

Top of slab	28.40-28.26m OD
Base of modern slab	27.90-27.76m OD (0.5m thick kerb blocks and concrete bed)
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	N/A
Base of trench	26.16m OD
Natural observed	N/A

Trench 7 (Fig 6) was located in a sloping driveway to the underground car park of the Follett House, in an open yard. The top of slab in western side of trench was at 28.40m OD, eastern at 28.26m OD.

The trench was excavated to a depth of 2.10m and revealed a loose brick rubble deposit. In the northern section an arched window and door were built into the brickwork of the party wall c.1.15m below ground level. This was similar to that observed in Trench 2.

The brick rubble deposit is probably the in-fill of a backfilled basement.

Because of health and safety constraints (the loose character of the backfill and the location of the trench itself -against a high supporting wall) the trench could not be excavated further.

Sealing the brickwork backfill was concrete slab 0.25m thick, covered by kerb blocks, at 28.40-28.26m OD.

One large piece of worked stone was retrieved from within the basement backfill (see building material report).

<i>Evaluation Trench 8</i>	
Location	Passage way leading to workshop, between 34 Osnaburgh Street and Regency House
Dimensions	2.60m by 1.60m ; depth 1.80m
Top of slab	28.55m OD
Base of modern slab	28.25m OD
Depth of archaeological deposits seen	28.25m OD (?)
Base of trench	26.75m OD
Natural observed	27.43m OD

Trench 8 was located in a passageway between No. 34 Osnaburgh Street and Regency House, leading to a workshop area.

The earliest deposit was natural brickearth at 27.43m OD, observed in the Northern part of trench.

This was overlain by a 0.70m thick layer of worked/redeposited dark orange-grey brickearth, containing small amount of brick fragments and streaks of charcoal. This deposit was observed at c. 28.13m OD. This is thought to be a post- medieval in date.

Truncating this was a brick wall, running diagonally across the trench roughly from SW to NE. Its top surface was recorded at 28.25m OD. The wall itself was c.0.70m wide and 2.50m long, and c.0.80m high. This seemed to be the foundation for a former wall that had been knocked down, as it runs along the same alignment as the existing partition walls in the area.

<i>Borehole 2</i>	
Dimensions	300mm in diameter
Depth	50m
Top of slab	c. 28.51m OD
Thickness of made ground	0.40m
Top of brickearth	28.11m OD
Top of river terrace deposits	26.311m OD
Top of London Clay	22.21m OD

<i>Borehole 3</i>	
Dimensions	250mm in diameter
Depth	25m
Top of slab	c. 28m OD
Thickness of made ground	0.75m
Top of brickearth	27.25m OD
Top of river terrace deposits	26.50m OD
Top of London Clay	21.45m OD

<i>Borehole 4</i>	
Dimensions	250mm in diameter
Depth	25m
Top of slab	c. 28m OD
Thickness of made ground	0.95m
Top of brickearth	27.05m OD
Top of river terrace deposits	26.40m OD
Top of London Clay	21.75m OD

<i>Borehole 5</i>	
Dimensions	250mm in diameter
Depth	25m
Top of slab (basement)	c. 24.92m OD
Thickness of made ground	0.50m
Top of river terrace deposits	24.42m OD
Top of London Clay	21.32m OD

### 3.3 Assessment of the evaluation

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 this site the trenches provided a broad, representative, well-balanced view across the area due to be affected by the development.

South of the wall foundation the redeposited brick earth was capped by a thick layer of creamy white mortar (c.0.08m thick), which was overlain by a surface made of worked tiles of sandstone (?), c.0.25x0.20x0.10m. On top of this there were broken marble slates, c.0.26x0.26x0.06m, sealed by worked, square-ish cobble stones, c.0.06-0.10x0.15x0.12m.

The top of this pavement-like surface was observed at 28.20m OD.

These deposits were overlain by a thin layer of hard yellowish-grey clay, c.0.02 thick.

North of the wall, the redeposited brick earth was covered by a layer of coarse yellow sand mixed with gravel, 0.10-0.15m thick, at 28.28m OD. This in turn was sealed by the clay layer as well.

The 0.25m thick concrete slab was recorded above these deposits at 28.55m OD. (Fig 4).

For boreholes and window samples locations see Fig.2.

There were 11 window sampling holes drilled, all 80mm in diameter to a maximum depth of 3.1m.

Window Sample (WS) 1 revealed natural (Thames) river terrace deposits consisting of sandy gravel at the depth of c. 24.38m OD.

WS2 revealed natural (Thames) river terrace deposits consisting of sandy gravel at c. 24.62m OD.

