

Oriel

A Written Scheme of Investigation for a Stage 2 Mitigation Watching Brief

Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (MEH)

February 2023

Delivering a better world

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	/	Verified by		Approved by
R	fint		Nut Maan	erby	Annelleka .
Dan Heale Archaeological Consultant	lain Williams Associate D	son irector Heritage	Neil Macnab Technical Directo Heritage	ır	Annette Roe Regional Director Heritage
Revision His	tory				
Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
Distribution L	ist				
# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / C	company Name		

Prepared for:

Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (MEH)

Prepared by:

Dan Heale Archaeological Consultant M: 07553371761 E: dan.heale@aecom.com

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park, Surrey Croydon CRO 2AP United Kingdom

T: +44 20 8639 3500 aecom.com

© 2023 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	6
Site Location and Proposed Development	7
2. Archaeological Background	8
Introduction	
Geology and Topography	
Previous Archaeological Investigations	
Historical and Archaeological Background	9
Palaeolithic and Mesolithic (up to 4000 BC)	9
Neolithic to Iron Age (4000 BC to AD 43)	9
Roman (AD 43 to 410)	
Early Medieval (410-1066)	
Medieval (1066-1640)	
Post-Medieval (1640-1900)	
Modern (1990-Present)	12
3 Project Aims and Objectives	13
Site Specific Aims	
Desearch Frameworks	
A Scope of Archaeological Work	
4. Scope of Archaeological Work	
5. Works Specification	
General Requirements	17
Specific Requirements for the Client	17
Specific Requirements for the Principal Contractor	17
Specific Requirements for the Archaeological Contractor	
General Watching Brief Methodology	
Hand Excavation	
Recording	
Targeted Watching Brief Methodology	21
Hand Excavation	
Recording	
General Requirements for General and Targeted Watching Brief	
Environmental Sampling	
Artefact Recovery	
Finds Processing	24
Human Remains	24
Treasure	24
Use of Drones	24
Completion of Fieldwork	
Fieldwork Reporting	
Archive Preparation and Deposition	
Public Engagement	27
Media and Communications	
Post-Excavation Assessment Report, Updated Project Design and Publication	
Monitoring, Progress Reports and Meetings	
Programme and Resources	
6. General Project Requirements	30
Insurances and Health and Safety	
Confidentiality and Publicity	
Copyright	
General Provisions	

7. References	32
Appendix A - Figures	34
Appendix B – Standards and Guidance	35
Appendix C – Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report	45

Figures

Figure 1: Site Location Figure 2: Areas of General and Targeted Watching Brief Figure 3: Areas of Key Archaeological Interest Figure 4: Known Archaeological Assets Figure 5: Previous Archaeological Events Figure 6: John Rocque Map of London 1746 Figure 7: Greenwood 1827 Map of London Figure 8: Parish Map of 1849 Figure 9: Stanford Map of London 1871 Figure 10: OS Map 1871 Figure 11: 1880 Parish Map Figure 12: 1940 OS Map

Tables

Table 1: Areas of Specific Archaeological Interest	15
Table 2: Sampling Strategy	23

1. Introduction

- 1.1 AECOM (the 'Consultant') has been commissioned by Moorfields Eye Hospital, UCL Institute of Ophthalmology (IoO) and Moorfields Eye Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (MEH; 'the Client') to undertake a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological mitigation at St Pancras Hospital, 4 St Pancras Way, London, NW1 0PE, London Borough of Camden, following the demolition of four existing structures, and prior to the construction of a new facility within the Site grounds by the Client's appointed contractor (the 'Principal Contractor').
- 1.2 A desk-based assessment (DBA) was undertaken by AECOM in 2020 to determine the potential for encountering archaeological remains within the Site. The DBA highlighted a high potential to encounter post-medieval remains and, in particular, the remains of the St Pancras Workhouse that previously occupied the Site. The DBA also highlighted there was a potential to encounter burials associated with the workhouse within the workhouse grounds. Due to the Site's proximity to the early medieval St Pancras Church, there was a moderate potential to encounter remains associated with the nearby Anglo-Saxon settlement located to the south of the church.
- 1.3 Subsequent archaeological trial trench evaluation within the Site confirmed that well preserved structural remains of workhouse buildings survive within the footprint of the Proposed Development.
- 1.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out how the significance of heritage and archaeological assets that may be affected by a development proposal should be assessed. Significance is defined in Annex 2 as: 'the value of an asset based on its heritage interest. This interest may include archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance'.
- 1.5 Based upon this definition the significance of the St Pancras Workhouse is derived from its archaeological, historical interest, being an example of one of the earliest workhouses in London and developing over the 19th century into a large institutional complex, which remained a focal point in the local area, until its closure in the 1930s. The buried remains of the workhouse and any evidence of any earlier settlement within the Site are significant at a local and potentially regional level, contributing, through the Research Framework for London Archaeology (2002), to our understanding of the settlement growth and increasing urbanisation of Camden, the establishment and development of workhouses as institutions, and societies treatment and attitudes to the poor during the late 18th and 19th century.
- 1.6 The Stage 2 archaeological mitigation is required to discharge planning condition 10 (planning ref: **2020/4825/P**), Moorfields Eye Hospital, London Borough of Camden. Planning Condition 10 States:

"If heritage assets of archaeological interest are identified by stage 1 then for those parts of the site which have archaeological interest a stage 2 WSI shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing.

For land that is included within the stage 2 WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed stage 2 WSI which shall include:

A. The statement of significance and research objectives, the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works.

B. Where appropriate, details of a programme for delivering related positive public benefits.

C. The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material."

- 1.7 The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) and accompanying figures set out the methodology for archaeological mitigation to be carried out within the Site. An archaeological contractor (the 'Archaeological Contractor') shall be appointed to undertake the archaeological mitigation works. The Archaeological Contractor will complete and submit a report on any findings and results.
- 1.8 This WSI has been prepared by AECOM on behalf of the Client in accordance with guidance provided by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), including the CIfA Code of Conduct (2022), Standards

and guidance for an archaeological watching brief (2020) and GLAAS Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London (2015). The archaeological works contained within this WSI will contribute to the understanding of the archaeological deposit sequence within the Site, and the nature of the archaeological resource.

- 1.9 The Archaeological Contractor undertaking the archaeological mitigation will be a Registered Archaeological Organisation (RAO) of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.
- 1.10 The WSI will be approved by the GLAAS Advisor for the London Borough of Camden.

Site Location and Proposed Development

- 1.11 The Site is located within the grounds of St Pancras Hospital, London Borough of Camden, at National Grid Reference (NGR) TQ 29649 83650. The Site is bounded by Granary Street to the north and east and St Pancras Way to the west, whilst the maintained and cultivated St Pancras Gardens lie directly to the south (Figure 1). The Site is situated within the northern extent of the gated surroundings of St Pancras Hospital and encompasses an area of approximately 0.76 hectares. Within the Site boundary there are six extant buildings, these include Ash House, Bloomsbury Building, Camley Centre, The Jules Thorne Building, the Kitchen Building, and the Post Room and Former Mortuary.
- 1.12 The Proposed Development is to demolish the existing buildings within the Site and construct a new facility that will allow the existing Moorfields Eye Hospital, at City Road (Moorfields at City Road), and University College London (UCL) Institute of Ophthalmology (IoO), on Bath Street, to relocate from the existing sites into a single building at the existing St Pancras Hospital site. The new building will be between seven and ten storeys high and will include a sub-basement of approximately 3m in depth.

2. Archaeological Background

Introduction

- 2.1 The section below summarises the historical and archaeological background based on a study area of 350m surrounding the Site. The historical background has been summarised from the desk-based assessment (DBA) published in 2020 by AECOM (2020).
- 2.2 There are no World Heritage Sites, scheduled monuments, or registered battlefields, within the Site. Within the 350m study area there is one registered park and garden and 32 non-designated archaeological assets.
- 2.3 A single non-designated asset lies within the Site boundary, the remains of the St Pancras Workhouse (A31, Figure 3).

Geology and Topography

- 2.4 The existing levels across the Site are higher towards the north-eastern corner at a level of approximately +23m aOD, falling to +19.09m aOD in the south-western corner of the Site.
- 2.5 The underlying bedrock across the Site is London Clay Formation which comprises a laminated, firm blue to grey/brown silty clay. No superficial deposits have been recorded within the Site (BGS 2023).
- 2.6 Nine geo-technical boreholes were excavated across the Site ahead of demolition; these have provided an indication of the depths of deposits and the natural geology within the Site (AECOM 2021).
- 2.7 Three boreholes were excavated within the north-eastern area of the Site and recorded made ground to a depth of at least 1.10m bgl (below ground level) prior to being abandoned.
- 2.8 Three boreholes were undertaken in the south-western and southern areas of the Site. The boreholes recorded made ground to a depth of approximately 1.7m bgl in the south-western corner and at 3.60m bgl in the southern area of the Site. Deposits of made ground sealed the natural London Clay.
- 2.9 Two boreholes were excavated close to the north-western edge of the Site and displayed made ground down to an approximate depth of 2.10m below ground level (bgl), with natural London Clay directly beneath this deposit. A borehole was excavated in the centre of the Site with made ground recorded to a depth of approximately 2.45m bgl. Underlying this deposit was a layer of silty clay recorded to a depth of 3.4m where it sealed London Clay.

Previous Archaeological Investigations

- 2.10 An archaeological evaluation was undertaken within the grounds of St Pancras hospital in December 2022 and January 2023 (MOLA 2023). Three archaeological trenches were excavated to confirm whether any remains of the St Pancras Workhouse survived within the Site boundary. The interim report for the archaeological evaluation has been appended to this report (Appendix C).
- 2.11 The archaeological evaluation recorded the surviving remains of the earliest phase of the workhouse in Trench 3, with wall foundations and floor surfaces surviving. The late 19th and early 20th century structural additions to the workhouse were recorded in Trenches 1 and 2, with wall foundations linked to those recorded on the 1871 Town OS map (Figure 2). The external wall of the Oakum Rooms and several of the walls related to the Female Wards were identified in the same position as on the 1871 OS Town Plan. A further sub-basement may be present within Trench 2, within the Female Wards; however, this was not conclusively proven during the evaluation. Several internal walls and divisions were recorded, that were not depicted on the OS map.
- 2.12 Within Trench 3 the internal walls and brick floor of the oldest surviving area of the workhouse were exposed, with these dating to between 1809 and 1827 (MOLA 2023).
- 2.13 A further 35 archaeological investigations have been carried out within the 350m study area (**Figure 5**), these include:

- In 1995, archaeological investigations were carried out at Euston Road, approximately 350m south-east of the Site. Evidence of medieval agricultural farming was recorded (E1).
- Throughout 2002, PCA and MOLA undertook seven watching briefs (E3-E20) recording evidence of the 19th century railways and associated industrial buildings. Further investigations recorded brick foundations for a 19th century railway bridge, and evidence of an embankment and backfilling using alluvial deposits.
- In 2004, archaeological investigations were undertaken at St Pancras Gardens, approximately 100m south of the Site (**E21-E25, E34**). The investigations recorded a post-medieval cemetery, with 689 inhumations recorded during the excavations. These burials were recorded at a level of approximately 21.3m aOD.
- Archaeological investigations within the study area have recorded remains of the industrial structures and warehouses that were linked to the nearby St Pancras railway station. MOLA undertook two watching briefs at Wharf Road (E28-E29, E33), recording a 19th century building.
- Further evaluations at York Way (E30) recorded the remains of an industrial shed and machine platform, along with timbers related to the 19th century goods yard (E31) and remains of a 19th century locomotive shed (E32).

Historical and Archaeological Background

Palaeolithic and Mesolithic (up to 4000 BC)

- 2.14 Throughout the Early Prehistoric period, large cultural changes occurred with the appearance of modern humans and the development of hunter-gatherer societies. Palaeolithic *in-situ* remains are relatively rare nationally, however, Palaeolithic and Mesolithic deposits and remains are recorded across London, particularly within areas of floodplains and close to existing tributaries of the Thames, such as Newham, in north-east London and close to Crayford, in south-east London.
- 2.15 Assemblages of flints have been previously identified during archaeological investigations of the construction of Terminal 5 at Heathrow, approximately 20km south-west of the Site, with a broken leaf point recorded at Ham, approximately 10km east of the Site. (Nixon, Swain, Tomber and McAdams 2002).
- 2.16 Several flint tools have been recorded across Camden, however, these have been recorded in secondary deposited gravels (Historic England 2018). There is a high potential for preserved *in-situ* Palaeolithic remains to be located in Langley Silts, these have not been mapped within the borough, however, where these are identified, there is a high potential for Palaeolithic survival.
- 2.17 No Early Prehistoric archaeological remains have been previously identified within 350m of the Site.

Neolithic to Iron Age (4000 BC to AD 43)

- 2.18 The transition from hunter-gatherer societies to more sedentary settlement started in the Neolithic period, with small communities starting to move to an agrarian lifestyle. Animal husbandry and the domestication of animals first occurred in this period, with large-scale forest clearance of areas.
- 2.19 The emergence of monumental funerary sites within the landscape appears throughout this period, and into the Early Bronze Age, with causewayed enclosures, henges, barrows and cursus all appearing in this period. By the Bronze Age, settlement patterns had become more nucleated, with the landscape becoming much more agrarian, with field systems making an appearance by this period.
- 2.20 Evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age settlement has been recorded at Hampstead, approximately 3.5km north-west of the Site, with evidence of bell barrows recorded here.
- 2.21 By the Iron Age, nucleated settlements had become much more defended, with walled, hilltop settlements and enclosed *oppida* becoming more visible across the landscape. There is very little evidence for Iron Age settlement within London, and it has been suggested that the Roman placement of the settlement of *Londinium* was undertaken due to the lack of an Iron Age presence in the nearby vicinity (Nixon, Tomber, Swain and McAdams 2002).
- 2.22 Evidence for Iron Age activity across Camden is rare, with potential Iron Age remains identified at the Vale of the Heath, approximately 2.5km north of the Site (Historic England 2018).

2.23 No Neolithic, Bronze Age or Iron Age archaeological remains have been identified within 350m of the Site.

Roman (AD 43 to 410)

- 2.24 The Roman invasion of Britain started in the South-East of England, with the Roman armies quickly subduing the indigenous British tribes. The Roman settlement of *Londinium* was established upon the banks of the River Thames, quickly becoming a major port for the import and export of goods from across the Empire (Nixon, Tomber, Swain and McAdams 2002). Several historians have identified that whilst it has its roots in a trading centre, it was also established at a strategic location (Millett 1990).
- 2.25 Archaeological excavations across the City have identified the remains of hundreds of structures and dwellings, however, Camden lies just outside of the original walled city of *Londinum*, with Roman roads such as Watling Street leading into the City and passing through Camden. There is evidence of burials alongside the Roman road that extends from High Holborn Road to New Oxford Street (Historic England 2018).
- 2.26 Evidence of Roman occupation within the study area is lacking, with no Roman settlement assets identified. However, there are Roman bricks identified in the walls of the Old Church of St Pancras (A2), approximately 230m south of the Site, indicating that Roman settlement activity may be located within the surrounding area.

