



**LAWS BUILDING
King's College
152–158 The Strand
London WC2**

City of Westminster

Report on a pre-determination archaeological evaluation

February 2014



**Laws Building (Kings College London)
152-158 Strand
London WC2R**

Pre-determination Evaluation Report

NGR 530760 180890

Sign-off history:

Issue No.	Date:	Prepared by:	Checked by	Approved by:	Reason for Issue:
1	14.02.2014	Portia Askew (Author) Judit Perezstegi (Graphics)	Laura O’Gorman	Laura O’Gorman Contract Manager	First issue

Y code: P0120

© Museum of London Archaeology
Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED
tel 0207 410 2200 fax 0207 410 2201 email:generalenquiries@mola.org.uk

Museum of London Archaeology is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales with company registration number 07751831 and charity registration number 1143574.
Registered office: Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED

Contents

Executive summary	1
1 Introduction	2
1.1 Site background	2
1.2 Designated heritage assets	2
1.3 Aims and objectives	2
2 Archaeological and historical background	3
2.1 Topography and geology	3
2.2 Predicted archaeological potential	3
3 The evaluation	5
3.1 Methodology	5
3.2 Results	5
3.3 Significance of the results	8
3.4 Assessment of the evaluation	9
4 Proposed development impact and recommendations	10
5 Finds summary	11
6 Planning framework	12
6.2 Statutory protection	12
6.3 National Planning Policy Framework	12
6.4 Greater London regional policy	15
6.5 Local planning policy	15
7 Bibliography	20
8 NMR OASIS archaeological report form	21

Figures

Cover: Photograph of existing buildings looking south across the Strand (MOLA photo)

Fig 1 Site location

Fig 2 Trench location plan

Fig 3 Photograph of test pit 1 showing 17th century drain cuts

Fig 4 Photograph of test pit 1 showing the north facing section through the natural deposits

Fig 5 Photograph of test pit 1 showing quarry pit [34] and Saxon pit [25]

Fig 6 Photograph of test pit [2] showing quarry pit [34] and Saxon pit [25]

Fig 7 Photograph of test pit 3 in vault of 157 Strand

Fig 8 Photograph of test pit 4 showing 17th-century foundation wall [22] and 19th-century pit [20]

- Fig 9 Close-up of 19th-century pit [20] after further excavation to expose details of architectural iron waste*
- Fig 10 Photograph of test pit 4 showing sondage through natural deposits*
- Fig 11 Photograph of test pit 5 showing possible remains of medieval chalk wall*
- Fig 12 Photograph of test pit 6 showing late 19th/early 20th-century coal holes*
- Fig 13 Photograph of test pit 7*

Executive summary

This report presents the results of a pre-determination archaeological evaluation carried by Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) on the site of the Laws Building (Kings College London), 152-158 Strand, London, and WC2R. The report supplies sufficient information to enable the local planning authority to formulate an appropriate mitigation strategy in light of the proposed development. The evaluation was commissioned by Kings College London.

The evaluation comprised seven test pits located within the basement of the building. Four of the test pits were specifically designated for archaeological investigation and three for geotechnical purposes to assess the nature and depth of the building foundations. The results of the field evaluation have helped to refine the initial assessment of the archaeological potential of the site.

The evaluation recorded heavily truncated Saxon and post-medieval activity of low to medium significance on the site with possibly medieval activity of low significance. The construction of the 19th century basements have resulted in truncation of horizontally stratified deposits.

Natural gravel and sand was found in all but one of the test pits and found immediately below the basement slab. The earliest archaeological survival was evidenced by a Saxon pit cutting the natural deposits. A possible late medieval chalk wall was recorded on the south side of the site in 156 Strand. Within the same property, below the north wall an east-west 17th century brick foundation wall, constructed out of reused medieval bricks was recorded. Adjacent to the wall was a late post-medieval pit backfilled with architectural wrought iron fragments. Some of these could be identified as parts of railings, a gate latch and coal-hole covers, the latter with an intricate ivy design. The latest evidence represented was coal hole of late 19th or early 20th century, in the southeast corner of the site. To the east in 158 Strand the remains of two interconnecting drains were recorded and are probably contemporary with the 17th-century brick wall.

The results of the evaluation along with a full impact assessment from the development and recommendations for further work will be included within the final Historic Environment Assessment (MOLA 2014).

1 Introduction

1.1 Site background

1.1.1 The evaluation took place within the basement of the Laws Building, King's College, 152-158 The Strand, hereafter called 'the site' (Fig 1). It is bounded by the Strand to the north, Kings College to east and Somerset House to the west and south. The OS National Grid Ref. for centre of site is 530756 180888. The site code is KNC13.

1.1.2 An Historic Environment Assessment (in draft format at the time of writing this report) has been prepared by MOLA and provides in depth detail on the natural geology, archaeological and historical background of the site, and the initial interpretation of its archaeological potential. The results of the evaluation have provided further information of the archaeological potential within the site and the results will be included into the final Historic Environment Assessment. The evaluation has taken place at the pre-planning stage, and the report will be submitted as part of the planning application, to enable the local planning authority to formulate an appropriate mitigation strategy in light of the proposed development.

1.2 Designated heritage assets

- 1.2.3 The site lies within/contains the following designated heritage assets:
- The site lies within/contains the following 152 and 153 Strand are grade II listed.
 - The site lies within the Strand Conservation Area.
 - The site lies within the *Lundenwic* and Thorney Island Area of Special Archaeological Priority.