WS3 did not reach natural levels.

WS4 registered brickearth at 27.21m OD.

WS5 showed natural river terrace deposit (gravel) c. 0.36m below the slab.

WS6 and 7 registered brickearth at 26.30m OD

WS7 registered river terrace deposits at 26.70m OD

WS8 showed river terrace deposits (gravels) c. 1.40m below the slab level.

WS9 indicated river terrace deposits (gravels) are present c. 0.60m below the slab.

WS10 registered natural brickearth at c. 27.48m OD.

WS11 did not reach natural levels.

There were 5 cable percussion boreholes drilled.

These were recorded as follows:

<i>Borehole 1</i>	
Dimensions	300mm in diameter
Depth	50m
Top of slab	c. 28.51m OD
Thickness of made ground	0.95m
Top of brickearth	27.56m OD
Top of river terrace deposits	26.51m OD
Top of London Clay	22.51m OD

layers were identified in Trenches 2, 4 and 8, excavated in elevated areas of the site at 27.20m, 27.67m and 28.13m respectively.

Building remains from previous buildings was also found on the site as was the remains of paving found under the slab in trench 8 (Fig 4).

Nevertheless, these deposits are of relatively modern date, not older than 19th century, and their significance is low.

*5. What is the level of truncation caused by earlier basements in this area?*

The truncation caused by earlier basements on the site has had a deep impact on the survival of any archaeological remains.

In the basement trenches (T 1, 3, 4, 6) natural deposits (clean brickearth and gravel) were directly under the basement slab (at 24.217m, 25.53m and 25.27m OD-Fig 3), which leads to the conclusion that the construction of the basements has removed all possible archaeological remains.

*4. What are the latest deposits identified?*

The latest identified deposits consist of modern concrete and brick rubble used to level the ground; these are found directly under the top slab.

From the inspection of the trenches located in the open yard/passage areas, the previous 19th century buildings appear to have horizontally and vertically truncated the natural brickearth in the area.

## **4.2 General discussion of potential**

The evaluation has shown that the potential for survival of ancient ground surfaces (horizontal archaeological stratification) on the site is very low. There is also little potential for the survival of cut features. Such survival is likely to be extremely limited in certain areas because of truncation caused by extensive late post-medieval/modern construction activity.

On the site of Regent's Place construction of the basements and underground structures has practically removed any deposits of archaeological potential, as was observed in case of Trenches 1, 3, 4, and 6. It was expected to observe some archaeological survival in open yard areas, but as it appeared in Trenches 2, 5, 7 and 8 no such deposits survived mostly due to the existing buildings construction and ground levelling.

In the case of the trenches located within the basement areas (T 1, 3, 4, 6) natural deposits (clean brickearth and gravel) were found immediately under the basement slab.

Trenches situated in the yards and workshop areas contained some remains of brickwork likely to be no earlier than 19th /20th century, and thick deposits of modern backfill material, mostly brick and concrete rubble, Trench 8, located in a passage way revealed a cobble and marble pavement/yard) directly below the current ground surface/floor slab. Layers of re-worked/redeposited brickearth overlay the 'clean' natural brickearth in these trenches.

A high degree of confidence can be placed on the evaluation results.

## 4 Archaeological potential

### 4.1 Realisation of original research aims

The limited nature of the proposed works and the archaeological evaluation made it unreasonable to establish many specific archaeological research objectives. The archaeological brief is essentially limited to establishing the levels and nature of surviving archaeological deposits, and to ensure that the digging of geotechnical pits does not involve unnecessary destruction of such deposits. Nevertheless, in addition, a few broad research questions were outlined:

*1. What is the nature and level of natural topography?*

The natural geology consists of Thames gravel and clean undisturbed brickearth. The highest level of the gravel observed was at 25.53m OD (Trench 3, basement); the highest natural brickearth was identified at 27.46m OD in Trench 5. This height is characteristic of the brickearth across the site, in less disturbed areas.

*2. What are the earliest deposits identified?*

The earliest deposits identified are the natural Thames gravels and overlying sandy clays (brickearth), originating from the last glaciation period. The earliest human made deposit is dirty redeposited brickearth, however no secure dating evidence was retrieved. It is unlikely that these deposits were earlier than 19th century though, due to the presence and nature of brick fragments throughout.

*3. John Rocque's map of 1746 shows Bilson's farm on the southern part of the site, in the area now occupied by Jellicoe House. Are there any remains of the farmhouse in this area?*

No evidence of the old farmhouse was observed in the Jellicoe House site area. This is most probably due to the modern construction activity in the area which resulted in removal of any any building remains from this date.