Early Medieval (410-1066)

- 2.27 The decline of Roman Britain and the settlement of Germanic tribes from northern Europe marks the start of the early medieval period in England. Archaeological investigations within London have identified a small trading post, called *Ludenwic*, located at Covent Garden. The Site lies approximately 2.5km north of the settlement at *Ludenwic*, however, the settlement does border the southern extent of the Borough of Camden (Historic *England* 2018). Evidence of Anglo-Saxon settlement has been identified approximately 230m to the south of the Site (A4), surrounding the St Pancras Church (A3), which originally dates to the Anglo-Saxon period.
- 2.28 The 9th and 10th centuries are marked by continual raids by Vikings upon London, with the small settlement at *Ludenwic* moved to within the protected Roman walled city by the 8th and 9th centuries (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1859).
- 2.29 Whilst there is clear evidence for an Anglo-Saxon settlement surrounding St Pancras Church to the south, no early medieval remains have been previously identified within the Site.

Medieval (1066-1640)

- 2.30 The Borough of Camden comprises the early medieval parishes of Hampstead, St Giles-in-the-field, St Pancras and St Andrew Holborn (Historic England 2018); these likely reflected the Anglo-Saxon estates. The Site is situated in the parish of St Pancras, which was divided between the manors of Tottenhall, Cantalowes, Rugmere and St Pancras. There is very little surviving evidence of the location or survival of these manor sites.
- 2.31 The earlier Anglo-Saxon settlement was established surrounding St Pancras Church, however, there appears to have been a shift in settlement, with medieval settlement situated at Kentish Town in the 12th century. The borough experienced further growth in this period, with other settlements established at Highgate and Battle Bridge (Historic England 2018). Whilst the Anglo-Saxon settlement was abandoned, the church of St Pancras was used throughout the medieval period, with a substantially sized burial ground located here (**A10**).
- 2.32 Very few other medieval assets have been identified within the study area, however, there is evidence of several medieval roads running close to the Site; these include Fig Lane, located approximately 100m south of the Site, on the same trajectory as Crowndale Road (A11). An unnamed road has been identified close to St Pancras Church (A9), linking Battle Bridge to Kentish Town, and was identified approximately 70m east of the Site.

Post-Medieval (1640-1900)

- 2.33 Throughout the 18th century, London grew inexorably, with a population increase from 120,000 in 1550 to just over a million in 1801 (Finlay and Shearer 1986). The wealthier elite living in London, started to move outside of the City, and into the suburbs such as Camden.
- 2.34 Remains of the Civil War are still present across the Borough of Camden; the interconnecting 'Lines of Communication' defensive forts and trenches were constructed by the Parliamentarians to defend the capital from the Royalists with remnants still spread across the borough, stretching from Pimlico in North London, down to Vauxhall, south of the Thames.
- 2.35 Prior to the Industrial Revolution, Camden was a largely rural area, however, the introduction of the railways in the early 19th century and the opening of Regents Canal in 1820 led to the increasing urbanisation and growth of the population within the borough. Archaeological assets relating to the construction of the Regents Canal have been recorded within the 350m study area, with deposits relating to the construction recorded approximately 330m to the south-east of the Site (**A29**), and brick and timber foundations recorded at Camley Street, 330m south-east of the Site (**A27**).
- 2.36 Evidence of increasing urbanisation have been identified within the study area, with remains of the Victorian railways identified through previous archaeological investigations located within the study area. Wooden revetment timbers associated with a now-demolished railway bridge were identified approximately 230m south of the Site (A13). The remains of a railway turntable, approximately 21m in diameter, was also recorded close to the wooden revetments (A14).
- 2.37 A number of 19th century industrial structures are located surrounding the Site, these include a 19th century coal depot (A16), built between 1896 and 1916, and located approximately 420m south of the Site. The site of a locomotive repair shop (A30) was also located close to the coal depot, approximately 280m north of the Site. Other foundations and tiled floors of associated railway structures have been recorded 330m to the south-east of the Site (A28).
- 2.38 The remains of the St Pancras Workhouse are located within the Site boundary (A38). A workhouse was originally constructed along the eastern side of St Pancras Way in 1731, however, this quickly became overcrowded and fell into disrepair, becoming decrepit. To combat this chronic overcrowding a second workhouse was built at the junction of Hampstead Road ad Kentish Town in 1775.
- 2.39 A third workhouse was built close to the location of the original workhouse, just off St Pancras Way, opening in 1809. The workhouse initially housed 500 workers in a large 2-storey building. Extensions and upgrades were made to the workhouse throughout the 19th century including the addition of two infirmaries, built in 1812 and 1849.
- 2.40 The workhouse had chronic issues with overcrowding and poor sanitation, and by 1880, the Local Government Board voted to build an extension to the Site to try and alleviate some of these issues, with the South Wing built shortly after.
- 2.41 Evidence to suggest that workers were buried within the grounds of the workhouse are inconclusive. Archival research has not identified any records of burials within the Site, and its proximity to St Pancras churchyard is suggestive that it is unlikely. Burial records from the parish are vague, with many burials recording only a pauper or poor burial.
- 2.42 It was documented by Edwin Brown in 1902 that the staff and inmates of the workhouse had complained about the overpowering stench of rotting corpses emanating from St Pancras Burial Ground (1902: 43). Whilst providing evidence into the daily life of the workhouse, these sources do not prove or disprove the possibility of burials within the workhouse grounds.
- 2.43 Cartographic regression has provided evidence for how the workhouse was adapted and expanded since its construction in 1809. The John Rocque's London 10 Miles Round, Map of London 1746 (**Figure 6**) shows the Site to be located within open agricultural fields prior to the construction of the workhouse.
- 2.44 The Greenwood 1827 (**Figure 7**) map shows the earliest phase of the workhouse to be the large building located in the western area of the Site, on a north-south alignment. Male wards were located in the southern area of the Site, adjacent to the St Pancras Burial Grounds. The Parish Map of 1849 (**Figure 8**) highlights that several new buildings were constructed between 1827 and 1849, including a nursery and

kitchen to the north of the Site, and a structure located centrally within the Site that included a laundry room and a second kitchen area.

2.45 The Stanford map of London (**Figure 9**), the First Edition OS map 1871 (**Figure 10**) and the OS Town Map of 1871 (Not reproduced) show a fully developed and expanded workhouse during this period, with new female wards and Oakum Rooms located in the north-western area of the Site, and new workshops and storerooms along the eastern periphery of the Site. The Town Map of 1871 is the most detailed of the plans of the workhouse and identifies several distinct areas within the workhouse at this period, including several kitchens, male and female wards, a bakery and Oakum Rooms, used to pick oakum for ship construction. The oldest building at the workhouse, located within the western area of the Site has many small rooms, and housed the master's office, master's workrooms the chapel and the matron's office.

Modern (1990-Present)

- 2.46 The Borough of Camden, and in particular St Pancras, continued to become industrialised throughout the 20th Century, with the continual development of the railways and expansion of St Pancras Station. Areas of the borough have been more focused towards serving the community, and this is evident in areas of parkland that have been designed for locals to use, such as Camley Street Natural Park, which was redeveloped from a coal depot in 1985 (A33) and is located approximately 350m south-east of the Site.
- 2.47 The St Pancras Workhouse was abolished in 1929, with the passing of the Local Government Act which abolished the workhouse system. A new hospital was built on the Site between 1929 and 1948, with the 1940 OS map showing that the workhouse buildings had been demolished and replaced with modern structures.
- 2.48 In 1951, the hospital became the Centre for Tropical Diseases, with the structures built to replace the workhouse expanded and altered throughout the latter half of the 20th century.

3. Project Aims and Objectives

- 3.1 The general objectives of the watching brief are:
- to identify and record the location, extent, depth, character, date and state of preservation of any archaeological remains within the Site, particularly those associated with the St Pancras Workhouse;
- to record the nature, complexity and significance of any archaeological remains;
- to record the range, quality and quantity of artefactual and environmental evidence present;
- to create a full archaeological record of any archaeological remains recorded within the Site; and
- to interpret the archaeology of the site within its local, regional and national archaeological context.

Site Specific Aims

- 3.2 The Stage 1 archaeological evaluation identified the surviving remains of both the early 19th century workhouse and the later 19th century/early 20th century phases of the workhouse within the Site.
- 3.3 The Site-specific aims for the project are:
- to identify and record the remains of the early 19th century remains of the workhouse;
- to identify and record the remains of the late 19th and early 20th century workhouses and to determine how these interact with the earlier phases of the workhouse;
- to identify and record the form, function, and relationship of the remains of the workhouse, the phasing of the workhouse buildings and any areas of particular structural development;
- to identify and record any burials associated with the workhouse; and
- to identify and record any Roman or Anglo-Saxon archaeological remains that may survive within the Site.

Research Frameworks

- 3.4 The Site has the potential to contribute information that may inform on the broad principles and key questions posed in the Research Framework for London Archaeology (2002). The key questions posed in the research framework objectives for post-medieval London that are relevant to the project are:
- L2: Establishing through the archaeological record how sustainable and determined (or not) were public and civic efforts to put in place, and then maintain, different aspects of London's infrastructure;
- L3: Characterising assemblages for use in analytic models where the archaeological record helps to define the nature and extent of different neighbourhoods, in social, economic, ethnic, or religious terms;
- L3: Developing assemblage 'signatures' for different groups of Londoners, including the 19th century, in which many London communities may well have gone unrecorded and, to that extent, be 'without history'; and
- L4: Characterising the effects on people's bodies of living in London.
- 3.5 Major research themes relevant to the project include:
- TD3: Establishing through the archaeological record (as a balance to documentary interpretations) how sustainable and determined (or not) were public and civic efforts to put in place, and then maintain, different aspects of London's infrastructure;
- TD6: Completing baseline surveys of buildings and synthesising data to establish patterns of building renewal and replacement and to understand the life cycle of buildings of different types and function, at different periods;
- TS4: Using the archaeological record wherever possible to trace individual lives;
- TS4: Understanding the experience of children through London's past;
- TS1: Understanding what London's past environments meant to different groups and individuals;

- TS2: Considering regional variations in health, especially from the medieval period onwards, drawing parallels with modern societies in terms of urban regeneration aims; and
- TS6: Synthesising data on known religious sites and buildings, their chronology, use and influence locally, regionally or nationally.

4. Scope of Archaeological Work

- 4.1 This document sets out the methodology and protocols for two stages of archaeological watching brief.
- 4.2 Two phases of archaeological mitigation will be undertaken within the Site. These will include a general watching brief and a further targeted watching brief. These are defined as:
- 4.3 **General Watching Brief**: A programme of observation, investigation and recording undertaken during construction in areas where specific remains have not been previously identified by DBA or field evaluation but where there remains a realistic potential for archaeological discoveries. The Principal Contractor's method of working would not be directly controlled for archaeological purposes, unless important archaeological discoveries are found (in which case the site method may change to Targeted Watching Brief (see below).
- 4.4 A general archaeological watching brief will be undertaken across those parts of the Site where remains of the St Pancras Workhouse have not been previously identified. The areas for a general watching brief are highlighted on **Figure 2**.
- 4.5 **Targeted Watching Brief:** A programme of observation, investigation and recording of archaeological remains integrated with construction within those parts of the Site where the survival and likely extent of archaeological remains has been demonstrated by previous stages of field evaluation, but where detailed investigation prior to the main construction programme is impracticable or inappropriate (e.g. due to safety or logistical considerations or environmental or engineering constraints). Within the targeted watching brief area the Principal Contractors preferred method of working would be controlled as necessary to allow archaeological recording to take place to the required standard (see paragraphs. 5.53-5.73 below).
- 4.6 Areas of targeted watching brief have been identified through cartographic regression and confirmed by the archaeological evaluation undertaken within the Site and are highlighted in **Figure 2**. Specific areas of the workhouse have been identified as holding particular archaeological and historical interest and are able to answer specific research questions highlighted in the Research Framework for London (2002). These areas have been highlighted in **Figure 3**.
- 4.7 The areas of particular archaeological and historical interest are detailed below:

Table 1	. Areas	of Specific	Archaeo	logical	Inter	est

Area of the Workhouse	Phase of Workhouse	Research Questions		
Oakum Rooms	Late 19 th Century	L4: Characterising the effects on people's bodies of living in London		
Female Wards	Early 19 th Century	TS1: Understanding what London's pa environments meant to different group and individuals		
		L3: Developing assemblage 'signatures' for different groups of Londoners, including the 19th century, in which many London communities may well have gone unrecorded and, to that extent, be 'without history'		
Chapel Early 19 th Century		TS6: Synthesising data on known religious sites and buildings, their chronology, use and influence locally, regionally or nationally		
Master's Rooms	Early 19 th Century	TS4: Using the archaeological record wherever possible to trace individual lives		
Master's Office	Early 19 th Century	TS4: Using the archaeological record wherever possible to trace individual lives		
Bakery Late 19 th Century		TS2: Considering regional variations in health, especially from the medieval period onwards, drawing parallels with		

Area of the Workhouse	Phase of Workhouse	Research Questions		
		modern societies in terms of urban regeneration aims		
Matron Room Early 19 th Century		TS2: Considering regional variations in health, especially from the medieval period onwards, drawing parallels with modern societies in terms of urban regeneration aims L4: Characterising the effects on people's bodies of living in London		
Kitchen	Early 19 th Century	TS2: Considering regional variations in health, especially from the medieval period onwards, drawing parallels with modern societies in terms of urban regeneration aims		
Nursery	Early 19 th Century	TS4: Understanding the experience of children through London's past		

5. Works Specification

General Requirements

- 5.1 All archaeological works will be carried out in accordance with this WSI and any further instructions from the Client. This design takes account of the guidance provided by Historic England's GLAAS Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London (2015), the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (ClfA) Code of Conduct (ClfA 2022), the Standard and Guidance for an Archaeological Watching Brief (ClfA 2020) and other current and relevant good practice and standards and guidance (refer to Appendix B).
- 5.2 The Archaeological Contractor will undertake the works in accordance with this WSI and any other subsequent variations. No variation from or changes to this WSI will occur except by prior agreement with the Consultant, in consultation with GLAAS.
- 5.3 The Archaeological Contractor shall ensure that the archaeological investigations are undertaken in an organised, efficient and professional manner.
- 5.4 The on-site archaeological recording and recovery techniques will be in line with current industry good practice and should be fully understood by all.
- 5.5 All paper and digital records made during the course of the fieldwork, and the treatment of artefacts and environmental remains, will be reviewed continuously and informed by specialist input. Record checking and collation will be completed at regular intervals, as appropriate, and before an area is considered complete, and handed back to the Principal Contractor for construction. Errors or omissions in recording discovered during post-excavation cannot be recovered. The Archaeological Contractor must make suitable allowance for this task.

Specific Requirements for the Client

- 5.6 The Client will provide the Archaeological Contractor with any available details for site specific hazards including the presence of contaminated land or the threat of unexploded ordnance and will brief the Archaeological Contractor as to their location and the process for dealing with these issues on Site.
- 5.7 The Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Interpretive Report (AECOM 2021) previously highlighted that there is a low risk for soil contamination within the Site, however, the archaeological trial trench evaluation recorded remains of asbestos within Trench 3 (MOLA 2023). The Principal Contractor will brief the Archaeological Contractor with the locations of any known land contamination or locations of identified asbestos.
- 5.8 It will be the responsibility of the Client and Principal Contractor to procure a specialist contractor to remove asbestos and ground contaminants, where appropriate, and the Principal Contractor will have adequate control measures in place to deal with and to remove the ground contaminants. The Principal Contractor will liaise and brief the Archaeological Contractor on any asbestos or ground contaminants that are identified within the Site.
- 5.9 The Client will allow for adequate time for the Archaeological Contractor to clean, define and record any archaeological remains that may be encountered during both the general and targeted watching brief.