1.3 Aims and objectives

1.3.4 The following research aims and objectives were established in the Written Scheme of Investigation for the evaluation (Section 3):

- Identify the presence/absence of archaeological remains within the site. Archaeological remains could comprise;
 - Isolated Roman finds.
 - Saxon features and deposits
 - Late medieval buildings fronting the Strand
 - Possibility of late medieval burials and/or remains of the Church of the Nativity of Our Lady and the Innocents
 - Footings of earlier post-medieval buildings
- Identify the extent of any modern disturbance.
- Identify the depth of the natural deposits.

1.3.5 Provide recommendations of any further assessment/fieldwork which may form a condition as part of planning consent, or where assets are thought to be of national or international significance (ie of schedulable quality), preservation *in situ*.

1.3.6 The evaluation will also provide the opportunity to record and assess the existing vaults to the north of the basements in order to determine that date of construction and any phases of later development/alterations.

2 Archaeological and historical background

2.1 Topography and geology

2.1.1 A description of the topology and underlying geology is detailed in the Historic Environment Assessment/Written Scheme of investigation [delete as appropriate]. In summary:

2.1.2 A description of the topology and underlying geology is detailed in the Historic Environment Assessment (MOLA 2014). In summary:

- Ground level in the quad, (between the east wing of Somerset House and Chesters Inn, Kings College lies at c 14.80m OD.
- Basement level lies at c 12.00m OD.
- The natural geology comprises natural gravels. In 1991 truncated natural gravel was recorded at 10.37m OD at the base of a Saxon pit in an archaeological trial pit excavated in the basement of 156 Strand.

2.2 Predicted archaeological potential

2.2.3 There is likely to be archaeological survival within the footprint of the single-basement of the Laws Building, although these may be limited to cut features such as pits, wall foundations, drains and wells.

2.2.4 The archaeological potential for each period is discussed below in relation to the site.

Prehistoric period (800,000 BC–AD43)

2.2.5 The site has low potential for prehistoric remains, despite its close proximity to a water source and lying on free draining gravels, with the possibility of residual flint tools surviving, as has been found on the sites of the Savoy Theatre, c 300 metres to the west and Catherine Street c 200m to the north-west (MOLA 2014). The construction of the buildings on the site in the late 17th/early 18th century and subsequent modifications to the properties in the late 19thc and early 20th century are likely to have removed any evidence for occupation.

Roman period (AD 43–410)

2.2.6 The site has low potential for Roman archaeological remains. Much of the evidence for this period within the vicinity of the site have been recorded as residual in context within medieval and post-medieval deposits at Arundel House to the east and to the north at St Mary-le-Strand, opposite the site, (MOLA 2014, Section 4). There have been no confirmed Roman settlement sites along the Strand between St Brides Church on Fleet Street and the Roman burial ground around St Martin-in-the-Fields to the west.

Early medieval/Saxon period (AD 410–1066)

2.2.7 The site has moderate potential for remains dating to the early medieval period and low. During evaluation work on the site in 1990-1991 part of a Saxon rubbish pit was recorded in 156 Strand (MoLAS 1991). The location of the pit (KIL90;test pit) would appear to lie south of the proposed test pit 4 in the 2014 evaluation. The focus of settlement at this time was concentrated to the west around the areas of Aldwych, the Strand and Covent Garden, known as *Lundenwic*. Although its eastern limit is unknown, occasional finds have been found further east from the Inns of Court (Cowie and Blackmore 2013, 114-116). Further evidence for possible Saxon occupation in the area has come from the Archive Centre Building on the west side of Strand Lane, where several sherds of Saxon/early medieval pottery were

recovered, from a second phase of work in 2001-2003 (MoLAS 2003).

- 2.2.8 During evaluation work on the site in 1990-1991 part of a Saxon rubbish pit was recorded in 156 Strand (MoLAS 1991). The location of the pit (KIL90;test pit 3) lies south of proposed test pit 4 in the 2014 evaluation (see Fig 2).

Late medieval period (AD1066–1485)

- 2.2.9 The site has moderate potential for archaeological remains dating to the late medieval period. Whilst it is documented that the area along the Strand became the focus for the construction of great houses for a number of bishops and nobles from the 12th century onwards, including, by 1531, the King and Queen, some of the houses were levelled in the mid-16th century by the Duke of Somerset to make way for Somerset House. The actual layout of the properties on the site at this time is unknown and can only be approximated from documentary and cartographic sources and it is unknown whether the buildings on the site were levelled at this time. They may have survived until the late 18th century when the area underwent development with the construction of a new Somerset House in 1775, with the basic layout of the six properties the same. This configuration remains the same in essence until today, although piecemeal alterations are likely to have had impacts from the late 19th century onwards. It is possible that, whilst upstanding walls are likely to have been destroyed, their foundations may survive below ground.

Post-medieval period (AD1485–present)

- 2.2.10 The site has high potential for the survival of remains for the post-medieval period, specifically wall foundations. The documentary and cartographic sources indicate at least two major development phases; the clearance of many medieval properties to make way for the construction of Somerset House in the mid-16th century with a further phase of redevelopment in 1775 for a new Somerset House. The properties on the site underwent similar redevelopment from the late 18th century through to the early 20th century. Each property has a vault which runs north of the basement under the pavement of the Strand, though the date of them is unknown and it is possible they relate to an earlier phase of building.

