely from post-consumption waste associated with the consumption of beef from young and adult animals, and probably of both lamb and mutton. There were no identifications of goat or pig. The carcase-part distribution shows a definite bias towards areas of good meat-bearing quality, particularly the vertebrae, ribs and upper limb (scapula, humerus, innominate, femur) with only occasional recovery of the lower limb (radius, tibia) and feet (metcarpal, metatarsal), respectively areas of moderate and poor meat quality. The

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

dominance of ox and sheep/goat with the absence of pig and this bias in carcase-part distribution. compares closely with an 18th century bone assemblage from Wimbledon Village (Rielly 2004). There was no recovery of horncore or phalanges, and no real evidence for primary carcase processing of cattle or sheep at site. Recovery of head and foot elements from chicken, and foot elements of rabbit, suggest that these smaller carcases were indeed processed *in-situ*. There was no evidence for bone or horn-working. Clear butchery evidence showed the use of cleavers to split the ox carcase down the midline into 'sides', and of cleavers and knives to further disarticulate and divide the ox and sheep/goat carcases. The small size of the feature assemblages prevents useful *intra-site* comparison, although pits [127] and [148] show the largest concentrations of chicken and rabbit bones. The small fish assemblage of cod and plaice/flounder is very typical of medieval and post-medieval sites in Greater London; both are caught by trawling in the tidal Thames particularly at the mouth of the river (Wheeler 1979, 83).
The lack of wild species such as amphibians or small mammals prevents any comment on local habitats.

Bibliography

Amorosi, T, 1989 A postcranial guide to domestic neo-natal and juvenile mammals

BAR International Series 533

Rielly, K, 2004 Assessment of the animal bones from Greengables and land to rear of 32-33 High Street, Wimbledon Village, London SW19 London Borough of Merton (HWM04)
MoLSS assessment report BON/ASS/13/2004

Schmid, E, 1972 1972 *Atlas of animal bones for prehistorians, archaeologists, and Quaternary geologists*
London. Elsevier

Wheeler, A, 1979 *The tidal Thames*
London. Routledge & Kegan Paul

 © AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

REPORT ON THE BUILDING MATERIAL FROM 17 KING STREET, RICHMOND UPON THAMES (KNR03)

Museum of London Specialist Services **MoLSS ref:AOC/KNR03/bm01.doc**

Ian M. Betts

Quantification

Summary/Introduction

The ceramic building material assemblage from 17 King Street comprised 15.32 kg of tile and brick from 19 contexts. One floor tile is present, the remaining material is composed of peg roofing tile and brick. There is also one fragment of burnt mudstone from Context 122 but this is probably not building material so is not discussed further.

Methodology

All the building material has been recorded using the standard recording forms used by the Museum of London. This has involved fabric analysis undertaken with a x10 binocular microscope. The fabric numbers used as those in the Museum of London fabric reference collection.

The information on the recording forms has been added to an Excel database.

Roofing Tile

The roofing tile comprises entirely of peg tile in common local London area fabrics (types 2271, 2276, 2586). The presence of tiles in fabric 2276 indicates a post 1480 date, as does the lack of any glazed tiles, whilst the absence of pantiles would indicate a date before AD 1630. This agrees well with the dating of most of the pottery to 1550-1625 (Jeffries pottery report).

The dating also supports the theory that the roofing tile and associated bricks, particularly those recovered from the pits to the north of the development area, derive from the demolition of the 16th century friary which lay close to the site.

The peg roofing tiles measure 10-15 mm in thickness, but no other size measurements survive. They are of standard two nail holes type, which are ubiquitous in the London area. The nail hole shape is mainly round (11-15 mm diameter) , although a triangular shaped hole (16 x 13 x 12 mm) is present on a fragment from Context 137. No other features are present apart from a rather odd mark which appears to have been made by accident in the top edge of one tile (Context 156).

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Brick

Most bricks present on site fall into two categories: a coarse sandy variety (fabric 3065) and a fine/moderately sandy variety (fabrics 3033, 3046). Both were almost certainly made in the London area, but are presumably from different brickyards. As with the roofing tiles, they probably derive from the 16th century friary buildings.

The sandy bricks measure 102-109 mm in breadth by 49-58 mm in thickness. Indented borders are present indicating a probable pre-1666 date. The finer fabric bricks are of similar size: measuring 103-111 mm in breadth by 50-58 mm in thickness. Indented borders are again present. One of the finer fabric bricks has a very worn flat surface suggesting it was used as paving, or perhaps cut for some decorative function (Context 137).

A slight different brick was recovered from Context 134. This is of similar thickness (55 mm) but has a rounded red clay inclusions. As there was only one example present it is uncertain if this is from the same source as fabrics 3033 and 3046, but made with a slightly unusual clay, or derives from another brickyard.