Specific Requirements for the Principal Contractor

- 5.10 The Principal Contractor will provide a Site-specific health, safety and environment induction to the Archaeological Contractor prior to the works commencing.
- 5.11 The Principal Contractor shall ensure Archaeological Contractor's site staff are inducted, have a valid CSCS card, and are signed up to daily briefings.
- 5.12 The Principal Contractor will approve the Archaeological Contractor's Method Statements and Risk Assessments (RAMS).

- 5.13 The Principal Contractor shall manage the risk and status of any live services and update the Archaeological Contractor on these risks.
- 5.14 The Principal Contractor will provide all necessary mechanical plant required to complete the general and targeted watching briefs e.g mechanical excavators, dumpers and pumps.
- 5.15 The Principal Contractor will provide plant supervision as required by their RAMS during all ground reduction and plant movements.
- 5.16 The Principal Contractor is responsible for providing any temporary works, shoring, edge protection and safe access/egress required in each area of ground reduction.
- 5.17 The Principal Contractor, is responsible for providing suitable site welfare facilities, including male and female toilets and changing/drying rooms.
- 5.18 The Principal Contractor will regularly update the Archaeological Contractor on any hazards such as contact with plant/machinery, trips, falls, zoning of site activities to prevent unnecessary overlap of working areas.
- 5.19 The Principal Contractor will define the Archaeological Contractor's access/egress routes to working areas and ensure dedicated pedestrian routes.
- 5.20 The Principal Contractor will specify the minimum Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to be worn at all times.
- 5.21 The Principal Contractor will respond to any contaminated or potentially contaminated material and introduce safeguards. It shall be investigated, controlled (e.g. placed separately from clean material) and removed from the site in accordance with the Principal Contractor's environmental protection requirements (as set out in their Environmental Management Plan).
- 5.22 The Principal Contractor will carry out works in such a way as to ensure that disturbance to all archaeological remains is managed in accordance with accepted historic environment practice and, where disturbance cannot reasonably be avoided, is controlled and limited as far as reasonably practicable.
- 5.23 The Principal Contractor will allow for adequate time for the Archaeological Contractor to clean, define and record any archaeological remains that may be encountered during both the general and targeted watching brief.
- 5.24 The Principal Contractor will provide a UXO specialist to undertake monitoring within the Site throughout the duration of ground reduction and demolition activities where appropriate. If during the Site setup and pre-demolition works, the Principal Contractor is unable to provide UXO monitoring, the Archaeological Contractor may be required to engage the Stage 1 UXO specialist to monitor any preliminary works.

Specific Requirements for the Archaeological Contractor

- 5.25 The Archaeological Contractor shall prepare and submit a Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) for the works prior to the commencement of the fieldwork. The draft RAMS will be submitted to the Consultant, the Client and the Principal Contractor for their review and approval.
- 5.26 The Archaeological Contractor shall inspect any areas of deep excavation at the beginning and end of each shift to confirm the areas of deep excavation are stable and safe to enter.
- 5.27 The RAMS compiled by the Archaeological Contractor will include a section on ground contamination, with the relevant policies outlined including minimum PPE requirements. As a minimum, the basic approach to risk assessment for contaminated land shall be followed as set out in Land Contamination and Archaeology. Good Practice Guide (Historic England 2017).
- 5.28 The Archaeological Contractor shall keep and issue a daily log of personnel attending the Site and submit these to the Consultant and Principal Contractor at the end of each week.

- 5.29 The Archaeological Contractor shall undertake archaeological monitoring following the progress of construction activities using a core team of archaeologists. The core team size will be commensurate with the scope of the works and agreed with the Consultant.
- 5.30 The Archaeological Contractor shall provide additional archaeologists (the 'support team'), to investigate and record archaeological remains, as appropriate. These additional resources shall be agreed with the Consultant and made available within 48 hours' notice to avoid delay to the construction programme.
- 5.31 The Archaeological Contractor's team shall consist of appropriately competent and experienced archaeologists commensurate with the scale and nature of the works.
- 5.32 The Archaeological Contractor shall perform the specified hand investigation and recording works for all interventions and perform all survey requirements for investigation areas and features as these are excavated.
- 5.33 The Archaeological Contractor shall provide all hand tools, survey equipment and recording media required to complete the general and targeted watching briefs.

General Watching Brief Methodology

- 5.34 The general watching brief will be undertaken within the areas defined in **Figure 2**. Within these areas the Archaeological Contractor will be present on Site to monitor any excavation or groundworks activities undertaken by the Principal Contractor. This includes all areas located outside of the predicted layout of the St Pancras Workhouse as defined by cartographic evidence and recent archaeological trial trenching.
- 5.35 During the general watching brief, mechanical excavation will proceed under the control of the Principal Contractor, under the supervision of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist, using an appropriate mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. During the removal of existing concrete surfacing or modern building foundations use of a toothed bucket may be appropriate. Made ground and overburden will be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Principal Contractor.
- 5.36 When archaeological deposits or features are encountered, mechanical excavation will proceed under the control of the Archaeological Contractor, with soil or overburden being reduced in level spits down to a depth at the discretion of the supervising archaeologist either the top of the first archaeological horizon or undisturbed natural deposits are encountered. Where archaeological deposits are encountered attention should be paid to achieving a clean and well-defined horizon with the machine.
- 5.37 The Principal Contractor shall provide a suitable and safe position from which the Archaeological Contractor can effectively monitor the ground reduction and allow the Archaeological Contractor sufficient time to investigate and record any archaeological remains that are exposed as a result of the operation.
- 5.38 Under no circumstances should the machine be used to cut arbitrary trenches down to natural deposits.
- 5.39 The surface achieved through machine excavation will be inspected for archaeological remains.
- 5.40 If important concentrations of artefacts suggestive of significant activity are uncovered during machining, these should be left in situ in the first instance, and investigated using hand tools only, if appropriate and safe to do so.
- 5.41 If extensive or significant archaeological deposits and/or features are identified, the archaeologist will notify the Consultant and GLAAS immediately.
- 5.42 In the event that archaeological remains are discovered during the general watching brief, ground reduction works will cease at that location, the area will be defined by the Archaeological Contractor, in agreement with the Consultant, and fenced to demarcate the area of archaeological works. If significant archaeological remains are identified within the areas defined for the general watching brief, e.g. but not limited to, Roman archaeological remains, Anglo-Saxon Settlement remains and burials associated with the St Pancras Workhouse, it may be necessary to implement the methodology for the Targeted Watching Brief as defined in paragraphs 5.53-5.75 of this WSI.
- 5.43 In either event the Principal Contractor will provide sufficient time and support to facilitate mapping, hand investigation, sampling and recording of the archaeological deposits. This will be achieved through careful

liaison and coordination between the Principal Contractor, Archaeological Contractor and Consultant to avoid any delay to the construction programme.

- 5.44 Ground reduction works outside any areas of defined archaeological remains can continue under archaeological supervision, whilst archaeological hand investigation and recording continues within the demarcated archaeological area.
- 5.45 The Archaeological Contractor shall not excavate any area beyond those impacted by the proposed scheme without consultation and agreement from both the Consultant and GLAAS.
- 5.46 The General Watching Brief will monitor all ground reduction to the surface of natural geology, which is archaeologically sterile, beyond which point there is no requirement for archaeological monitoring.
- 5.47 Archaeological remains that are exposed at the base of the proposed building footprint and extend below this level will be left *in situ*. However, the significance of these remains and their location will be reviewed, and they may be recorded if warranted, based upon their significance and the locations of piling impacts. This will be agreed in consultation with GLAAS."
- 5.48 Within 24 hours of the completion of each General Watching Brief area the Archaeological Subcontractor will prepare a Completion Statement for sign-off by the Consultant in agreement with GLAAS. Once agreed a copy of the signed and approved Completion Statement will be provided to the Principal Contractor as confirmation that the archaeological watching brief has been completed and that construction can proceed.

Hand Excavation

5.49 The following sampling strategies will be employed for hand excavation during the general watching brief:

- Linear features: A minimum sample in length not less than 1m long, where the depositional sequence is
 consistent along the length. Multi-phase linear features with complex variations of fill type will be sampled
 sufficiently in order to understand the phasing and sequence of deposition. Where possible, one section will
 be located and recorded adjacent to a trench edge.
- Discrete features: Pits, post-holes and other isolated features will normally be half-sectioned. A minimum requirement to meet the project objectives will be agreed in consultation with the Consultant. If large pits or deposits (over 1.5m diameter) are encountered, then the sample excavated should be sufficient to define the extent and maximum depth of the feature and to achieve the objectives of the watching brief but should not be less than 25%.
- Structures: Each structure will be sufficiently cleaned and exposed to define the extent, form, stratigraphic
 complexity and depth of the component features and its associated deposits to achieve the objectives of the
 archaeological watching brief. The remains of all upstanding walls will be hand cleaned sufficiently to
 understand and record their dimensions, extent, composition, sequence and relationships.
- Flint scatters: in particular where associated with buried land surfaces will require hand cleaning and threedimensional plotting prior to recovery;
- Timber structures and artefacts: will require expert recording and conservation until they are assessed fully.

Recording

- 5.50 The perimeter of each investigation area and all archaeological remains within them will be recorded in plan using metric survey-grade equipment (or its equivalent).
- 5.51 A Site diary/day sheet will be completed every day during the watching brief. The archaeological contractor will include entries for site code, excavation location, length and depth of excavation, the deposit sequence of each test pit and the location and description of any archaeological remains. The Site diary/day sheet will note the location of any modern remains and the reasons why any particular area of the Site was not observed, noting those areas not required for construction, details of any delays to the works and weather conditions.
- 5.52 Where archaeological remains are encountered within the area defined for a general watching brief, a record appropriate to the significance of the remains will be made. Hand drawn plans and sections / elevations of features / structures will be produced at an appropriate scale (normally 1:50 for plans and

1:10 or 1:20 for sections / elevations). All plans and sections will include spot heights relative to Ordnance Datum in metres, correct to two decimal places.

5.53 Photography (digital, colour transparency and / or monochrome negative photographs) will be taken in line with current industry good practice. In addition to records of archaeological features, a number of general site photographs will also be taken to give an overview of the Site. Particular attention should be paid to obtaining shots suitable for displays, exhibitions and other publicity.

Targeted Watching Brief Methodology

- 5.54 The areas of the St Pancras Workhouse as defined in **Figure 2**, will be subject to a targeted watching brief. Areas of specific interest within the workhouse have been identified and are highlighted on **Figure 3**.
- 5.55 During the targeted watching brief the Archaeological Contractor will be present on Site to monitor any areas of excavation or ground reduction. This will include all areas located within the predicted footprint of the early 19th century and the late 19th/early 20th century workhouse.
- 5.56 Specific areas of the St Pancras Workhouse have been identified on **Figure 3** as holding particular archaeological interest and may answer specific research questions posed in the Archaeological Research Framework for London (2002).
- 5.57 Within the limits of the targeted watching brief, all ground reduction will proceed under the continuous monitoring of a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist. The defined areas will be stripped under archaeological supervision using an appropriate mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless bucket. During the removal of existing concrete surfacing or modern building foundations use of a toothed bucket may be appropriate. Made ground and overburden will be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Principal Contractor.
- 5.58 The Principal Contractor shall provide a suitable and safe position from which the Archaeological Contractor can effectively monitor the ground reduction and allow the Archaeological Contractor sufficient time to investigate and record any archaeological remains that are exposed as a result of the operation.
- 5.59 During the targeted watching brief, controlled, mechanical excavation will proceed under direct archaeological supervision, in broadly level spits of no more than 200mm, until either the top of the first archaeological horizon or undisturbed natural deposits are encountered. If appropriate, attention should be paid to achieving a clean and well-defined horizon with the machine.
- 5.60 Particular care and attention will be given to defining the workhouse walls, and the machine may be used to remove demolition rubble within the workhouse, however, the machine may not be used to removed occupational layers, surfaces or remains that are adjacent to the workhouse wall foundations.
- 5.61 Once the structural remains and walls of the workhouse have been fully recorded, the mechanical excavator may be used to remove these remains, down to the next archaeological horizon.
- 5.62 Under no circumstances should the machine be used to cut arbitrarily down to natural deposits.
- 5.63 If important concentrations of artefacts suggestive of significant activity are uncovered during machining, these should be left in situ in the first instance, and investigated using hand tools only, if appropriate and safe to do so.
- 5.64 If extensive or significant archaeological deposits and/or features are identified, ground reduction works will cease at that location, and the area will be fenced to demarcate the area of archaeological works. The Archaeological Contractor will notify the Principal Contractor and Consultant immediately. The Consultant will then notify GLAAS.
- 5.65 Where archaeological remains are encountered the Principal Contractor will provide sufficient time and support to facilitate mapping, hand investigation, sampling and recording of the archaeological deposits. This will be achieved through careful liaison and coordination between the Principal Contractor, Archaeological Contractor and Consultant to avoid any delay to the construction programme.
- 5.66 The Targeted Watching Brief will monitor all ground reduction to the surface of natural geology, which is archaeologically sterile, beyond this point there is no requirement for archaeological monitoring.

- 5.67 Archaeological remains that are exposed at the base of the proposed building footprint and extend below this level will be left *in situ*. However, the significance of these remains and their location will be reviewed, and they may be recorded if warranted, based upon their significance and the locations of piling impacts. This will be agreed in consultation with GLAAS."
- 5.68 Within 24 hours of the completion of each Targeted Watching Brief area the Archaeological Subcontractor will prepare a Completion Statement for sign-off by the Consultant in agreement with GLAAS. Once agreed a copy of the signed and approved Completion Statement will be provided to the Principal Contractor as confirmation that the archaeological watching brief has been completed and that construction can proceed

Hand Excavation

- 5.69 The following sampling strategies will be employed for hand excavation during the targeted watching brief:
- 5.70 Linear features: A minimum sample in length not less than 1m long, where the depositional sequence is consistent along the length. Multi-phase linear features with complex variations of fill type will be sampled sufficiently in order to understand the phasing and sequence of deposition.
- 5.71 Where possible, one section will be located and recorded adjacent to a trench edge. If appropriate, all intersections will be investigated to determine the relationships between features. All termini will be investigated.
- 5.72 Discrete features: Pits, post-holes and other isolated features will normally be half-sectioned. A minimum requirement to meet the project objectives will be agreed in consultation with the Consultant. If large pits or deposits (over 1.5m diameter) are encountered, then the sample excavated should be sufficient to define the extent and maximum depth of the feature and to achieve the objectives of the targeted watching brief but should not be less than 25%.
- 5.73 For structural remains:
- Each structure within the targeted watching brief area as defined in **Figure 2**, will be cleaned and sampled sufficiently to define the extent, depth, form, method of construction, materials, phasing and stratigraphic complexity of the component features and its associated deposits to achieve the objectives of the targeted watching brief;
- The remains of all upstanding walls and surviving floors will be hand cleaned sufficiently to understand and record their dimensions, extent, composition, sequence and relationships;
- Sections will be excavated across walls, where appropriate, to provide the best record of the construction, phasing, relationships, profile and foundations associated with the workhouse. Where relevant, intersections between surviving walls, foundations and surviving floor surfaces will be investigated to determine the relationship(s) between the structural components and abutting walls; and
- The areas defined in Table 1 and highlighted on **Figure 3** are areas of particular interest that may help to answer specific questions posed in the Archaeological Research Framework for London (2002). Within these designated areas, hand excavation and cleaning will be undertaken for all non-demolition and rubble layers, including but not limited to, occupational deposits, floor surfaces, and working surfaces.