3 The evaluation

3.1 Methodology

- 3.1.1 All archaeological excavation, monitoring and recording during the evaluation was carried out in accordance with the preceding Written Scheme of Investigation (MOLA, 2013).
- 3.1.2 The evaluation involved the excavation and recording of seven trial pits and a short assessment of the brick types used in the vaults and the phase/s of construction on the north side of the site by Ian Bette, MOLA Building material Specialist and James Dixon, MOLA Buildings Specialist.
- 3.1.3 The basement slab was broken out and cleared by contractors under MOLA supervision. The underlying modern deposits were removed by contractors down to the level of the archaeological horizon, whereby MOLA staff continued the excavation and recording of in situ archaeological deposits and structures.
- 3.1.4 The trial pits were surveyed in by MOLA Geomatics then plotted onto the OS grid.
- 3.1.5 Levels were calculated from temporary bench marks (TBMs) established next to the test pits via a traverse from a known bench mark located on the north-east wing of Somerset House with a value of 15.43m OD.
- 3.1.6 The site has produced: 1 trench location plan; 34 context records; 8 section drawings at 1:20; and 28 photographs. In addition 1 small boxes of finds was recovered from the site.
- 3.1.7 The site finds and records can be found under the site code KNC13 in the MoL archive.

3.2 Results

- 3.2.8 For trench locations see Fig 2.

Evaluation Test pit 1

Location	Basement on north side of 158 Strand
Dimensions	2.2m by 2.2 by 0.82 depth
Top of slab	11.95m OD
Base of modern slab fill/slab	11.65m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	0.45m deep
Level of base of trench	11.25 m OD
Natural observed	Banded sand and gravels 11.45m OD

- 3.2.9 Two inter-connected 17th century brick lined drains [4] and [7] dated 1660-1666 from the brick type (pers comm, Ian Betts MoLA Building Material Specialist). Pottery found within the drain has been dated 1630-80 and 1600-1700, (pers comm Jacqui Pearce MoLA post-Medieval pottery Specialist). The drains cut through truncated and fairly ephemeral (up to 100mm depth) undated levelling deposits [10],[11], [12] and [13] that overlay the natural sand and gravel deposits (Figs 3 & 4).

Evaluation Test pit 2

Location	Basement on north side of 154 Strand)
Dimensions	1.74m by 2.00m by 1.13m depth
Top of slab	11.73m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	11.56m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	0.92m deep (not fully exposed)
Level of base of trench	10.60 m OD
Natural observed	Banded sand and gravels 10.83m OD

	(truncated)
--	-------------

- 3.2.10 Grey/brown silty sand deposits banded with gravel and sand deposits formed part of the backfill [32] of a large cut feature [34], possibly a quarry pit (Fig 6). Sectional detail of the pit indicated that it extended in a northerly and easterly direction, beyond the extent of the evaluation test pit. Of the few finds that were retrieved from the backfill, most were animal bone fragments though part of a Roman tile was recognisable. This feature is no later in date than Saxon as it was cut by a smaller pit [25] of Saxon date (Fig 5). The backfill [24] of this pit contained dark brown organic silt with occasional oyster shell, charcoal flecks, animal bone and small fragments of daub. Two fragments of pottery were also retrieved, one of which was dated 900 AD (pers comm Lyn Blackmore, MoLA Post-Roman pottery Specialist).

Evaluation Test pit 3

Location	Vault, north side of 157 Strand
Dimensions	0.84m by 1.10m by 0.32m depth
Top of slab	10.38m OD
Base of modern slab	10.32m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	N/A
Level of base of deposits observed and base of trench	10.06m OD
Natural observed	Sandy gravel 10.30m OD (truncated)

- 3.2.11 The test pit was located against the east wall of the vault (Fig 7). No archaeological deposits were recorded in the test pit, probably subject to wholesale removal when the vault was constructed. The natural deposits are also truncated below the level at which they would normally be expected to survive.

Evaluation Test pit 4

Location	Basement on north side of 158 Strand
Dimensions	2.00m by 1.90m by 0.48 depth
Top of slab	12.09m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	11.97m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	0.30m deep (not fully exposed)
Level of base of deposits observed	11.62m OD
Natural observed	Sandy gravel 11.97m OD

- 3.2.12 The remains of an east-west brick wall foundation [22] was recorded on the north side of the test pit, below the north wall of 156 Strand, surviving to a height of 11.85m OD, cutting through the natural deposits (Fig 8 & 10). Bricks used in its construction are considered to pre-Great Fire of 1666 and have been dated to the late 16th or early 17th century (pers comm Ian Betts MoLA Building Material Specialist). On the west side of the trench, part of a pit [20] was exposed, cutting through the natural deposits and surviving to a height of 11.86m OD. The backfill [19] contained fragments of architectural wrought ironwork, some of which were recognised as parts of a railing, a complete drain cover, a gate latch and coal hole cover, the latter incorporating an intricate ivy pattern around its perimeter (Fig 9). The iron work probably derives from one of the properties that stood on the site in the 18th century (following the 1775 phase of redevelopment on Somerset House), demolished in the 19th century.
- 3.2.13 Neither the brick wall or the pit was fully exposed and their depths are unknown.

Evaluation Test pit 5

Location	Basement on south side of 156 Strand
Dimensions	1.00m by 0.50m by 0.91m depth
Top of slab	12.04m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	11.68m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	c 0.40m (max depth observed)
Level of base of trench	11.13m OD
Natural observed	N/A

- 3.2.14 Test pit 5 was located in the corner of the boiler room at the south end of the property. The foundations of the west and south walls of the current building were exposed along with modern backfill (Fig 11). At a depth of c 0.60m below slab level, chalk blocks were visible on the south facing section, at a height of c 11.44m OD. The full extent and depth of the chalk blocks was difficult to ascertain, due to the narrowness of the pit, compounded further by limited light. It was not possible to determine whether the blocks formed a coherent wall foundation or were rubble backfill. Presence of the chalk does indicate that it may be material derived from the medieval properties that occupied the site until their demolition in either the 17th or 18th centuries.