*6. What is the nature and significance of the surviving archaeological remains?*

The only surviving archaeological remains are redeposited brick earth layers, containing small amount of late pottery, animal bones and building material. These

## 6 Building Material Assessment

*Terence Paul Smith*

January 2007

### 6.1 Site archive: finds and environmental, quantification and description

*Table 1 Finds and environmental archive general summary*

Building material	6 crates of worked stone and terracotta; not weighed
-------------------	--

#### 6.1.1 The building material

*Table 2 Building material*

Material*	Count	Count as %
Stone	16	94.1
Terracotta	1	5.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Not weighed

##### 6.1.1.1 Introduction/methodology

The building material, all unstratified, has been recorded using standard Museum of London recording forms and fabric codes. Fabric identification has been undertaken using a binocular microscope (x10). Data from the recording forms have been added to the Oracle database. Some material has been retained after recording.

##### 6.1.1.2 Worked stone

Context: [0]

Various stones, none complete, were recovered, all unstratified.

Most impressive is part of a cornice or similar component with a cyma reversa, ovolos, and vertical fascias in magnesian limestone. The mouldings are returned along the one extant end and round a slightly projecting frontal element. The length is not preserved, but the stone has a breadth of 195mm and a height of 85mm. There is mortar adhering to the worked faces, so that the stone has been reused, perhaps as rubble, at some stage. It is of post-medieval date, possibly as late as the 19th century.

A longish piece in oolitic limestone has lost its moulded face. In each of the surviving bedfaces is a series of square sockets, approximately 40mm across, clearly intended to hold metal (perhaps iron or lead) fixing armatures. Part of an L-sectioned iron bar is fixed to one of the bedfaces. The stone is perhaps sawn. Of its dimensions only the thickness/height of 100mm is preserved. It is impossible to be certain of the function of this stone, though it is long and rectilinear and probably formed a string or similar component. It is of post-medieval date, possibly as late as the 19th century.

## **5 Proposed development impact and recommendations**

The proposed redevelopment at Regent's Place, Osnaburgh Street involves demolition of the existing buildings and erection of multi-storey residential buildings, with basements and sub-basement levels.

The impact of this on any surviving archaeological deposits if present will be to remove them entirely. However, this report concludes that the site has little archaeological potential due to the severe modern and late post-medieval truncation that has already occurred on site. On this basis MoLAS recommends that that no further work is necessary.

The decision on the appropriate archaeological response to the deposits revealed within rests with the Local Planning Authority and their designated archaeological advisor.

## **6.2 Analysis of potential**

### **6.2.1 Building material**

The cornice (or similar) stone with Classical mouldings and the terracotta Ionic capital derive from Classical buildings (or a single building), of post-medieval and probably of 19th-century date. Since the material is unstratified, however, its value is seriously vitiated. It may represent dumping, not necessarily very close to the original building site(s). Certainly the mortar on the faces of the moulded stone indicates reuse at some stage. The other stones have little or no potential.

A longish roughly square block in oolitic limestone has a series of square sockets, for fixing, in one (damaged) face and the seating for a metal cramp in the opposite face; there is also a single square socket in the one surviving end. Of its dimensions only the breadth of 168mm is preserved. The stone is perhaps sawn. Again it is of post-medieval date, possibly as late as the 19th century.

Two flat pieces of medium grained laminated sandstone possibly come from steps. One has a slightly curved angle between the edge and one bedface. The pieces are 98mm and 102mm thick; other dimensions are not preserved. It is not possible to assign a date to these characterless pieces.

Ten fragments of imported marble were recovered. Some have slightly curved surfaces, some are slightly angled – that is, their bedfaces are not parallel. Maximum preserved thicknesses range from 46mm to 50mm; other dimensions are not preserved. Their purpose and date are not clear.

Two sub-square blocks of possible Black Carboniferous limestone may possibly be paving setts.

#### *6.1.1.3 Terracotta*

Context: [0]

A terracotta component was recovered, unstratified. It represents about half an Ionic capital. There is an inserted lead bar, presumably for holding the capital securely in place atop a column or pilaster. There is a covering of white and pink paint, not necessarily primary. No dimensions are preserved. This is a post-medieval piece, perhaps of 19th-century date.

#### *6.1.1.4 Assessment work outstanding*

None

## **6.4 Revised research aims**

### **6.4.1 *Building material***

The building material does not suggest any revised research aims.

### **6.3 Significance of the data**

The stones and the terracotta have little significance, even locally. They have no wider significance.