Recording

- 5.74 The perimeter of each investigation area and all archaeological remains within them will be recorded in plan using metric survey-grade equipment (or its equivalent).
- 5.75 A full written, drawn and photographic record will be made of each watching brief location, even where no archaeological features are identified. Archaeological deposits will be recorded using proforma record sheets and registers. Hand drawn plans and sections / elevations of features / structures will be produced at an appropriate scale (normally 1:50 for plans and 1:10 or 1:20 for sections / elevations). All plans and sections will include spot heights relative to Ordnance Datum in metres, correct to two decimal places.
- 5.76 A Site diary/day sheet will be completed every day during the watching brief. The archaeological contractor will include entries for site code, excavation location, length and depth of excavation, the deposit sequence of each area and the location and description of any archaeological remains; the

location of any modern remains and the reasons why any particular area of the Site was not observed, noting those areas not required for construction, delays and weather conditions.

5.77 Photography (digital, colour transparency and / or monochrome negative photographs) will be taken in line with current industry good practice. In addition to records of archaeological features, a number of general site photographs will also be taken to give an overview of the Site. Particular attention should be paid to obtaining shots suitable for displays, exhibitions and other publicity.

General Requirements for General and Targeted Watching Brief

Environmental Sampling

- 5.78 The Archaeological Contractor's Method Statement will outline an appropriate environmental sampling strategy that conforms to this WSI. The Historic England London Advisor for Archaeological Science (Anne de Vareilles; 07557 828187) will be notified of the commencement of the project and will be consulted regarding the sampling strategy proposed by the Archaeological Contractor. Provision will also be made for the recovery of material suitable for scientific dating.
- 5.79 Any samples taken must come from securely stratified deposits using the methodologies outlined by Historic England in the Centre for Archaeology Guidelines No.1, Environmental Archaeology and Environmental Archaeology; A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Methods, from Sampling and Recovery to Post-excavation (Historic England 2011).
- 5.80 Any samples taken must come from appropriately cleaned surfaces, be collected with clean tools and be placed in clean containers. They will be adequately recorded and labelled, and a register of all samples will be kept. Once the samples have been obtained, they should be stored appropriately in a secure location prior to being sent to the appropriate specialist.

Potential data	Method	Context type	Sample size (Itr)	Excavated feature sample
CPR	Bulk	Structural/occupation features	40	50%
		Pits	40	50%
		Gully/ditch	40	10%
Waterlogged and organic remains	Bulk	Deposit sequence	As advised by specialist	N/A
Small bones	Bulk	All contexts	40	50
Molluscs	Incremental	Deposit sequence	As advised by specialist	N/A
Pollen	Monolith	Deposit sequence	As advised by specialist	N/A

Table 2: Sampling Strategy

Artefact Recovery

- 5.81 All artefacts will be collected, stored and processed in accordance with standard methodologies and national guidelines (refer to Appendix B). Except for modern artefacts all finds will be collected and retained, the Archaeological Contractor will clarify the Collection Policy in the Method Statement and will ensure that it is in line with relevant local authority guidelines. Each 'significant find' will be recorded three dimensionally. Similarly, if artefact scatters are encountered these should be also recorded three dimensionally. Bulk finds will be collected and recorded by context.
- 5.82 All recovered artefacts will be stabilised, conserved and stored in accordance with the current national conservation guidelines and standards (refer to Appendix B). If necessary, a conservator will visit the site to undertake 'first aid' conservation treatment. If waterlogged organic materials are encountered and

appropriate cold storage facilities are not available onsite, the project manager will arrange the removal of

5.83 Artefacts will be stored in appropriate materials and conditions and monitored to minimise further deterioration.

Finds Processing

the finds to nearby suitable facilities.

- 5.84 Initial processing of finds (and if appropriate other samples) will be carried out concurrent with the fieldwork.
- 5.85 The processing of finds will be finished shortly after completion of the investigations, the finds will be retained (according to the Collection Policy), washed, marked, bagged and logged on a MS Access or GIS database (or equivalent), together with their locations according to the requirements set out in the Collection Policy (e.g. 'significant finds' will be recorded on the OS National Grid (eastings, northings) and Ordnance Datum (height) to two decimal places).
- 5.86 The finds assemblage will be treated, labelled and stored in accordance with the appropriate Historic England guidance documents, local authority guidelines (if appropriate) and the Institute of Conservation guidelines (refer to Appendix A). The Archaeological Contractor will ensure that the processing of the assemblage is in accordance with the requirements of the Museum of London.
- 5.87 If appropriate, each category of find or each material type will be examined by a suitably qualified archaeologist or specialist and the results incorporated into the fieldwork report.

Human Remains

- 5.88 If human remains are discovered during the course of the general or targeted phases of the watching brief, the remains shall be demarcated and fenced off to protect the remains, and all human remains will be covered and protected, in line with industry good practice, until a Ministry of Justice (MOJ) licence is processed.
- 5.89 Once a Ministry of Justice licence has been granted the human remains may be removed, however, these remains must be screened from public view. All human remains will be treated with due care and respect at all times and in accordance with current good practice and guidance. Once lifted, the remains must be transported to a secure location and kept in appropriate conditions, such as the Archaeological Contractors finds processing facility, until specialist assessment takes place.
- 5.90 If any human remains or burials are encountered during the course of the general watching brief, the area in which the human remains are located will be subject to the methodology stated in the Targeted Watching Brief methodology (see paragraphs 5.53-5.73).

Treasure

- 5.91 Any artefacts which are recovered that fall within the scope of the Treasure Act 1996 and Treasure (Designation) Order 2002 will be reported to the Consultant immediately. The Consultant will contact H.M. Coroner, and the local Finds Liaison Officer and will ensure that the Treasure regulations are enforced and that all the relevant parties are kept informed. A list of finds that have been collected that fall under the Treasure Act and related legislation will be included in the fieldwork report.
- 5.92 Artefacts that are classified as 'treasure' will be removed to a safe place but where removal cannot be achieved on the same working day as the discovery, suitable security measures must be taken to protect the finds from damage or unauthorised removal.

Use of Drones

- 5.93 The use of an aerial drone may be employed to map and record any archaeological remains encountered during both the general and targeted watching brief.
- 5.94 The Archaeological Contractor shall prepare and submit a RAMS for the use of the drone within the Site boundary to the Client and Principal Contractor for their review and approval prior to its use.

- 5.95 Remote pilots will comply with all of the safety requirements and limitations of the Permission for Commercial Operations issued by the UK Civil Aviation Authority (CAA).
- 5.96 All staff operating the drone must be appropriately trained, qualified and fit to fly and all insurances, permissions and conditions must be in place for each flight operation.
- 5.97 The Archaeological Contractor's pilot will assume command and control of each flight operation, ensuring that all equipment and personnel are appropriately set up for the task.
- 5.98 The Archaeological Contractor shall ensure all personnel involved with each flight operation, and the Principal Contractor are fully briefed and aware of their responsibilities.

Completion of Fieldwork

- 5.99 The Site will be left in a tidy condition and the Archaeological Contractor will ensure that all materials brought onto Site are removed.
- 5.100 At the end of the general and targeted watching brief, the Archaeological Contractor shall complete the following:
 - a completion statement submitted to the Consultant within one working day of completing the fieldwork;
 - on approval of the completion statement by the Consultant and GLAAS, the Archaeological Contractor will confirm to the Principal Contractor that the watching brief has been completed and construction activities can re-commence; and
 - an OASIS entry. If appropriate the entry should include caveats about conclusions drawn in advance of assessment and/or analysis.
- 5.101 The OASIS entry may be updated and re-submitted not later than three months after the completion of the fieldwork report. The Archaeological Contractor is advised to ensure that adequate time and costings are built into their tenders to allow sufficient time to complete the form.

Fieldwork Reporting

- 5.102 An interim fieldwork report for the combined general and targeted watching brief phases will be submitted in draft to the Consultant within four weeks of the completion of each stage of the archaeological works.
- 5.103 The submission of the final Watching Brief Report is dependent on the delivery of the specialist reports, but it is anticipated it will be delivered within two months of the completion of fieldwork. The preparation of the site archive will be undertaken in accordance with this document and will follow relevant archaeological standards and national policy and guidance (refer to Appendix B).
- 5.104 The Watching Brief Report will include the following:
 - a signed QA sheet detailing as a minimum title, author, version, date, checked by, approved by;
 - a non-technical summary;
 - a site location drawing;
 - the archaeological and historical background;
 - the methodology employed for the investigations;
 - the aims and objectives of the investigations;
 - the results of both the general and targeted watching brief (to include full description, assessment of condition, quality and significance of the remains);
 - where human remains are encountered the report will include a statement that addresses the future retention of the material, including if appropriate, options for reburial;
 - an appendix containing specialist artefact, dating and environmental sampling reports;
 - an appendix illustrating specific finds and general working shots or portraits of specific features or structures as appropriate;
 - a list of all finds that fall within the scope of the Treasure Act and associated legislation;

- a stratigraphic matrix for each trench (as appropriate);
- assessment /conclusion and a statement of potential with recommendations for further work and analysis identifying specific research questions;
- a statement of the significance of the results in their local, regional and national context cross referenced to relevant research agenda;
- the current and proposed arrangements for long-term conservation and archive storage (including details of the recipient museum);
- general and detailed plans showing the location of each watching brief area accurately positioned on an Ordnance Survey base map (at an appropriate and recognised scale);
- detailed plans and sections illustrating archaeological features (at an appropriate and recognised scale), including a long section of each area that contains archaeological remains;
- a section and plan of 'negative' areas, i.e. those containing no archaeological remains, does not need to be produced providing there is a summary of the stratigraphic profile and depth of deposits included in the Watching Brief Report;
- colour photographic plates illustrating the site setting, work in progress and archaeological discoveries; and
- a cross-referenced index of the project archive.
- 5.105 The Watching Brief Report will specifically comment on the significance of the remains, the level of preservation and will comment on the character of the overlying deposits and on the potential for extrapolating the results into adjacent areas.
- 5.106 Digital copies of the completed draft report (complete with illustrations and plates) in both Word and PDF format will be submitted to the Consultant for comment. If, in the opinion of the Consultant, the draft report contains a large number of mistakes or significant omissions, then it is likely that the Archaeological Contractor will need to revise the draft report before it is finalised. When the draft report is of a sufficient standard, the Consultant will submit a copy of the draft report to the Client and to the GLAAS Archaeological Advisor. In finalising the report, the comments of the Consultant and the GLAAS Archaeological Advisor will be taken into account.
- 5.107 The final report will be submitted to the Consultant within two weeks of the receipt of comments on the draft report.
- 5.108 A project archive including image files in JPEG or TIFF format and digital text files shall be submitted in Microsoft Word format, and illustrations in AutoCAD format or ArcView shapefile format. A fully collated version of the fieldwork report shall be included in PDF format.

Archive Preparation and Deposition

- 5.109 Archaeological material recovered from fieldwork is irreplaceable and data recorded in the course of archaeological investigations should be copied and additionally held securely in a separate location in line with current good practice.
- 5.110 The Site records and assemblages (list of fieldwork interventions, notebooks / diaries, context records, feature records, structure records, site geometry (drawings), photographs and films, finds records and associated data files) will constitute the primary Site Archive. This is the key archive of the fieldwork project and the raw data upon which all subsequent assessment and analysis and future interpretation will be based. The archive will therefore not be altered or compromised.
- 5.111 The Site archive should be quantified, ordered, indexed and made internally consistent, and in line with current good practice (refer to Appendix B). All finds and coarse-sieved, and flotation samples will have been processed and stored under appropriate conditions. The archive will also contain a site matrix, a summary of key findings and descriptions of artefactual and environmental assemblages. Arrangements should be made for the proper cataloguing and storage of the archive during the project life-cycle (it may be appropriate to liaise with an archive specialist). The content of an outline structure for a fieldwork archive is presented in MoRPHE, PPN3 Appendix 1, Product P1 and Product P3 (Historic England 2015).

- 5.112 The Archaeological Contractor will, prior to the start of fieldwork, liaise with the Museum of London to obtain agreement in principle to accept the physical, documentary, digital and photographic archive for long-term storage. The Archaeological Contractor will be responsible for identifying any specific requirements, archiving costs or policies of the museum in respect of the archive, and for adhering to those requirements (MOLA 2009).
- 5.113 Relevant reference numbers will be obtained by the Archaeological Contractor in advance of the fieldwork, to ensure that the project is recorded in accordance with the requirements of the local authority.
- 5.114 The archive of finds and records generated during the fieldwork will be removed from the Site at the end of each day and kept secure at all stages of the project until it is deposited with the recipient museum. The archive will be produced to current national standards (refer to Appendix B).
- 5.115 The deposition of the archive forms the final stage of this project. The Archaeological Contractor shall provide the Consultant with copies of communication with the Museum of London and written confirmation of the deposition of the archive.

Public Engagement

- 5.116 The programme of archaeological watching brief has the potential to provide important insights into the archaeology, history, development, and significance of the St Pancras Workhouse, which will provide clear public benefit from the project.
- 5.117 The programme's public engagement will be aligned to the Client's overarching community engagement strategy. This strategy will detail how they are going to communicate construction developments, information and news to local residents, businesses, and other community members. This will be undertaken through a number of different channels including the Oriel Construction Working Group and by building key relationships with local community groups, including the St Pancras Old Church.
- 5.118 The programme of archaeological watching brief and monitoring will be a key topic and will focus on uncovering the history and heritage of the area the Client will be moving into. As the client has a strategy which incorporates history and heritage, they are keen to learn more about the site and the people who occupied it and engage with the local community during this this programme.
- 5.119 The Archaeological Contractor will discuss and agree a public outreach strategy with the Client and Consultant with the aim of disseminating the results of the investigation both during and after fieldwork. The public outreach strategy will comply with the Clients public engagement strategy and, where possible, will provide appropriate content for use either on online platforms or at specific public engagement events.

5.120 Possible activities that will be considered include:

- Specialist blog posts communicating the results of the archaeological works and any interesting discoveries and stories. Public talks with local community organisations and local societies, some of which could be posted online to reach a wider audience. This may include talks provided to the public through the Client's Working Group Forum.
- Classroom-based archaeology sessions, within the Borough of Camden, aimed at involving children and teachers in their local cultural heritage.
- Provision of information panels on site hoardings detailing the history and archaeology of the site and promoting the programme of archaeological work undertaken by the Client.
- Permanent or semi-permanent displays or interpretation panels, possibly within the public spaces or grounds of the hospital (subject to permissions) to allow users of the hospital an opportunity to learn about the archaeological fieldwork results.
- Information, updates, and case study stories included in the Client's community newsletter and on the Client's website.

5.121 Possible groups that could benefit from the public engagement include:

- Members of the public notably local community groups;
- Members of local archaeological, history and civic societies;

• Primary and secondary school pupils.

Media and Communications

5.122 The Public Outreach Strategy programme could be disseminated through a range of specialist blog websites to reach an interested audience. This may include, but is not limited to, blog updates by the Archaeological Contractor. The Client will maintain full control over the dissemination of all public media outreach and if they wish, may sub-contract this aspect of public dissemination to be managed by the Archaeological Contractor's communications team.