Evaluation Test pit 6

Location	Basement of 152/3 Strand
Dimensions	2.00m by 2.00m by 1.20 depth
Top of slab	12.05m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	11.95m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	1.20m OD deep
Level of base of deposits observed and base of trench	10.75m OD
Natural observed	N/A

- 3.2.15 Test pit 6 was located on the southwest corner of the site. Below the slab two backfilled coal holes [28] and [33] were revealed at a height of 11.95m OD, of which one [28] was excavated (Fig 12). The coal hole measured 1.50m (N-S) by 1.22m (E-W) by 1.19m deep and was tiled on the side and its base. These features are likely to be of 19th century date.

Evaluation Test pit 7

Location	Vault, north side of 152/3 Strand
Dimensions	1.07m by 0.80m by 0.60m depth
Top of slab	11.86m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	11.76m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	N/A
Level of base of base of trench	11.26m OD
Natural observed	Gravel 11.34m OD

- 3.2.16 Test pit 7 was located against the west wall of the vault and revealed the brick foundations below modern rubble and gravel (Fig 13). No archaeological remains were recorded.

Vaults 2, 4 and 5

- 3.2.17 The original bricks used in the assessable vaults (nos 2, 4, 5) are all very similar. The vaults are all are made of fairly sharp edged, dark red London-made brick

(fabric 3032) which can be given a general 1750-1900 date. Unfortunately, there are no features such as frogs or lettering/numbering in the frog base which could provide a tighter date. Only the bricks in Vault 4 could be measured with accuracy. Many of the bricks in Vault 2 were covered in concreterious deposits – the result of water running down the vault walls. Vault 5 was rendered, although in one half a small patch of render had been removed. Unfortunately, these bricks were too poorly preserved to measure, although their fabric could be identified. In the other half of Vault 5 the bricks used in construction of the coal shoot into the cellar could be measured, although with some difficulty.

3.2.18 A selection of bricks were measured and presented in tabular form below:

Location	Length (mm)	Breadth (mm)	Thickness (mm)
Vault 2	215 to 226	103 to 108	60 to 64
Vault 4	221 to 227	102 to 206	62 to 65
Vault 5 (coal shoot)	226	99 to 101	59 to 65

3.2.19 It may or may not be relevant, but there is no sign of yellow London stock bricks in any of the cellar walls. Yellow stocks became increasingly common in London building from the mid-19th century onwards, although they were occasionally used earlier.

3.2.20 A fragment of pale green Reigate stone was incorporated into the brick wall of Vault 4. This is probably a block of medieval or early post-medieval ashlar which was reused in the vault wall.

Vault 2

3.2.21 The walls of the 'wine rack' appear to be contemporary, but have clearly been repaired/modified by later bricks.

3.2.22 Chamfered bricks are not common in the 19th-20th century, though chamfered bricks were not used. Normal bricks were used in the 'wine racks' which were then cut to shape when *in situ*.

3.2.23 This vault could be older than the Vault 4 but there is no evidence of an earlier date from the exposed brickwork.

Vault 4

3.2.24 The vault is unlikely to be of solid construction to pavement level. The vault roof would appear to be one brick skin deep as there is a void above the coal shoot.

Vault 5

3.2.25 A small strip of wall in the eastern vault indicated that they are fabric 3032 but are too damaged to analyse further.

3.2.26 As almost all of the vault is rendered, it is impossible to say whether the two parts of the vault are of the same date, although the small patches of brick which are visible do appear to be similar.

3.3 Significance of the results

3.3.27 The evaluation recorded heavily truncated Saxon and post-medieval activity of low to medium significance on the site with possibly medieval activity of low significance. The construction of the 19th century basements have resulted in truncation of horizontally stratified deposits. Natural gravel was exposed in all but one (TP6) of the test pits, immediately beneath the basement slab.

3.3.28 The earliest surviving archaeological remains consist of deep cut features such as

the quarry and rubbish pits in test pit 2, and of early medieval/Saxon date. The quarry pit lies some few metres to the west of a generically similar feature found during the earlier evaluation in 1990-91 (MoLAS 1991).

- 3.3.29 Medieval activity on the site was evidenced in test pit 5, where a possible medieval chalk wall foundation may survive.
- 3.3.30 Post medieval structural remains were found in three of the test pits within the basement area. Wall foundations and a drain appear to date to the 17th century with some evidence of re-use of building materials from the late medieval period. The latest evidence represented by the coal hole was of late 19th or early 20th century date.

3.4 Assessment of the evaluation

- 3.4.31 GLAAS guidelines (English Heritage, 1998) require an assessment of the success of the evaluation 'in order to illustrate what level of confidence can be placed on the information which will provide the basis of the mitigation strategy'.
In the case of the site the location and spread of the test pits indicates a high level of confidence in the information obtained during the evaluation.

4 Proposed development impact and recommendations

- 4.1.1 The details of the proposed development are currently unknown however it is likely to include deepening of the existing basement.
- 4.1.2 The results of the evaluation along with a full impact assessment from the development and recommendations for further work will be included within the final Historic Environment Assessment (MOLA 2014).