Floor tile

A solitary unglazed floor tiles was found in one of the pits in the north of the site (Context 141). The silty fabric (type 3080) and the present of twin sets of nail holes in two corners show that the tile was an import from the Low Countries. These holes are somewhat irregular but at least one is more or less square (2 x 2 mm) whilst another is more oval in shape (1.5 x 3 mm).

The tile was almost certainly never used because a large pebble near the surface coursed the tile to crack and the clay above to be come detached. It was found with what is believed to be building debris from the friary so this may have been its origin source, although the lack of wear and attached mortar shows it was never set into a tile floor.

The pottery associated with the tile is dated to AD 1480-1600, but it is unlikely that it was imported into London much before the late 16th century. The earliest unglazed Low Countries tiles brought into London are provisionally dated to around AD 1580-1600, and they were definitely in use by the mid 17th century. However, there is some uncertainly surrounding the date of the King Street tile because of its unusually small size (141 x 138 x 32 mm). Other plain unglazed floor tiles imported in from the Low Countries are normally much larger: between 195 and 260 mm square.

Discussion

The ceramic building material from King Street is similar in many respects to other post-medieval brick and tile assemblages excavated in the London area. Most is probably of similar date to much of the associated pottery which is dated to the second half of the 16th and first quarter of the 17th century. The building material is of particular interest as it would appear that much of it may derive from the 16th century friary which was located close to the north limit of the excavation. The presence of various bricks and roofing tiles hints at the appearance of some of the friary buildings, at least one of which may have had a plain unglazed tile floor.

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

APPENDIX C – OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM

OASIS ID: AOCARCHA1-6177

Project details

Project name	17 King Street, Richmond
Short description of the project	The property was located in the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames; it lay within an Area of Archaeological Constraint as designated by the London Borough of Richmond, and contained no Scheduled Ancient Monuments. 17 King Street was a Grade II Listed building, dating to the late 18th century; it lay in the north-east corner of a roughly rectangular area, with the garden to the south-west. A review of documentary, geological, archival and cartographic sources indicated that the site lay in an area known to have archaeological potential. It highlighted the potential of the river terraced gravels upon which the site lay, to contain prehistoric remains and the fact that during the Medieval and Post-medieval period the site was near to a medieval Manor (later Richmond Palace) and closer still to a 16th century friary. The site itself had undergone development from the 18th century onward, through construction of the present property. The finds revealed by the work indicated both prehistoric activity on the site and contributed to our understanding of the medieval and early post-medieval development of this part of Richmond.
Project dates	Start: 21-07-2003 End: 17-10-2003
Previous/future work	No / No
Any associated project reference codes	KNR 03 - Site code
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	Local Authority Designated Archaeological Area
Current Land use	Residential 1 - General Residential
Significant Finds	POTTERY Medieval
Significant Finds	POTTERY Post Medieval
Significant Finds	CBM Medieval
Significant Finds	CBM Post Medieval
Significant Finds	ANIMAL BONE Medieval
Significant Finds	ANIMAL BONE Post Medieval

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Methods & techniques	'Sample Trenches'
Development type	Small-scale extensions (e.g. garages, porches, etc.)
Prompt	Direction from Local Planning Authority - PPG16
Position in the planning process	After full determination (eg. As a condition)

Project location

Country	England
Site location	GREATER LONDON RICHMOND UPON THAMES RICHMOND UPON THAMES 17 King Street
Postcode	TW9
Study area	240 Square metres
National grid reference	TQ 7680 4810 Point

Project creators

Name of Organisation	AOC Archaeology
Project brief originator	Local Authority Archaeologist and/or Planning Authority/advisory body
Project design originator	AOC Archaeology
Project director/manager	Ron Humphrey
Project supervisor	Sophie Adams
Sponsor or funding body	Developer

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	AOC Archaeology
Physical Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Environmental'
Physical Archive notes	Will be held at AOC Archaeology until dispatched to local museum

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Physical Archive Exists?	Yes
Digital Archive recipient	AOC Archaeology
Digital Contents	'Stratigraphic','Survey'
Digital Media available	'Spreadsheets','Survey','Text'
Digital Archive notes	Will be held at AOC Archaeology until dispatched to local museum
Digital Archive Exists?	Yes
Paper Archive recipient	AOC Archaeology
Paper Contents	'Animal Bones','Ceramics','Environmental','Stratigraphic','Survey'
Paper Media available	'Context sheet','Correspondence','Diary','Drawing','Matrices','Miscellaneous Material','Notebook - Excavation',' Research',' General Notes','Photograph','Plan','Report','Section','Survey ','Unpublished Text'
Paper Archive notes	Will be held at AOC Archaeology until dispatched to local museum
Paper Archive Exists?	Yes

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	17 King Street, Richmond, Watching Brief Report
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Adams, S. Thatcher, C
Date	2005
Issuer or publisher	AOC Archaeology
Place of issue or publication	London
Description	Bound text and illustrations

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005

Entered by	Chris Thatcher (christhatcher@aocarchaeology.co.uk)
Entered on	20 January 2005

© AOC ARCHAEOLOGY GROUP – MAY 2005