Post-Excavation Assessment Report, Updated Project Design and Publication

- 5.123 Part C of Condition 10 states that once the archaeological site investigations have been undertaken and completed, a *"programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material"* is required. This is to be undertaken as a separate phase of work.
- 5.124 Following on from the Watching Brief Report, further analysis may take the form of a Post-excavation Assessment Report and will include an Updated Project Design (UPD), in accordance with the guidance and standards set out in Historic England's Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The report will incorporate and reference all the results from all other phases of archaeological work that have been undertaken for the Proposed Development.
- 5.125 The Post-excavation Assessment Report and UPD will be submitted to GLAAS within six months of the completion of the archaeological fieldwork. As a minimum the Post-excavation Assessment Report and UPD will present:
- a summary of the project background, original aims and objectives;
- an integrated description of the results by period for each area of archaeological mitigation;
- a quantification of each artefact and ecofact type recovered during the mitigation works;
- an assessment of how the results of the archaeological mitigation address the original and any new research objectives;
- a proposal for a revised set of research objectives;
- recommendations for further analysis and publication (if relevant to the investigation results); and
- a detailed task list and programme for analysis and publication (if relevant to the investigation results).
- 5.126 If detailed analysis and publication are recommended by the UPD, a stage of post-excavation analysis and publication will be required. The post-excavation analysis stage of the project will comprise the detailed quantification, analysis and reporting of the recorded archaeological remains (contextual records), artefacts and ecofacts recovered during the programme of archaeological mitigation. The post-excavation analysis will be undertaken by the Archaeological Contractor supported by external specialists as appropriate.
- 5.127 The programme for analysis and publication will be agreed with the Client, the Consultant and GLAAS.
- 5.128 The format of any publication shall be commensurate with the heritage significance of the archaeological results and will be agreed with the Client, Consultant and GLAAS. Online publication formats as well as traditional publication formats will be considered.
- 5.129 If the results merit it, a popular publication report and illustrated document explaining the results in layman's terms should be produced. The popular report should inform the non-expert audience about the discoveries and their significance in an accessible manner. Popular booklets may be produced both for children and for adult audiences.

Monitoring, Progress Reports and Meetings

- 5.130 The archaeological watching brief will be subject to regular monitoring visits by the Consultant who will have unrestricted access to the site, site records or any other information. The work will be inspected to ensure that it is being carried out to the required standards and that it will achieve the stated objectives.
- 5.131 Weekly written progress reports (via e-mail each Monday by 10.30am) will be provided to the Consultant by the Archaeological Contractor during the archaeological investigation. In addition, the Archaeological Contractor will inform the Consultant on the progress of the fieldwork verbally upon request.
- 5.132 Progress meetings between the Client, Principal Contractor, the Consultant, the GLAAS Archaeological Advisor and the Archaeological Contractor will be held on site during the course of the watching brief, where appropriate. Officers from Historic England will also be invited to attend. These meetings will be arranged by the Consultant.
- 5.133 The Archaeological Contractor will only accept instruction from the Consultant in regard to archaeological matters.

Programme and Resources

- 5.134 The programme and key contacts for the project will be confirmed prior to the start of the watching brief and will be set out in the Archaeological Contractor's Method Statement.
- 5.135 The Principal Contractor will provide the demolition and groundworks programme to the Consultant and the Archaeological Contractor at least two weeks prior to the start of Site works.
- 5.136 The Archaeological Contractor must ensure that they have adequate and appropriate management procedures in place to ensure that risks to the programme timetable (more extensive remains, better preserved deposits, exceptional finds and interruptions from periods of prolonged inclement weather) can be identified at an early stage. These risks will be kept under constant review by the Archaeological Contractor to ensure that the aims and objectives are met within the agreed timetable and budget. The Consultant will be notified at the earliest opportunity of any changes to the methodology or programme of work that arise from review.
- 5.137 Changes or variation to the programme will only be accepted after they have been agreed in writing with the Consultant. The Archaeological Contractor shall give immediate warning to the Consultant should any agreed programme date not be achievable.
- 5.138 All archaeological personnel involved in the project should be suitably qualified and experienced professionals. The Archaeological Contractor shall provide the Consultant with staff CVs of the Project Manager, Site Supervisor and proposed specialists. Site assistants' CVs will not be required, but all site assistants should have an appropriate understanding of excavation procedures.
- 5.139 All staff will be fully briefed and aware of the work required under this specification and will understand the objectives of the investigation and methodologies to be employed.

6. General Project Requirements

Insurances and Health and Safety

- 6.1 The Archaeological Contractor will provide the Consultant with details of their public liability and professional indemnity insurance cover. All archaeological works will follow the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations (2015).
- 6.2 The Archaeological Contractor will have their own Health and Safety policies compiled using national guidelines, which conform to all relevant Health and Safety legislation and good practice. A copy of the Archaeological Contractor's Health and Safety policy will be submitted to the Client and Principal Contractor prior to the start of the archaeological watching brief.
- 6.3 The Archaeological Contractor shall prepare a RAMS and submit this to the Consultant, the Client and the Principal Contractor for approval two weeks prior to the commencement of the fieldwork. The Archaeological Contractor's RAMS will be kept under continuous review throughout the works and updated as necessary.
- 6.4 All staff working on the Site shall undertake HS&E Site inductions provided by the Principal Contractor, prior to starting work on the Site and will have read, understood and signed the Archaeological Contractor's RAMS.
- 6.5 All staff involved in the fieldwork should be CSCS qualified to a minimum standard as an 'Archaeologist Technician' (for Construction Related Occupation cards), Professionally Qualified Person (through accreditation with ClfA) or Academically Qualified Person (through an archaeology degree). Staff CVs will include CSCS qualifications.
- 6.6 All site personnel will receive a site/task specific briefing and will familiarise themselves with the following:
 - site emergency and evacuation procedures;
 - the site's health and safety coordinator;
 - the first aider; and
 - the location of the nearest hospital and doctor's surgery.
- 6.7 The archaeological supervisor will maintain a record of site attendance for each day that there is a team in the field.
- 6.8 The Principal Contractor will confirm to the Archaeological Contractor the minimum PPE requirements for working on Site in their Health & Safety Plan and this will be reflected in the Archaeological Contractor's RAMS. It is expected that all site personnel will wear PPE consisting of hardhat, steel toe-capped boots with mid-sole protection and high-visibility vest or jacket at all times. Additional PPE will be issued by the Archaeological Contractor as required, i.e. goggles, masks, gloves etc. Any visitors to the investigations will require a Site induction in accordance with the Principal Contractor's Health and Safety requirements. In addition, site personnel will ensure that any visitors to the Site are equipped with suitable PPE prior to entry to the Site, and in line with the Principal Contractor's SHE requirements.
- 6.9 All equipment must be 'fit for purpose' and be maintained in a sound working condition that complies with all relevant Health and Safety regulations and recommendations.
- 6.10 Health and Safety considerations will be of paramount importance and will override all other working considerations at all times. This includes all stages of the archaeological works, including Site-based and office-based activities. All anticipated activities should be included in the Archaeological Contractor's RAMS and suitable mitigation measures to reduce the risk of injury be put in place.

Confidentiality and Publicity

6.11 All communication regarding this project is to be directed through the Consultant on behalf of the Client. The Archaeological Contractor will refer all inquiries to the Consultant without making any unauthorised statements or comments. The Archaeological Contractor will not disseminate information or images associated with the project for publicity or information purposes without the prior written consent of the Consultant.

6.12 Publicity regarding the watching brief will be managed by the Client and the Archaeological Contractor on behalf of the Client.

Copyright

- 6.13 The Archaeological Contractor shall assign copyright in all reports, documentation and images produced as part of this project to the Client. The Archaeological Contractor shall retain the right to be identified as the author or originator of the material. This applies to all aspects of the project. It is the responsibility of the Archaeological Contractor to obtain such rights from sub-contracted specialists.
- 6.14 The Archaeological Contractor may apply in writing to use or disseminate any of the project archive or documentation (including images). Such permission will not be unreasonably withheld.
- 6.15 The results of the archaeological works shall be submitted to the Client and GLHER and will ultimately be made available for public access.

General Provisions

6.16 This document is valid for a period of six months, after which it will be reviewed by the Consultant and may need to be revised, updated or amended in order to accommodate changes to policy, legislation, standards and guidance, good practice, changes in design associated with the project or following the results of on-going archaeological fieldwork.

7. References

AECOM. 2020. Oriel Moorfields Eye Hospital-Desk-Based Assessment. Unpublished Document

AECOM. 2021b. Geotechnical and Geo-environmental Interpretive Report for Moorfields Eye Hospital. Unpublished Document

Brown, W. 1912. Open Spaces and Disused Burial Grounds. St Pancras. Town Hall, St Pancras

Burial Act 1857 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/20-21/81/contents

ClfA 2020a. Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, June 2020. https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GWatchingbrief_3.pdf

ClfA 2020b. Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, June 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIFAS%26GArchives_3.pdf

CIfA 2020c. Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, June 2020. <u>https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GWatchingbrief_3.pdf</u>

ClfA. 2022. Code of Conduct: Professional ethics in archaeology. Available online at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2022.pdf

Geology of Britain Viewer. http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html

Giles, J. 1912. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. London. G Bell and Sons

Historic England 2011. Environmental Archaeology: A guide to the theory and practice of methods, from sampling and recovery to post-excavation. Second edition. English Heritage Centre for Archaeology Guidelines, London https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/environmental-archaeology-2nd/

Historic England GLAAS .2015. Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service: Standards for Archaeological Work. Historic England-Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service, London https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/glaas-standards-forarchaeological-work/

Historic England .2015. Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE Project Manger's Guide. Historic England, Swindon https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-managers-guide/

- MoRPHE Project Planning Note 2 (2006) Developing Controlled Terminology
- MoRPHE Project Planning Note 3 (2008) Archaeological Excavations

Historic England. 2018. London Borough of Camden. Archaeological Priority Areas Appraisal. Available online at: https://historicengland.org.uk/content/docs/planning/apa-camden/

MOLA. 2023. Oriel. Interim Report on an Archaeological Evaluation. Unpublished Document

Museum of London. 2009. General Standards for the Preparation of Archaeological Archives Deposited with the Museum of London. <u>https://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/collections/other-collection-databases-and-libraries/museum-london-archaeological-archive/archaeological-research-resources</u>.

MoRPHE 2008. Project Planning Note 3 (2008) Archaeological Excavations. In: Historic England 2015 Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. The MoRPHE Project Manager's Guide. Historic England, Swindon <u>https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-managers-guide/</u>

Millett, M.1990. The Romanization of Britain, Cambridge

Nixon, T, McAdam, E, Tomber, R and Swain, H. (2002). A Research Framework for London Archaeology. https://www.mola.org.uk/research-framework-london-archaeology-2002 Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (Revised) England and Wales <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/77532/TreasureAct1996CodeofPra</u> <u>ctice2ndRevision.pdf</u>

Treasure (Designation) Order 2002. No. 2666 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2002/2666/contents/made

Appendix A - Figures

Figure 1: Site Location Figure 2: Areas of General and targeted Watching Brief Figure 3: Areas of Key Archaeological Interest Figure 4: Known Archaeological Assets Figure 5: Previous Archaeological Events Figure 6: John Rocque Map of London 1746 Figure 7: Greenwood 1827 Map of London Figure 8: Parish Map of 1849 Figure 9: Stanford Map of London 1871 Figure 10: OS Map 1871 Figure 11: 1880 Parish Map Figure 12: 1940 OS Map





ORIEL

CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

1

Red Line

Building Numbers referred to in the text

NOTES

Service Layer Credits: Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2020

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

Site Location Plan

FIGURE NUMBER

Figure 1






CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND



NOTES

Service Layer Credits: Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2020

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

Areas of Archaeological Interest

FIGURE NUMBER











CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

John Rocque 1746

FIGURE NUMBER







CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

Greenwood 1827

FIGURE NUMBER







CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

St Pancras Parish Map 1849

FIGURE NUMBER





CLIENT MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE Stanford 1871

FIGURE NUMBER





2

68.

会

\$<u>\$</u>

£ 216 Frave

Yard

(Disused)



ORIEL

CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

Stanford 1871

FIGURE NUMBER







CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

St Pancras 1880 Parish Map

FIGURE NUMBER







CLIENT

MOORFIELDS EYE HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST

CONSULTANT

AECOM Limited Sunley House 4 Bedford Park Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK www.aecom.com

LEGEND

NOTES

ISSUE PURPOSE

WSI

PROJECT NUMBER

60588325

FIGURE TITLE

FIGURE NUMBER

Appendix B – Standards and Guidance

AAF 2011 Archaeological Archives. A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation. Archaeological Archives Forum https://www.archaeologyuk.org/archives/aaf_archaeological_archives_2011.pdf

AAI&S 1988 The Illustration of Lithic Artefacts: a guide to drawing stone tools for specialist reports. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors Technical Paper 9

AAI&S 1994 The Illustration of Wooden Artefacts: an introduction to the depiction of wooden objects from archaeological excavations. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors Technical Paper 11

AAI&S 1995 The Survey and Recording of Historic Buildings. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors Technical Paper 12

AAI&S 1997 Aspects of Illustration: prehistoric pottery. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors Technical Paper 13

AAI&S n.d. Introduction to Drawing Archaeological Pottery. Association of Archaeological Illustrators and Surveyors, Graphic Archaeology Occasional Papers 1

ACBMG 2002 Ceramic Building Material. Minimum Standards for Recovery, Analysis and Publication. Archaeological Ceramic Building Materials Group https://www.archaeologicalceramics.com/uploads/1/1/9/3/11935072/ceramic_building_material_guidelines.pdf

ACBMG 2004 Draft Minimum Standards for the Recovery, Analysis and Publication of Ceramic Building Material. 3rd edition. Archaeological Ceramic Building Materials Group. URL: http://www.tegula.freeserve.co.uk/acbmg/CBMGDE3.htm

ADCA 2004 Archaeological requirements for works on churches and churchyards. Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists Guidance Note 1 http://www.archaeologyuk.org/adca/documents/ADCAGuidanceNote1.pdf

ADCA 2010 Archaeology and Burial Vaults. A guidance note for churches. Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists Guidance Note 2/Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England (APABE) http://www.archaeologyuk.org/adca/documents/ADCAGuidanceNote2.pdf

ADCA 2010 Dealing with architectural fragments. Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists Guidance Note 3 http://www.archaeologyuk.org/adca/documents/ADCAGuidanceNote3.pdf

ADCA 2014 Fabric recording in Churches and Cathedrals. Association of Diocesan and Cathedral Archaeologists http://www.archaeologyuk.org/adca/documents/FabricRecordConsultationDraftJuly12.doc

Archaeology Data Service & Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice: Niven, K. (ed.) 2013 Caring for Digital Data in Archaeology. Archaeology Data Service /Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice, Oxbow Books

Archaeology Data Service & Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice: Niven Schmidt, A. 2001 Geophysical Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service /Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice, Oxbow Books

ADS 2011 Guides to good practice. Archaeology Data Service, University of York https://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Contents

ADS 2014 Data Management and sharing Plans. Version 2.0 August 2014 Archaeology Data Service, University of York https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/DataManagementPlans

ADS 2020 Archaeology Data Service Guidelines for Depositors. Version 4.0 July 2020. Archaeology Data Service, York. Available at: https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/advice/guidelinesForDepositors.xhtml

AEA 1995 Environmental Archaeology and Archaeological Evaluations. Recommendations concerning the environmental archaeology component of archaeological evaluations in England. Working Papers of the Association for Environmental Archaeology No 2

Aitchison, K 2004 Disaster management planning for archaeological archives. IFA Professional Practice Paper 8, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ifa_paper_8.pdf

ALGAO 2015 Advice Note for Post-Excavation Assessment. Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers, October 2015.

https://www.algao.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/ALGAO_England_PXA_Advice_Note.pdf

AML 1994 A Strategy for the Care and Investigation of Finds. Ancient Monuments Laboratory, English Heritage

APABE/EH 2013 Science and the Dead: A guideline for the destructive sampling of human remains for scientific analysis. Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England/English Heritage http://www.archaeologyuk.org/apabe/Science_and_the_Dead.pdf