5 Finds summary

Context	Material	Sherds/ Fragments	Period	Date	Brief Comments	Retain Y/N If Yes, Why?
2	CLAY PIPE	6	Post-medieval	1680-1710	3 bowls (types 20 and 21); 3 stems	N
2	POST MEDIEVAL POTTERY	2	Post-medieval	1580-1700	Essex redwares	N
3	CLAY PIPE	3	Post-medieval	Late 16th/e.17thc	3 stems	N
3	POST MEDIEVAL POTTERY	2	Post-medieval	1630-1680	Tin glazed ware C; Martincamp 2 stoneware	N
4	POST MEDIEVAL CBM	2	Post-medieval	1500-1600	2 bricks (mortar indicate re-use in later post-med context)	N
6	CLAY PIPE	3	Post-medieval	Late 16th/e.17thc	3 stems	N
6	POST MEDIEVAL POTTERY	2	Post-medieval	1630-1680	Tin glazed wares C and D	N
7	CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL	1	Post-medieval	1550- 1666/1700	1 bricks (mortar indicates re-use in later post-med context)	N
7	POST MEDIEVAL CBM	1	Post-medieval	1550- 1666/1700	1 bricks (mortar indicates re-use in later post-med context)	N
10	POST MEDIEVAL POTTERY	3	Post-medieval	1630-1680	Tin glazed ware (burnt); Surrey-Hampshire border ware; Martincamp 2 stoneware	Y
13	CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL	1	Post-medieval	1480-1800	1 small fragment of cbm	N
22	POST MEDIEVAL CBM	3	Post-medieval	1550- 1666/1700	3 half bat bricks (mortar indicates re-use in a later post-medieval context)	N
24	ANIMAL AND NON-HUMAN BONE	8	Post-medieval	Saxon	1 Cattle mandible (right side, young-3yrs); 1 lamb mandible (rights side, juvenile-2yrs); 1 fragment os sheep rib; 1 fragment of pig femur; 1 adult cattle 3rd phalange; 1 calf scapula (right side-6 months); 1 goose femur (left side adult)	
24	CERAMIC BUILDING MATERIAL	4	Unknown	Unknown Unknown	3 small fragments of abraided brick 1 fragment of ceramic fired clay	Y N
24	POTTERY	1	Saxon	730-850 AD	Ipswich coarse ware	Y

6 Planning framework

- 6.1.1 Current planning legislation and policies are detailed in the Historic Environment Assessment/Written Scheme of Investigation (MOLA 2014)

6.2 Statutory protection

Scheduled Monuments

- 6.2.2 Nationally important archaeological sites (both above and below-ground remains) may be identified and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. An application to the Secretary of State is required for any works affecting a Scheduled Monument or its setting.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 6.2.3 The Act sets out the legal requirements for the control of development and alterations which affect buildings, including those which are listed or in conservation areas. Buildings which are listed or which lie within a conservation area are protected by law. Grade I are buildings of exceptional interest. Grade II* are particularly significant buildings of more than special interest. Grade II are buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them.

Human remains

- 6.2.4 Development affecting any former burial ground is regulated by statute, principally the Burial Act 1857, the Disused Burial Grounds Act 1884 and 1981, and the Pastoral Measure 1983. The prior exhumation and re-interment of human remains is required and must be carried out under the terms of a Burial Licence, to be obtained from the Ministry of Justice.
- 6.2.5 Where likely survival of human burials in ground consecrated under the rites of the Church of England has been identified in a Historic Environment Assessment it is possible that a 'Faculty' may need to be sought by the developer in addition to Planning Consent. Faculty is issued by the office of the Chancellor of the Diocesan authorities in accordance with the provision of the Faculty Jurisdiction Measure 1964 (as amended by the Care of Churches and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Measure 1991). Separately, exhumation of any human remains should be notified to the Ministry of Justice who may also need to issue a Burial Licence. A Burial Licence is required from the Ministry of Justice if the remains are not intended for reburial in consecrated ground (or if this is to be delayed - for example where archaeological or scientific analysis takes place first).
- 6.2.6 Under the Town and Country Planning (Churches, Places of Religious Worship and Burial Grounds) Regulations 1930, the removal and re-interment of human remains should be in accordance with the direction of the local Environmental Health Officer.

6.3 National Planning Policy Framework

- 6.3.7 The Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 (DCLG 2012). One of the 12 core principles that underpin both plan-making and decision-taking within the framework is to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations' (DCLG 2012 para 17). It recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource (para 126), and requires the significance of heritage assets to be considered in the planning process, whether designated or not. The contribution of setting to asset significance needs to be taken into account (para 128). The NPPF encourages early

engagement (i.e. pre-application) as this has significant potential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of a planning application and can lead to better outcomes for the local community (para 188).

6.3.8 NPPF Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, is produced in full below:

Para 126. Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

Para 127. When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.

Para 128. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Para 129. 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. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

Para 130. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

Para 131. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para 132: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are

irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Para 133. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Para 134. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Para 135. 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.

Para 136. Local planning authorities should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

Para 137. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

Para 138. Not all elements of a World Heritage Site or Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 133 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 134, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

Para 139. 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.

Para 140. Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Para 141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also 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.

6.4 Greater London regional policy

The London Plan

- 6.4.1 The overarching strategies and policies for the whole of the Greater London area are contained within the London Plan of the Greater London Authority (GLA July 2011). Policy 7.8 relates to Heritage Assets and Archaeology:
- A. London's heritage assets and historic environment, including listed buildings, registered historic parks and gardens and other natural and historic landscapes, conservation areas, World Heritage Sites, registered battlefields, scheduled monuments, archaeological remains and memorials should be identified, so that the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and of utilising their positive role in place shaping can be taken into account.
 - B. Development should incorporate measures that identify, record, interpret, protect and, where appropriate, present the site's archaeology.
 - C. Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate.
 - D. Development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
 - E. New development should make provision for the protection of archaeological resources, landscapes and significant memorials. The physical assets should, where possible, be made available to the public on-site. Where the archaeological asset or memorial cannot be preserved or managed on-site, provision must be made for the investigation, understanding, recording, dissemination and archiving of that asset.
 - F. Boroughs should, in LDF policies, seek to maintain and enhance the contribution of built, landscaped and buried heritage to London's environmental quality, cultural identity and economy as part of managing London's ability to accommodate change and regeneration.
 - G. Boroughs, in consultation with English Heritage, Natural England and other relevant statutory organisations, should include appropriate policies in their LDFs for identifying, protecting, enhancing and improving access to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings where appropriate, and to archaeological assets, memorials and historic and natural landscape character within their area.

6.5 Local planning policy

- 6.5.2 Following the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Planning Authorities have replaced their Unitary Development Plans, Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance with a new system of Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). UDP policies are either 'saved' or 'deleted'. In most cases archaeology policies are likely to be 'saved' because there have been no significant changes in legislation or advice at a national level.
- 6.5.3 Planning applications in Westminster must be determined in accordance with Westminster's City Plan: Strategic Policies, those policies in the Unitary Development Plan which have been 'saved' and not been replaced by the Strategic Policies, and the London Plan – unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.5.4 Westminster's City Plan: Strategic Policies was formally adopted by Full Council on 13 November 2013, and has full weight as part of the development plan in taking planning decisions from that date. This document was the result of a review of the City Council's Core Strategy adopted in January 2011 to ensure consistency with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the new London Plan published by the Mayor of London in July 2011, changes to legislation and other updates. This document includes:

POLICY S25 HERITAGE

Recognising Westminster's wider historic environment, its extensive heritage assets will be conserved, including its listed buildings, conservation areas, Westminster's World Heritage Site, its historic parks including five Royal Parks, squares, gardens and other open spaces, their settings, and its archaeological heritage. Historic and other important buildings should be upgraded sensitively, to improve their environmental performance and make them easily accessible.

Reasoned Justification

The intrinsic value of Westminster's high quality and significant historic environment is one of its greatest assets. To compete effectively with other major, world-class cities the built environment must be respected and refurbished sensitively in a manner appropriate to its significance. Any change should not detract from the existing qualities of the environment, which makes the city such an attractive and valued location for residents, businesses and visitors.

Detailed policies for each type of heritage asset will be set out in City Management policy. Area-based characteristics and detailed measures required to protect and enhance heritage assets have been set out in Conservation Area Audit Supplementary Planning Documents and the Westminster World Heritage Site Management Plan.

6.5.5 Remaining policies in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were published before adoption of the NPPF. Due weight should continue to be given to relevant policies, according in particular to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the UDP to those in the NPPF, the greater the weight that should be given). At this stage, only limited weight should be given to the emerging "City Management Policies (or "CMP") Revision", as they are still at a very early stage of the plan-making process (<http://www.westminster.gov.uk/services/environment/planning/planning-policy>, accessed 20.11.2013).

6.5.6 Westminster's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was approved in January 2007 (City of Westminster, 2007). It sets out the local policies for developing land, improving transport and protecting the environment in Westminster. Following the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the UDP will eventually be replaced by a LDF. The UDP document sets out the local authority's policies in relation to archaeology and heritage:

Policy DES 9: Conservation Areas

Aim: To preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas and their settings.

(A) Applications for outline planning permission in conservation areas. In the case of outline planning applications within designated conservation areas it may be necessary to require additional details to be produced in order that the physical impact of the proposed development may be fully assessed.

(B) Planning applications involving demolition in conservation areas

1) Buildings identified as of local architectural, historical or topographical interest in adopted conservation area audits will enjoy a general presumption against demolition

2) Development proposals within conservation areas, involving the demolition of unlisted buildings, may be permitted

a) If the building makes either a negative or insignificant contribution to the character or appearance of the area, and/or

b) If the design quality of the proposed development is considered to result in an enhancement of the conservation area's overall character or appearance, having regard to issues of economic viability, including the viability of retaining and repairing the existing building

3) In any such case, there should also be firm and appropriately detailed proposals for the future viable redevelopment of the application site that have been approved and their implementation assured by planning condition or agreement.

(C) Planning application for alteration or extension of unlisted buildings. Planning permission will be granted for proposals which

- 1) Serve to reinstate missing traditional features, such as doors, windows, shopfronts, front porches and other decorative features
- 2) Use traditional and, where appropriate, reclaimed or recycled building materials
- 3) Use prevalent facing, roofing and paving materials, having regard to the content of relevant conservation area audits or other adopted supplementary guidance
- 4) In locally appropriate situations, use modern or other atypical facing materials or detailing or innovative forms of building design and construction

(D) Conservation area audits. The existence, character and contribution to the local scene of buildings or features of architectural, historical or topographical interest, recognised as such in supplementary planning guidance, such as conservation area audits, will be of relevance to the application of policies DES 4 to DES 7, and DES 10.

(E) Changes of use within conservation areas. Permission will only be granted for development, involving a material change of use, which would serve either to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, bearing in mind the detailed viability of the development.

(F) Setting of conservation areas. Development will not be permitted which, although not wholly or partly located within a designated conservation area, might nevertheless have a visibly adverse effect upon the area's recognised special character or appearance, including intrusiveness with respect to any recognised and recorded familiar local views into, out of, within or across the area.

(G) Restrictions on permitted development in conservation Areas

1) In order to give additional protection to the character and appearance of conservation areas, directions may be made under article 4 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. Types of generally permitted development to which such directions may apply will include:

- a) painting, cladding or rendering of building facades
- b) insertion or replacement of doors and windows
- c) removal or replacement of boundary walls and fences
- d) alteration of roof profiles and replacement of roofing materials.

2) Such added powers of planning control may be applied to designated conservation areas the subject of adopted conservation area audits or to buildings or groups of buildings therein identified as being of architectural, historical or topographical interest.