APABE 2015 Large Burial Grounds. Guidance on sampling in archaeological fieldwork projects. Advisory Panel on the Archaeology of Burials in England, July 2015

http://www.archaeologyuk.org/apabe/Large_Burial_Grounds.pdf?bcsi_scan_e956bcbe8adbc89f=0&bcsi_scan_fil ename=Large_Burial_Grounds.pdf

APABE 2017 Guidance for Best Practice for the Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England. Second Edition. Advisory Panel for the Archaeology of Burials in England http://www.babao.org.uk/assets/Uploads-to-Web/APABE-ToHREfCBG-FINAL-WEB.pdf

BABAO 2012 BABAO position statement on methods of reburial of human remains. British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology http://www.babao.org.uk/index/reburialissues

BABAO & Historic England 2018 The Role of the Human Osteologist in an Archaeological Fieldwork Project. British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology & English Heritage. https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/role-of-human-osteologist-in-archaeological-fieldworkproject/

BABAO 2019 Code of Ethics. British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology https://www.babao.org.uk/assets/Uploads/BABAO-Code-of-Ethics-2019.pdf

BABAO 2019 Code of Practice. British Association of Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology https://www.babao.org.uk/assets/Uploads/BABAO-Code-of-Practice-2019.pdf

BABAO 2019 BABAO Guidance Document on Digital Imaging: recommendations on the ethical issues surrounding 2D and 3D digital imaging of human remains. British Association of Biological Anthropology. https://www.babao.org.uk/assets/Uploads/BABAO-Digital-imaging-code-2019.pdf

Ballin, TB, 2017 Lithic assemblages. A guide to processing, analysis and interpretation, BAJR Guide 49, available at http://www.bajr.org/BAJRGuides/49_Lithics/49_Lithics_guide.pdf

Barber, B, Carver, J, Hinton, P and Nixon, T 2008 Archaeology and development. A good practice guide to managing risk and maximising benefit. Construction Industry Research and Information Association Report C672

Barclay, A., Knight, D., Booth, P., Evans, J., Brown, D.H. and Wood, I. 2016. A Standard for Pottery Studies in Archaeology. Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group, Study Group for Roman Pottery and Medieval Pottery Research Group https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/standard-for-pottery-studies-in-archaeology/

Barnes, A 2011 'Close-Range Photogrammetry: a guide to good practice', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Photogram_Toc

Baxter, K., Boyle, G. and Creighton, L. 2018. Guidance for the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections. Society for Museum Archaeology

Bayliss, A. 2009. Rolling out Revolution: using radiocarbon dating in archaeology. Radiocarbon, 51, p.123-47

Behre, K.E., 1981. The interpretation of anthropogenic indicators in pollen diagrams. Pollen et Spores 23, 225-45

Bewley, B, Donoghue, D, Gaffney, V, van Leusen, M and Wise, A (rev. Bewley, B and Niven, K) 2011 'Aerial Survey for Archaeology', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/AerialPht_Toc

Bewley, RH 1993 Aerial photography for archaeology, in J Hunter & I Ralston (eds) Archaeological Resource Management in the UK. An Introduction, 197-204, Sutton Publishing, Stroud

Brennan, J. 2008. Rectified photography in The Building Conservation Directory. http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/rectified/rectified.htm

Brewer, P and Jansma, E 2016 Dendrochronological Data in Archaeology: A Guide to Good Practice. V1.1. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Dendro_Toc

Brickley, M and McKinley, JI 2004 Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains. IFA Professional Practice Paper No. 7, British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology and Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading http://www.babao.org.uk/HumanremainsFINAL.pdf

Brickstock, RJ 2004 The Production, Analysis and Standardisation of Romano-British Coin Reports. English Heritage, Swindon https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/production-analysis-and-standardisation-of-romano-british-coin/

Brown, A and Perrin, K 2000 A Model for the Description of Archaeological Archives. Information Management & Collections. English Heritage Centre for Archaeology/Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading http://www.eng-h.gov.uk/archives/archdesc.pdf

Brown, DH 2011 Safeguarding Archaeological Information. Procedures for minimising risk to undeposited archaeological archives. English Heritage https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/safeguarding-archaeological-information/

Brown, DH 2011 Archaeological Archives: A guide to best practice in creation, compilation, transfer and curation. 2nd edition. Institute of Field Archaeologists/Archaeological Archives Forum (Reading) http://www.archaeologyuk.org/archives/aaf_archaeological_archives_2011.pdf

Buikstra, J.E. and Ubelaker D.H. (eds) 1994 Standards for Data Collection from Human Skeletal Remains. Arkansas Archaeological Survey Research Series 44, Fayetteville, Arkansas

CABE Space 2017 A Guide to Producing Park and Green Space Management Plans. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118142340/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/parks-and-green-space-management-plans.pdf

CBI 1991 Archaeological Investigations. Code of Practice for Mineral Operators. Confederation of British Industry http://www.archaeologicalresearchservices.com/CBI%20Arch%20Invest%20Code%20of%20Practice.pdf

CIfA 2014 An introduction to providing career entry training in your organisation. CIfA Professional Practice Paper No. 11, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/node-files/2014.PPP_.Training-toolkit-web_0.pdf

ClfA 2017. An introduction to drawing archaeological pottery ClfA Professional Practice Paper No 10 Revised edition 2017, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfA-A5%20pottery%20paper_final_web.pdf

ClfA 2018 Policy statements (Equal opportunities in archaeology; Health and safety; The use of volunteers and students on archaeological projects; Environmental protection; Self-employment and the use of self-employed sub-contractors; The use of training posts on archaeological project). Revised August 2018. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading

https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Policy%20statements%20revised%20Aug%202018.pdf

ClfA 2019 Toolkit for Selecting Archaeological Archives. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/selection-toolkit

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance for archaeological advice by historic environment services. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GArchadvice_4.pdf ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance. Stewardship of the historic environment. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GStewardship_3.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for commissioning work on, or providing consultancy advice on, archaeology and the historic environment. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GCommissioning_2.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance. Forensic archaeologists. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GForensics_4.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_4.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for archaeological geophysical survey. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GGeophysics_3.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GFieldevaluation_4.pdf

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance for an archaeological watching brief. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfASGWatchingbrief.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for archaeological excavation. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GExcavation_2.pdf

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance for the archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings or structures. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GBuildings_3.pdf

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance for nautical archaeological recording and reconstruction. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GNautical_2.pdf

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological materials. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GFinds_2.pdf

CIfA 2020 Standard and guidance for the creation, compilation, transfer and deposition of archaeological archives. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIFAS%26GArchives_4.pdf

ClfA 2020 Standard and guidance. Appendices (Glossary; Preparation of specification; Contents of project design; Post-excavation project design; Copyright; Selected bibliography; Selected contact addresses). Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2020 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ClfAS%26GAppendices_2.pdf [document no longer being updated so some information may be out of date. It has been retained for reference purposes only]

CIfA 2021. Professional archaeology: a guide for clients 2021. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfA21_FINAL_72dpi_0.pdf

CIfA 2021. CIfA Professional Practice Paper: Delivering public benefit. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Delivering_public_benefit.pdf

CIfA 2022 Selection Toolkit. Archaeological archives from sterile projects. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, July 2022 https://www.archaeologists.net/selection-toolkit/sterile-projects

ClfA 2022. Code of Conduct: professional ethics in archaeology. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading, October 2022 https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20revOct2022.pdf

CIRIA 2021 (Nixon, T, Holloway, C, Geary, K, Hinton, P, King, G) Archaeology and construction: good practice guidance. CIRIA C799. Construction Industry Research and Information Association

CIRIA 2015 Environmental good practice on site (fourth edition). CIRIA C741. Construction Industry Research and Information Association

Clark, J, Darlington, J and Fairclough, G 2004 Using Historic Landscape Characterisation. English Heritage, London https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/using-historic-landscape-characterisation/

Cole, S. 2017 Photographing Historic Buildings. Historic England, Swindon

Conyers, L.B. & Goodman D. 1997. Ground Penetrating Radar, an Introduction for Archaeologists. Altamira Press, London.

Corfield, M., Hinton, P, Nixon, T and Pollard, M (eds) 1998, Preserving Archaeological Remains in situ: Proceedings of the Conference of 1st –3rd April 1996. Museum of London Archaeology Service, London

Countryside Agency 2006 Landscape: beyond the view. A simple guide to understanding the forces and influences that shape our landscapes and their character. Countryscape for Countryside Agency, September 2006 http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/2705143?category=60007

Countryside Agency 2006 Review and evaluation of heritage coasts in England. Land use Consultants for Countryside Agency, April 2006

http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4594438590431232?category=60007

Cox, M 2002 Crypt Archaeology: an approach. Institute of Field Archaeologists Professional Practice Paper No. 3, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/ifa_paper_3.pdf

Crown Estate 2021 Archaeological Written Schemes of Investigation for Offshore Wind Farm Projects. Wessex Archaeology https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/media/3917/guide-to-archaeological-requirements-for-offshore-wind.pdf

Davey PJ 1981 Guidelines for the processing and publication of clay pipes from excavations. Medieval and Later Pottery in Wales IV, 65-87

Davis, M.J., Gdaniec, K.L.A., Bryce, M. and White, L. 2004, Study of the Mitigation of Construction Impacts on Archaeological Remains. Museum of London Archaeology Service (London)

DCMS 2008 Treasure Act 1996 Code of Practice (2nd Revision) England and Wales. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/treasure-act-1996-code-of-practice-2nd-revision-england-and-wales

DCMS 2005 Guidance for the Care of Human Remains in Museums. Department for Culture, Media & Sport http://www.babao.org.uk/assets/Uploads-to-Web/dcmsguide-oct-2005.pdf

Dean, M.L., Ferrari, B.J.F., Oxley, I., Redknap, M., and Watson, K., (eds), 1995, Archaeology Underwater: the NAS guide to principles and practice. Archetype Press and the Nautical Archaeology Society (Second edition)

DigVentures for the Archaeological Archives Forum 2019 Work Digital/Think Archive: a Guide to Managing Digital Data Generated from Archaeological Excavations. https://digventures-thepixelparlour.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/WDTA-Guide-FINAL.pdf

Digital Curation Centre 2013. Checklist for a Data Management Plan. v.4.0. Digital Curation Centre, Edinburgh http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/data-management-plans

Dtl 2005 Department of Trade and Industry, Guidance on the Assessment of the Impact of Offshore Wind Farms: Seascape and Visual Impact Report.

https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20070603164510/http://www.dti.gov.uk/renewables/pdfs/seasc ape_rep.pdf

Highways England. 2019. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 101 Introduction to environmental assessment (formerly HA 200/08, HA 201/08, IAN 125/15, IAN 126/15, IAN 133/10). Revision 0. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/54b0eb69-fd65-4fa5-a86b-7313f70b3649

Highways England. 2019. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 102 Screening projects for Environmental Impact Assessment (formerly HD 47/08, IAN 126/15, IAN 133/10). Revision 0. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/dc73affe-4f24-4077-8637-e79e4fb7b198

Highways England. 2019. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 116 Cultural heritage asset management plans (formerly HA 117/08). Revision 0. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/01e6239c-c81f-4bff-b550-7155547c952a

Highways England. 2020. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 103 Scoping projects for environmental assessment (formerly HA 204/08, IAN 125/15, IAN 133/10). Revision 1. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/fb43a062-65ad-48d3-8c06-374cfd3b8c23

Highways England. 2020. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 104 Environmental assessment and monitoring (formerly HA 205/08, HD 48/08, IAN 125/15, and IAN 133/10). Revision 1. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/0f6e0b6a-d08e-4673-8691-cab564d4a60a

Highways England. 2020. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Appraisal. LA 106 Cultural heritage assessment (formerly HA 208/07, HA 60/92, HA 75/01). Revision 1. https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/8c51c51b-579b-405b-b583-9b584e996c80

Highways England. 2020. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. Sustainability & Environment Design. LD 117 Landscape design. Revision 0 https://www.standardsforhighways.co.uk/dmrb/search/82073bde-ec0c-4d4f-8eeb-afe0ace3c639

DfT & DCLG 2007 Manual for Streets. Department for Transport & Department of Communities and Local Government https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/manual-for-streets

DfT & DCLG 2010 Manual for Streets 2. Department for Transport & Department of Communities and Local Government https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/manual-for-streets-2

Dominic, D.F., Egan, K., Carney, C., Wolfe, P.J. & Boardman, M.R., 1995. Delineation of shallow stratigraphy using ground penetrating radar. Journal of Applied Geophysics 34, 167-175

Eiteljorg, H, Fernie, K, Huggett, J and Robinson, D with Thomason, B 2011 'CAD: A Guide to Good Practice', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Cad_Toc

English Heritage 2012 MIDAS: the UK Historic Environment Data Standard Version 1.1. Best practice guidelines. Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH) http://heritage-standards.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/MIDAS_Heritage_2012_update-_v5.doc

EAC 2014 The Standard and Guide to Best Practice in Archaeological Archiving in Europe. Europae Archaeologia Consilium (EAC) Guidelines 1, Belgium https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/arches/Wiki.jsp?page=Main

FAME 2006 Employment Practice Manual. Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers

FAME 2006 Health and Safety in Field Archaeology Manual. Federation of Archaeological Managers and Employers

Ferguson, L and Murray, D 1997 Archaeological Documentary Archives. IFA Professional Practice Paper 1, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

FISH (2018) Forum on Information Standards in Heritage (FISH) Thesauri

http://www.heritage-standards.org.uk/

http://thesaurus.historicengland.org.uk/

Forestry Commission 2004 Trees and Forestry on Archaeological sites in the UK: A review document. Forest Research, Environmental Research Branch http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FR_archaelogical_review.pdf/\$FILE/FR_archaelogical_review.pdf

Forestry Commission. 2011. The UK Forestry Standard. http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/INFD-8BVECX

Forestry Commission. 2011. UKFS Guidelines on Forests and the Historic Environment. http://www.forestry.gov.uk/website/forestry.nsf/byunique/infd-8bvf2g Forestry Commission 2018 Creating a woodland management plan. https://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-9bmjwe

Gaffney, C and Gater, J with Ovenden, S 2002 The Use of Geophysical Techniques in Archaeological Evaluations. IFA Professional Practice Paper 6, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

The Gardens Trust 2016 The Planning System in England and the Protection of Historic Parks and Gardens. Guidance for Local Planning Authorities

http://www.thegardenstrust.org/uploads/3/4/9/4/34947685/planning_system_in_england_and_protection_of_histo ric_parks_and_gardens_2016_v1.pdf

Gearey, B et al., 2010 Peatlands and the Historic Environment. IUCN UK Peatland Programme http://www.iucn-ukpeatlandprogramme

Gillings, M and Wise, A 2011 'GIS Guide to Good Practice', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Gis_Toc

Gray. S. 2014 UAV Survey: A Guide to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/AerialPht_UAV

Gurney, DA 1985 Phosphate Analysis of Soils: A Guide for the Field Archaeologist. IFA Technical Paper 3, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

HA 2007 Assessing the Effect of Road Schemes on Historic Landscape Character. Halcrow for Highways Agency with English Heritage and Department for Transport (London) http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/assessing-the-effect-of-road-schemes-on-historic-landscape-character/

Handley, M 1999 Microfilming Archaeological Archives. IFA Professional Practice Paper 2, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

Hayfield, C (ed) 1980 Fieldwalking as a Method of Archaeological Research. DoE, Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings, Occasional Papers No. 2, 1980

Haselgrove, C 1985 Inference from ploughsoil artefact samples, in C Haselgrove, M Millett & I Smith (eds) Archaeology from the Ploughsoil. Sheffield University, 7-30

Heritage Lottery Fund 2017 Parks for People management and maintenance plan guidance. October 2017. Heritage Lottery Fund https://www.hlf.org.uk/parks-people-management-and-maintenance-plan-guidance

Heritage Lottery Fund 2017 Conservation plan guidance. September 2017. Heritage Lottery Fund https://www.hlf.org.uk/parks-people-conservation-plan-guidance

Hird, CC, Emmett, KB and Davies, G 2006 Piling in Layered Ground: risks to groundwater and archaeology. Environment Agency Science Report SC020074/SR (Bristol)

Hodgson, J 2001 Archaeological reconstruction: illustrating the past. IFA Professional Practice Paper 5, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Reading

https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/5%20Archaeological%20reconstruction_illustrating%20the%20p ast.pdf

Icon 2014 Icon Professional Standards: The professional standards of the Institute of Conservation (Icon). Institute of Conservation, London http://icon.org.uk/system/files/documents/professional-standards-2016.pdf

IEMA 2021 Principles of Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in the UK. July 2021. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists / Institute of Historic Building Conservation / Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment https://www.iema.net/resources/blog/2021/07/20/launch-of-principles-of-cultural-heritage-impact-assessment

Lambert, D, Goodchild, P & Robert, J 2006 Parks and Gardens. A Researcher's Guide to Sources for Designed Landscapes. Landscape Design Trust/English Heritage.