3) The existence of such directions will be taken into account in the authorisation of development that may itself be made subject to the removal of permitted development rights, in appropriate individual cases.

DES 10: Listed Buildings

Aim: To protect and enhance listed buildings, their settings and those features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess.

(A) Applications for planning permission. Applications for development involving the extension or alteration of listed buildings will where relevant need to include full details of means of access, siting, design and external appearance of the proposed development in order to demonstrate that it would respect the listed building's character and appearance and serve to preserve, restore or complement its features of special architectural or historic interest.

(B) Demolition of listed buildings.

1) Development involving the total demolition of a listed building (or any building listed by virtue of being within its curtilage) will only be permitted if, where relevant, the following criteria are met:

a) it is not possible to continue to use the listed building for its existing, previous or original purpose or function, and

b) every effort has been made to continue the present use or to find another economically viable use and obtain planning permission, with or without physical alteration, and

c) the historic character or appearance of the main building would be restored or improved by the demolition of curtilage building(s), or

d) substantial benefits to the community would derive from the nature, form and function of the proposed development, and (in all cases)

e) demolition would not result in the creation of a long-term cleared site to the detriment of adjacent listed buildings

2) If development is authorised in conformity with any of the above criteria, it may be made subject to a condition, agreement or undertaking that any consequential demolition shall not be carried out until all the relevant details of the proposed development have been approved and a contract has been entered into for its subsequent execution.

(C) Changes of use of listed buildings. Development involving the change of use of a listed building (and any works of alteration associated with it, including external illumination) may be permitted where it would contribute economically towards the restoration, retention or maintenance of the listed building (or group of buildings) without such development adversely affecting the special architectural or historic interest of the building (or its setting) or its spatial or structural integrity.

(D) Setting of listed buildings. Planning permission will not be granted where it would adversely affect:

a) the immediate or wider setting of a listed building, or

b) recognised and recorded views of a listed building or a group of listed buildings, or

c) the spatial integrity or historic unity of the curtilage of a listed building.

(E) Theft or removal of architectural items of interest. In order to reduce the risk of theft or removal of architectural items of interest or value from historic buildings during the course of development, the City Council may require additional security arrangements to be made while buildings are empty or during the course of building works.

Policy DES 11: Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Areas and Sites of Archaeological Priority and Potential

Aim: To identify archaeological remains of national and local importance, conserve them in their settings, and provide public access to them. Where new development is proposed on sites of archaeological potential, to ensure adequate archaeological impact assessment, followed by appropriate provision for preservation or investigation, recording, and publication.

(A) Scheduled Ancient Monuments

Permission for proposals affecting the following Scheduled Ancient Monuments, or their settings, will be granted providing that their archaeological value and interest is preserved:

1. The Chapter House and Pyx Chamber in the Cloisters, Westminster Abbey;
2. The Jewel Tower.

(B) Areas of Special Archaeological Priority and Potential

Permission will be granted for developments where, in order of priority:

1. all archaeological remains of national importance are preserved in situ;
2. remains of local archaeological value are properly recorded, evaluated and, where practicable, preserved in situ;

3. if the preservation of archaeological remains in situ is inappropriate, provision is made for full investigation, recording and an appropriate level of publication by a reputable investigating body.

7 Bibliography

- ACAO, 1993 *Model briefs and specifications for archaeological assessments and field evaluations*, Association of County Archaeological Officers
- Archaeological Archive Forum, 2011 *Archaeological Archives: a guide to best practice in creation, compilation transfer and curation*
- BADLG, 1991 *Code of Practice*, British Archaeologists and Developers Liaison Group
- Cowie, R, and Blackmore, L, 2012 *Lundenwic: Excavations in Middle Saxon London 1987–2000*, MoLAS Monograph
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], March 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework*.
- DCLG [Department of Communities and Local Government], EH [English Heritage] & DCMS [Department for Culture, Media and Sport], March 2010 *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide*.
- Disused Burial Grounds (Amendment) Act 1981
- English Heritage 2008 *SHAPE 2008: A Strategic framework for Historic environment Activities and Programmes in English Heritage. Guidance for external grant applicants*. Swindon English Heritage.
- GLA [Greater London Authority], July 2011 *The London Plan. Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London*.
- Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service, 2009: *Standards for Archaeological Work London Region, External Consultation*.
- Hammerson, M J, 1975 Excavations on the site of Arundel House in the Strand, WC2, in 1972, *Trans London Middlesex Archaeol Soc* 26, 209–51
- Institute for Archaeologists (IFA), rev. 2008 *By-Laws, Standards and Policy Statements of the Institute for Archaeologists: Standards and guidance*
- Museum of London Archaeology Service, 1991 *Watching Brief at King's College WC2, December 1990–January 1991*, (KIL90) MoLAS unpublished report
- MOLA 2014
- Museum of London, 1994 *Archaeological Site Manual 3rd edition*
- Museum of London Archaeology Service, 2001 *King's College, Strand Lane London WC2, A report on the evaluation*, unpublished report
- Museum of London, 2002 *A research framework for London archaeology 2002*
- Museum of London Archaeology Service, December 2003 *Basement of King's College, Strand London WC2, City of Westminster: An archaeological building assessment*, unpublished report
- Museum of London, 2009 *General Standards for the preparation of archaeological archives deposited with the Museum of London*
- Museums and Galleries Commission (1992) *Standards in the Museum Care of Archaeological Collections*.
- Society of Museum Archaeologists (1993) *Selection, Retention and Dispersal of Archaeological Collections. Guidelines for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*.
- Society of Museum Archaeologists (1995) *Towards an Accessible Archive. The Transfer of Archaeological Archives to Museums: Guidelines for Use in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales*.
- Standing Conference of Archaeological Unit Managers, 1991 revised 1997 *Health and Safety in Field Archaeology, Manual*
- Treasure Act 1996 *Code of Practice (2nd Revision)* 1996, DCMS
- Treasure (Designation) Order 2002, TSO
- Thompson, A, Westman A, and Dyson, T (eds), 1998 *Archaeology in Greater London 1965–90: a guide to records of excavations by the Museum of London*, Archaeol Gazetteer Ser Vol 2, London