LI & IEMA 2013 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment, Third Edition. Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, Routledge

Longworth, C and Wood, B 2000 Standards in Action Book 3: working with archaeology guidelines. Society of Museum Archaeologists/ Museum Documentation Association

McDermott, A 2004 Wallpapers in the historic interior. Building Conservation Directory. http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/wallpapers/wallpapers.htm

McKinley, JI and Roberts, C 1993 Excavation and Post-excavation Treatment of Cremated and Inhumed Human Remains. Institute of Field Archaeologists Technical Paper No. 13, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/13_Cremation.pdf

Mitchell, PD & Brickley, M (eds.) 2017 Updated guidelines to the standards for recording human remains. ClfA Professional Practice Paper, British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology and Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading

http://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/14_Updated%20Guidelines%20to%20the%20Standards%20for% 20Recording%20Human%20Remains%20digital.pdf

MPRG 2000 A Guide to the Classification of Medieval Ceramics. Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Papers No. 1

MPRG 2001, Minimum Standards for the Processing, Recording, Analysis and Publication of Post-Roman Ceramics. Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper No. 2 http://www.medievalpottery.org.uk/docs/Standards.pdf

Natural England 2012 An Approach to Seascape Character Assessment. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR105. Natural England, October 2012

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/396177/seascape-character-assessment.pdf

Natural England 2014 An approach to landscape character assessment. NE579. Natural England, October 2014 https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/396192/landscape-character-assessment.pdf

Nixon, T (ed) 2004 Preserving Archaeological Remains in situ. Proceedings of the 2nd Conference, 12–14 September 2001. Museum of London Archaeology Service (London)

Owen, J 1995 Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive. The Transfer of archaeological archives to museums. Guidelines for use in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Society of Museum Archaeologists http://www.socmusarch.org.uk/docs/towardsaccessiblearchive.pdf

Payne, A 2011 'Laser Scanning for Archaeology: a guide to good practice', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/LaserScan_Toc

Perrin, K., Brown, D.H., Lange, G., Bibby, D., Carlsson, A., Degraeve, A., Kuna, M., Larsson, Y., Pálsdóttir, S.U., Stoll-Tucker, B., Dunning, C. and Rogalla Von Bieberstein, A. 2014 The Standard and Guide to Best Practice for Archaeological Archiving in Europe (EAC Guidelines 1)

http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/arches/Wiki.jsp?page=The%20Standard%20and%20Guide%20to%20Best% 20Practice%20in%20Archaeological%20Archiving%20in%20Europe

Peters L., Daniels, J.J. & Young J.D., 1994. Ground Penetrating Radar as a subsurface environmental sensing tool. Proceedings of the IEEE 82, 1802-1822

Phillips, T and Creighton, J 2010 Employing people with disabilities: good practice guidance for archaeologists. IfA Professional Practice Papers No 9, Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Disabilitypaper.pdf

Philo, C and Swann, A 1992 Preparation of Artwork for Publication. Institute of Field Archaeologists Technical Paper No. 10, Reading

Roberts, C. A. and Connell, B. 2004 'Guidance on recording palaeopathology.', in Guidelines to the standards for recording human remains. Southampton; Reading: British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology and Institute of Field Archaeologists, pp. 34-39. IFA papers 7 https://dro.dur.ac.uk/6160/

RFG and FRG, 1993 Guidelines for the Preparation of Site and Assessments for all Finds other than Fired Clay Vessels. Roman Finds Group and Finds Research Group

Robinson, W 1998 First Aid for Underwater Finds. Archetype Books, London

Schmidt, A, Linford, P, Linford, N, David, A, Gaffney, C, Sarris, A & Fassbinder, J 2016 EAC Guidelines for the Use of Geophysics in Archaeology. Questions to Ask and Points to Consider. Europae Archaeologia Consilium (EAC), Belgium ttps://www.europae-archaeologiae-consilium.org/eac-guidlines h

Schofield, AJ (ed) 1998 Interpreting Artefact Scatters. Oxbow Monograph 4, Oxford

SGRP 1994 Guidelines for the Archiving of Roman Pottery. Study Group for Roman Pottery http://www.romanpotterystudy.org/SGRPPublications/GuidelinesArchivingRomanPot.pdf

Schmidt, A and Ernenwein, E 2011 'Guide to Good Practice: geophysical data in archaeology (2nd Edition)', in Archaeology Data Service / Digital Antiquity Guides to Good Practice. Archaeology Data Service, York http://guides.archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/g2gp/Geophysics_Toc#section-Geophysics_Toc-ByArminSchmidtAndEileenErnenwein

SMA/Historic England (Baxter K., Boyle G., and Creighton. L.) 2018. Guidance on the Rationalisation of Museum Archaeology Collections. Society for Museum Archaeology on behalf of Historic England. https://socmusarch.org.uk/projects/guidance-on-the-rationalisation-of-museum-archaeology-collections/

SMA 2020. Standards and Guidance in the Care of Archaeological Collections. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Material Factsheets: Botanical Materials. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Ceramics. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Collections Packaging & Silica Gel. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Composite Objects. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Faunal Materials. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Glass. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Human Remains. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Leather. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Metals (Ferrous). Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Metals (Non-Ferrous). Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Stone. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Textiles. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Thin Sections. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

SMA 2020. Waterlogged Materials. Society for Museum Archaeology http://socmusarch.org.uk/training/smart-project/

Spectrum 2017. Spectrum 5.0: the UK Collections Management Standard. Collections Trust https://collectionstrust.org.uk/spectrum/

Stanbridge, R 2005 Photogrammetry: A Practical Guide in The Building Conservation Directory. http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/photogram/photogrammetry.htm

Taylor, J 2000 Dendrochronology in Dating Timber Framed Buildings and Structures in The Building Conservation Directory. http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/dendrochron/dendro.htm

Theimer, B.D., Nobes, D.C. & Warner, B.G., 1994. A study of the geo-electrical properties of peatlands and their influence on ground-penetrating radar surveying. Geophysical Prospecting 42, 179-209

Tomber, R, and Dore, J, 1998 The national Roman fabric reference collection: a handbook, MoLAS Monograph 2. Available online: http://www.molas.org.uk/projects/fabrics_tei.asp

UKIC 1983 Packaging and Storage of Freshly Excavated Artefacts from Archaeological Sites. (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, Conservation Guidelines No 2)

UKIC 1984 Environmental Standards for Permanent Storage of Excavated material from Archaeological Sites. (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, Conservation Guidelines No 3)

UKIC 1990 Guidance for Conservation Practice. United Kingdom Institute for Conservation

UKIC 1990 Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for Long-term Storage. United Kingdom Institute for Conservation Archaeology Section

UKIC 2001 Excavated Artefacts and Conservation. (United Kingdom Institute for Conservation, Conservation Guidelines No 1, revised)

WAC 1989 The Vermillion Accord – Human Remains. Motion Approved at the First Inter-Congress on the Disposal of the Dead. World Archaeology Congress, Vermillion, South Dakota

Wait, G. 2017 An Introduction to Professional Ethics. ClfA Professional Practice Paper. Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/03.%20 ClfA%20Ethics%20Practice%20Paper%20digital.pdf

Watkins, J & Wright, T. (eds) 2007 The Management and Maintenance of Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes. The English Heritage Handbook . English Heritage, Frances Lincoln

Watkinson, DE and Neal, V 2001 First Aid for Finds. RESCUE/United Kingdom Institute for Conservation

Watson, S. et al. 2021 Delivering public benefit. CIfA Professional Practice Paper, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/Delivering_public_benefit.pdf

Willis, S 1997 (ed) Research Frameworks for the Study of Roman Pottery. Study Group for Roman Pottery

Wilson, DR 2000 Air Photo Interpretation for Archaeologists. Tempus Publishing, Stroud

Wiseman, J & El-Baz, F 2007 Remote Sensing in Archaeology. Interdisciplinary Contributions to Archaeology. Springer. New York

Young C 1980 Guidelines for the Processing and Publication of Roman Pottery. Department of the Environment

Other sources of relevant Standards include http://www.isgap.org.uk/

Appendix C – Archaeological Evaluation Interim Report



ORIEL St Pancras Hospital 4 St Pancras Way London NW1 OPE

LB Camden

INTERIM REPORT ON AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

January 2023

Author: Sam Pfizenmaier



Museum of London Archaeology Mortimer Wheeler House 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED Tel 020 7410 2270 https://www.mola.org.uk general enquiries: <u>enquiries@mola.org.uk</u>

Oriel St Pancras Hospital 4 St Pancras Way London NW1 OPE

Site Code PWY22 NGR 29649 83650 OASIS reference molas (to follow)

Planning reference: 2020/4825/P Condition Number 10

Interim report on an archaeological evaluation

Sign-off History:

Issue No.	Date:	Prepared by:	Checked/Approved by:	Reason for Issue:
1	23.01.2023	Sam Pfizenmaier	Gwilym Williams	First issue
		Author	Project Manager	
2	30.01.2023	Sam Pfizenmaier	Gwilym Williams	Second issue, following
		Author	Project Manager	consultant's comments

Graphics: Catherine Drew

© MOLA

Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1 7ED tel 0207 410 2200 Unit 2, Chineham Point, Crockford Lane, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG24 8NA, tel: 01256 587320

email <u>business@mola.org.uk</u>

MOLA 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

Summary

This is an interim report focused on the provisional archaeological findings from an evaluation undertaken by MOLA (Museum of London Archaeology) at St Pancras Hospital, 4 St Pancras Way.

Three trenches uncovered structural remains, including basements and brick floors, of at least 2 phases of brick building, assumed to be the remains of the St Pancras workhouse that occupied the entire site from the early 19th century until being partly destroyed during WW2 and subsequently levelled by 1951-2.

The primary phase of workhouse dates from 1809 and roughly fronted St Pancras Way (originally Kings Road) with two shorter wings to the north and south. The evaluation has demonstrated that the Investigated parts of this earlier building were basemented, corresponding with historic photographs, and potentially remain preserved beneath the shallow foundations of buildings currently occupying the western side of the site.

This report concludes post-medieval structural remains of moderate significance will be impacted upon by the proposed sitewide 3m ground reduction.

A mitigation strategy will be in place prior to ground reduction, which will involve an excavation targeted on the primary phase of workhouse with a sitewide watching brief on the later phases of the workhouse and latterly hospital until the 1940s.

Contents

<u>Sun</u>	Summary	
<u>Con</u>	ntents	2
<u>1</u>	Introduction	3
<u>2</u>	Evaluation methodology	4
<u>3</u>	Results of the evaluation	5
<u>4</u>	Archaeological potential	15
<u>5</u>	Proposed development impact and conclusions	16

List of Figs

Fig 1 Interventions overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map	17
Fig 2 Archaeological features in Trench 1 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map	18
Fig 3 Archaeological features in Trench 2 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map	18
Fig 4 Archaeological features in Trench 3 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map	18
List of Photos	
Photo 1 Trench1, East-west wall [8] (centre) with narrow walls [6] running off to north an	ıd [4]
to south, looking south (scale 1m) 6	
Photo 2 Trench 1, walls [14], [12], [16] and [18] - all truncated by the more massive 20th	ר-
century wall [2], looking south. 7	
Photo 3 Trench 2, Walls [20] and [21], with possible doorway-bottom left leading south,	brick
rubble [24] had been used to backfill the basement, looking west. 8	
Photo 4 Trench 2, substantial rendered wall [22], truncated by a 20th-century access	
chamber, looking west. 9	
Photo 5 Trench 2, Possible doorway at western end of basement wall [23], looking east.	
9	
Photo 6 Trench 3, wall [29] and associated brick floor [28] forming part of the Masters O	ffice,

Photo 6 Trench 3, wall [29] and associated brick floor [28] forming part of the Masters Office, possibly one of a series of similar narrow rooms – with 20th-century rubble backfill [25], looking north.

Photo 7 Trench 3 east end showing substantial foundation wall [27] and later southern addition [27], looking north-east.

Photo 8 Trench 3, foreground walls [26] and [27], with the backfilled basement room beyond the large truncation, looking west. 11

Photo 9 Trial Pit 3b, after partial backfilling, looking south.12Photo 13 Paw print form a domestic dog on edge of a brick from wall [26].13

1 Introduction

1.1 Site background

- 1.1.1 An archaeological evaluation was carried out by MOLA, under the supervision of the author, at St Pancras Hospital, 4 St Pancras Way ('the site'), London, between 15 December 2022 and 17 January 2023 (see Fig 1). The centre of the site lies at National Grid reference 29649 83650.
- 1.1.2 This document is an interim report on that work. A full report will follow.

1.2 Planning background

1.2.1 The planning and legislative background to the site was set out in the AECOM WSI (2022). To summarise:

The planning submission (Planning ref: 20/00214/FULMAJ) was subject to two archaeological conditions (Conditions 10 and 11). The evaluation works were undertaken to address Condition 10, which stated:

Condition 10

Archaeological evaluation shall be carried out in order to compile archaeological records in accordance with a timetable and scheme of such archaeological work submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any commencement of development works.

1.3 Scope of the evaluation

- 1.3.1 Evaluation is defined by Historic England as intended to provide information about the archaeological resource in order to contribute to the:
 - formulation of an appropriate response or mitigation strategy to planning applications or other proposals which may adversely affect such archaeological remains, or enhance them; and/or
 - formulation of a proposal for further archaeological investigations within a programme of research
- 1.3.2 An archaeological evaluation is a limited fieldwork exercise designed to test the conclusions of preliminary desk-based work. It is not the same as full excavation.
- 1.3.3 The evaluation was carried out within the terms of the relevant Standard for evaluation specified by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA, 2020).
- 1.3.4 All work has been undertaken within the research priorities established in the Museum of London's *A research framework for London Archaeology*, 2002 and *A strategy for researching the historic environment of Greater London*.
- 1.3.5 All work was undertaken within research aims and objectives established in the Written Scheme of Investigation for the evaluation (Section 2).