8 NMR OASIS archaeological report form

OASIS ID: molas1-171215

Project details

Project name	Laws Building
Short description of the project	The evaluation comprised the evaluation of seven test pits located within the basement of the building. Four of the test pits were specifically designated for archaeological investigation and three for geotechnical purposes to assess the nature and depth of the building foundations. The results of the field evaluation have helped to refine the initial assessment of the archaeological potential of the site. Natural gravel and sand was found in all but one of the test pits and found immediately below the basement slab. The earliest archaeological survival was evidenced by a Saxon pit cutting the natural deposits. A possible late medieval chalk wall was recorded on the south side of the site in 156 Strand. Within the same property, below the north wall an east-west 17th century brick foundation wall, constructed out of reused medieval bricks was recorded. The latest evidence represented was coal hole of late 19th or early 20th century.
Project dates	Start: 02-01-2014 End: 17-01-2014
Previous/future work	Yes / Yes
Any associated project reference codes	KIL90 - Site code
Any associated project reference codes	KNC13 - Site code
Type of project	Field evaluation
Site status	Local Authority Designated Archaeological Area
Site status	Listed Building
Current Land use	Other 2 - In use as a building
Monument type	WALL Post Medieval
Monument type	DRAIN Post Medieval
Monument type	COAL HOLE Post Medieval
Significant Finds	POT Post Medieval
Significant Finds	POT Early Medieval
Significant Finds	BONE Early Medieval
Significant Finds	IRON Post Medieval
Methods & techniques	"Test Pits"

Development type	Building refurbishment/repairs/restoration
Prompt	Planning condition
Position in the planning process	Between deposition of an application and determination

Project location

Country	England
Site location	GREATER LONDON CITY OF WESTMINSTER CITY OF WESTMINSTER Laws Building Kings College, 152-158 Strand, London
Postcode	WC2R
Study area	800.00 Square metres
Site coordinates	TQ 30 80 51.5034653531 -0.126747150184 51 30 12 N 000 07 36 W Point
Height OD / Depth	Min: 10.30m Max: 11.45m

Project creators

Name of Organisation	MOLA
Project brief originator	MOLA
Project design originator	MOLA
Project director/manager	Laura O'Gorman
Project supervisor	Portia Askew
Type of sponsor/funding body	Kings College London
Name of sponsor/funding body	Kings College London

Project archives

Physical Archive recipient	LAARC
Physical Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics"
Digital Archive recipient	LAARC
Digital Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics"
Digital Media available	"Database","Text"
Paper Archive recipient	LAARC

Paper Contents	"Animal Bones","Ceramics"
Paper Media available	"Context sheet","Diary","Matrices","Notebook - Excavation',' Research',' General Notes","Photograph","Plan","Report","Section","Survey","Unpublished Text"

Project bibliography 1

Publication type	Grey literature (unpublished document/manuscript)
Title	Laws Building Kings College, A predetermination archaeological evaluation report
Author(s)/Editor(s)	Askew, P
Date	2014
Issuer or publisher	MOLA
Place of issue or publication	MOLA
Description	A4 client report

Entered by	Portia Askew (paskew@mola.org.uk)
Entered on	11 February 2014

OASIS:

Please e-mail [English Heritage](#) for OASIS help and advice

© ADS 1996-2012 Created by [Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham](#), email Last modified Wednesday 9 May 2012

Cite only: <http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/print.cfm> for this page



Fig 1 Site location



Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. City of London 100023243 2014.

WESTT616EVR14#02

[KNC13] Pre-determination evaluation © MOLA 2014

Fig 2 Trench location plan



Fig 3 Photo of test pit 1 (looking north) showing 17th century drain cuts [8], (centre), and [5] (top right by scale)



Fig 4 Photograph of test pit 1 (looking south) showing the north facing section through the natural banded sands and gravels, contexts [14-18], (by scale) cut through by drain cut [8] (on right of picture)



Fig 5 Photograph of test pit 2 (looking south) showing Saxon pit [25] (bottom left of test pit)



Fig 6 Photograph of test pit 2 (looking south-west) showing quarry pit [34] with its backfill [32] seen in section and Saxon pit [25] (left of picture)



Fig 7 Photograph of test pit 3 in vault of 157 Strand (looking north east)



Fig 8 Photograph of test pit 4 (looking east) showing 17th-century foundation wall [22] (left of picture) and pit 19th-century pit [20] with architectural iron waste railings, door latch and drain cover within the backfill (bottom of picture)



Fig 9 Close-up of 19th-century pit [20] (looking west) after further excavation to expose more architectural iron waste, including a coal hole lid with intricate ivy design



Fig 10 Photograph of test pit 4 (looking west) showing sondage through the natural sandy gravel deposits bottom of picture to the left of 17th-century wall [22]



Fig 11 Photograph of test pit 5 (looking west) showing possible remains of chalk wall showing under the foundations of the current building



Fig 12 Photograph of test pit 6 (looking south) showing late 19th/early 20th-century excavated coal cellar [28] (right) adjoining to another [33] (left, unexcavated)



Fig 13 Photograph of test pit 7 (looking south east)