2 Evaluation methodology

2.1 Field methodology

- 2.1.1 Three evaluation trenches were excavated between 0.7 and 1.8m deep prior to demolition of low-rise standing buildings (Fig 1).
- 2.1.2 A small trial pit (3b) was excavated to 1m bgl, at this depth a significant quantity of Asbestos was uncovered restricting further excavation (Fig 1).
- 2.1.3 Trial pit 3a was descoped as it was decided on site that Trench 3 (with extension) had evaluated the immediate area (Fig 1).
- 2.1.4 Archaeological excavation of all trenches was carried out in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation (AECOM 2022).
- 2.1.5 Trench locations were located on site by MOLA Geomatics and subsequently tied into the OS grid.
- 2.1.6 Where referenced in this report, levels (eg '1.2m OD') relate to OS Ordnance Datum and were either taken from a service plan or generated onsite by MOLA geomatics.

2.2 Recording methodology

2.2.1 A written and drawn record of all archaeological deposits encountered was carried out in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation (AECOM 2022).

2.3 Site archive

Number of trench record sheets	3
Number of overall location plans	
Number of Context (SU) sheets	31
Number of photographs	40
Number of Plan sheets	6
Number of Sections	1

3 Results of the evaluation

3.1 Trench 1 (Fig 2)

Location	North-western area of site
Dimensions	N-S 12.2m, E-W 8.5m 0.5-0.75m deep
Modern ground level/top of slab	21.91m OD
Base of modern fill/slab/turf	21.40m OD
Depth of archaeological	1.2m (localised), potentially c. 0.5m in
stratigraphy above natural (if any)	places
Level of base of lowest features or	Redeposited clay-silt natural with frequent
deposits observed	CBM - possibly mixed in with drain run at
	20.05m OD
Top of surviving natural observed at	Not observed
Level of base of trench	21.29m OD

- Trench 1 was located immediately east of the two-storey Bloomsbury Building, 3.1.1 constructed in 1972. The Bloomsbury Building was terraced into the land on which Trench 1 was located. This raised area comprised flower beds along its northern edge, a concrete path running down the central area with trees and shrubs bordering to the east. This trench was not intentionally located over the later phase of workhouse (c 1871), as the location was dictated by access and extant buildings, however historic mapping suggests that this area was exterior to and immediately north of the earlier phase, and therefore it was not expected to be found here.
- 3.1.2 MOLA reduced an area measuring 12m N-S by 8.5m E-W down to surviving historic structures - all brick walls dating from the 19th and 20th centuries. Modern post-WW2 deposits sealed these walls.
- 3.1.3 The earliest wall stratigraphically was [8] (Photo 1), which ran NE-SW for over 6m, with a width of 0.36m and formed from whole red and yellow stock bricks with a layer of slate as a damp-proof course. It extended beyond the LOE to the east and was truncated by the later Victorian drain to the west. This wall when overlaid onto the 1871 OS map relates well with the southern exterior wall of the structure marked 'Oakum Rooms (females)'. Three narrow and shallow walls [6] ran off it at a right angle to the north of [8], possibly representing internal partitions. A further section of wall [4] abutted [8] to the south also at a right-angle, probably an exterior garden/retaining wall.
 - Further south a series of walls [14], [12], [16] and [18] appeared roughly 3.1.4 contemporary but were focused on a different alignment, nearer E-W (Photo 2.) This structure continued beyond the south LOE and consisted of 3 narrow sections of wall radiating out from a central larger square block or plinth [14], an 'L' shaped section of wall immediately to the east [12] was formed from similar bricks. Further north two sections of wall (both truncated) [16] and [18] continued on the same alignment. Together these walls are assumed contemporary and were constructed from reused red and yellow stock bricks, with some small variation in mortar. The alignment of these walls/structure is not consistent with any building visible on historic mapping and therefore at this stage their purpose remains unclear. They may possibly be the remains of a garden feature.



Photo 1 Trench1, East-west wall [8] (centre) with narrow walls [6] running off to north and [4] to south, looking south (scale 1m)

- 3.1.5 Walls [14] and [12] formed a square structure (Photo 2), which was subsequently utilised as a rubbish pit. The fill [1] consisted of a compact black-brown sandy silt and contained a variety of late 19th-century, apparently domestic, rubbish, including: ceramic plates and cups, a bone toothbrush, Tobacco pipes as well as food waste, including: oyster shell and animal bone.
- 3.1.6 As the relationship between walls [14] and [12] with the walls to the north is unclear they have been described as if subsequent to the construction of the Female Wards and Oakum Rooms (Females) shown on the 1871 map. It is of course very likely that these represent a phase not recorded in cartographic sources, between Greenwood (1827) and the OS Town Map of 1871, which it should be noted differs markedly from Stanford's map of the same year (1871, not shown). The Town Map does show parts of the Oakum Rooms (Females) at an angle not dissimilar to these walls, and so might represent an intermediate phase of workhouse.
- 3.1.7 A large well-preserved Victorian access chamber survived in the northern area of the trench; an associated drain run ran to the south truncating all earlier structures (particularly [8]).
- 3.1.8 A small square brick soakaway [10] formed from whole and half brick bricks truncated the south-western corner of [12]. All these features were truncated by a larger 'L' shaped wall [2] formed from red and yellow frogged bricks-bonded with an hard concrete mortar evidently 20th century in date. This distinctive wall identifiable on the 1916 county series map (not reproduced here) is exterior to a building immediately to the west, it may be a retaining wall that continues into Trench 2 as [30].

3.1.9 A section of wall, with dark red, glazed bricks, in the north-west excavation area is all that survives of an earlier phase of 20th-century retaining wall. Similar walls faced with red glazed bricks can be seen in the western ground/lower ground floor extension to Ash House in the centre-east of the site.



Photo 2 Trench 1, walls [14], [12], [16] and [18] – all truncated by the more massive 20th-century wall [2], looking south.

3.2 Trench 2 (Fig 3)

Location	North-west
Dimensions	N-S 16m by E-W 4.5, depth- top step 1.2m bgl
	20.91m OD, base max 1.85m bgl (bottom step)
	20.20m OD
Modern ground level/top of slab	22.59m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	Mixed deposit-concrete/ shingle/terram (bases
	for bike shed) 0.3m
Depth of archaeological stratigraphy	Observed within s slot to <i>c</i> 2m bgl- <i>c</i> 20.00m OD-
above natural (if any)	still mixed clay silt and CBM
Level of base of lowest features or	sondage - <i>c</i> 20.00m OD
deposits observed	
Top of surviving natural observed at	-0.95m OD
Level of base of trench	-0.6m OD

3.2.1 This trench, which was positioned between buildings in a narrow strip previously used as a bike park, targeted the northern wing of the earlier workhouse, where the

'Females Wards' is believed to have been located. A series of walls aligned NE-SW, running across the trench corresponded well with the surviving workhouse plan (WSI Fig 2). It was evident that all faces exposed had been rendered, with some having also been painted, and that this early phase of building was basemented in this location. The results discussed below suggest that Trench 2 was located entirely over deep basements.



Photo 3 Trench 2, Walls [20] and [21], with possible doorway-bottom left leading south, brick rubble [24] had been used to backfill the basement, looking west.

- 3.2.2 A broad structural wall [20] constructed from whole red bricks ran along the northern trench edge, 0.45m bgl (Photo 3). The southern face of the wall was rendered, with the northern beyond the LOE. To the south a similar wall [21] was rendered along its northern and eastern face. Although heavily truncated by wall [30] enough survived of [21] to show that there was a possible doorway heading south, into further basements.
- 3.2.3 Further excavation to the south revealed a similar wall [22] at 20.96m OD rendered on both faces, with some blue paint surviving (Photo 4).
- 3.2.4 The wall [23] was recorded 2.3m further to the south, again rendered and painted blue. A break at the western end of [23] appeared to be another doorway (Photo 5).
- 3.2.5 Most of the excavated area of the trench revealed masses of demolished materials, comprising loose building rubble [24], consisting of bricks, mortar and also occasional sections of glass and metal. This deposit backfilled the basements and was likely a mixture of bomb damage and post-war demolition/levelling of the standing walls. A section was excavated between walls [21] and [22] to establish the surviving floor level, however no floor was evident at a depth of 2m bgl (*c.* 20.00m OD). This suggests that the sondage was not deep enough, but that the floor subsists; or that the floor had been robbed-out prior to backfilling.
- 3.2.6 Retaining wall [30] appears on the 1916 county series map and is most likely a continuation of wall [2] from Trench 1.
- 3.2.7 A series of deep and robust drains and access chambers had caused some damage

to the underlying basement walls along the western side of the trench; however, the walls were substantial enough to survive *in situ*.



Photo 4 Trench 2, substantial rendered wall [22], truncated by a 20th-century access chamber, looking west.



Photo 5 Trench 2, Possible doorway at western end of basement wall [23], looking east.

3.3 Trench 3 (Fig 4)

South-west
N-S 3.70m by E-W 10.1, max depth 1.7m
20.36m OD
Unmortared paving slabs, sand and garden soil
to 19.80m OD
1.2m max
18.60m OD
Possibly within a narrow slot at 18.5m OD
18.98m OD

- 3.3.1 Trench 3 was located over the earliest phase of workhouse, in an area labelled the 'Masters Office, although there seems here to be a variety of different sized rooms, likely of various uses.
- 3.3.2 Within a narrow slot at the base of the trench a light yellowish-brown silty clay [31] was exposed at 18.50m OD, provisionally recorded as natural geology.
- 3.3.3 The central and western parts of the trench were over a backfilled room, possibly a half-basement or partially subterranean room (Photo 6). A substantial wall [29] ran

down the centre of the trench surviving 0.6m bgl (top at 19.69m OD), constructed from whole red bricks and bonded with a soft grey-brown lime mortar 13 courses survived. An associated brick floor [28] formed from whole bricks laid on edge survived to the south at 18.98m OD. Bricks from both structures appeared reused and dated to after 1700 (Han Li *pers comms*).

3.3.4 This floor and wall, which were covered in a dark sooty/coal residue, both continued beyond the western and southern LOE of the evaluation trench and had been truncated to the east. The northern face of [29] was only partially exposed, but this also appeared sooted, suggesting this was an internal wall. Currently, this wall when overlaid onto the 1871 OS town map floats west of the main façade over the entrance steps. It is unlikely but not impossible that the workhouse basement extended beyond the main façade, it is more likely that these rooms are beneath the main entrance hall/corridor.



Photo 6 Trench 3, wall [29] and associated brick floor [28] forming part of the Masters Office, possibly one of a series of similar narrow rooms – with 20th-century rubble backfill [25], looking north.

- 3.3.5 Two brick walls were recorded at the eastern end of the trench (Photo 7; Photo 8), although not stratigraphically related both appeared later in material and construction to the backfilled room to the west. The earlier wall [27] measured 0.47m thick (two brick lengths) and over 1.37m long surviving 0.3m below ground surface at 20.04m and continuing into the northern LOE. Wall [27] was constructed from whole red and yellow bricks with a very hard lime mortar, two offsets were visible along the exposed western edge, suggesting this was the corner foundation for a substantial upstanding wall.
- 3.3.6 In contrast wall [26] (see 3.5.2) was shallow and poorly constructed. This had been roughly bonded onto [27] and sat on a very loose unconsolidated brick rubble. A brick with the pawprint of a dog was recovered from this wall.
- 3.3.7 The eastern third of the trench appeared to have been truncated by a relatively modern, deep and vertically sided cut, of unclear function. Modern drains were also evident immediately east of [26] and [27] running across and along the south-east corner of the trench.



Photo 7 Trench 3 east end showing substantial foundation wall [27] and later southern addition [27], looking north-east.



Photo 8 Trench 3, foreground walls [26] and [27], with the backfilled basement room beyond the large truncation, looking west.

3.4 Trial pit 3b

Location	Against standing wall of
Dimensions	N-S 2.05m by E-W 1.98 depth 1m max
Modern ground level/top of slab	C 1m OD
Base of modern fill/slab	Slab 0.75m thick 0.25m OD
Depth of archaeological stratigraphy	<i>c</i> 0.3m
above natural (if any)	
Level of base of lowest features or	-0.66m OD
deposits observed	
Top of surviving natural observed at	Foreshore deposits exposed at -0.55m OD
Level of base of trench	-1.0m OD



Photo 9 Trial Pit 3b, after partial backfilling, looking south.

3.4.1 Trial pit 3b was excavated to 1m bgl then backfilled due to the presence of asbestos. The remains of a ceramic toilet were also visible at this depth- taken together this suggests these are possibly the remains of an outdoor toilet block constructed from asbestos sheeting. No structural remains were exposed at this depth. The foundations of the adjacent single-storey late 20th-century brick building (see above) were found to be stepped and 0.5m deep.

3.5 The Finds

- 3.5.1 The building material has been provisionally assessed by Han Li (MOLA ceramic building material specialist). The majority of the bricks appeared to have been reused, some displaying multiple types of mortar. The earliest bricks from wall [29] and associated floor [28] dated to after 1700. The remainder all dated to after 1750, with some likely to be later 19th century as they were bonded by a very hard concrete mortar.
- 3.5.2 Of particular interest was a paw print (Alan Pipe *pers comms*) from a domestic dog


(Canis lupus familiaris) on the edge of a brick taken from wall [26] (Photo 10).

Photo 10 Paw print form a domestic dog on edge of a brick from wall [26].

3.5.3 Pottery, clay pipes and accessioned finds will be discussed in the full evaluation report.

3.6 The site as a whole

- 3.6.1 Archaeological preservation across the site was relatively good, although there were significant deep services within Trench 1 and 2 and a deep excavation in Trench 3. However, outside the standing buildings structural remains survive at relatively shallow depths, in Trenches 2 and 3 only 0.3m below ground level, and in Trench 1 at a depth of 0.6mbgl.
- 3.6.2 Multiple phases of workhouse were recorded; within the constraints of the evaluation only a limited understanding of the relationships between walls was possible. Nonetheless, an outline chronology of the structures identified was possible.
- 3.6.3 The apparently earliest wall in Trench 3 was constructed from materials (bricks) and a mortar that suggest construction in the early 19th century, which would place it between the publication of Thomson's map in 1801 and Greenwod's map of 1827. This corresponds with the known date for the erection of the workhouse in 1809. These remains along with the substantial rendered walls in Trench 2 suggest that the primary phase of workhouse was at least partially (and very possibly entirely) basemented.
- 3.6.4 A photograph of 1889 (https://www.workhouses.org.uk/StPancras/) shows that the main range was indeed basemented, and there is no reason, at present to believe the rest of the contemporary early 19th-century buildings on the site were not constructed the same. The same website notes that in 1812 an infirmary was added

to the nascent complex, pre-dating the infirmary of 1848, shown on the 1871 map.

- 3.6.5 This has wider implications for preservation across the site if, as it would appear, the primary phase of workhouse survives to a greater depth than any later phases (these were shown to be of modest preservation and shallow survival in Trench 1). For example, it is possible that basements survive to some extent beneath the Bloomsbury Building (1972) currently occupying the north-western corner of the site. This area is noted as the 'Chapel' on the earlier phase plan, although it should be noted this likely refers to the ground floor.
- 3.6.6 In such an eventuality, the earliest phase of the workhouse could feasibly extend the length of the development on its north-south axis, extending the full depth back from the western frontage of the workhouse building to the east.
- 3.6.7 Later additions to the workhouse complex appear to be of shallower construction. As a result, the remains of the later workhouse are more fragile and therefore more susceptible to unanticipated impacts during unmonitored groundworks than the earlier remains.
- 3.6.8 Unlike the earlier workhouse complex, it would not appear, from the results of the evaluation, that any floor levels from the later complex subsist in the vicinity of Trenches 1 and 2. However, this is not to disregard the possibility of localised survival elsewhere.

4 Archaeological potential

4.1 General discussion of potential

- 4.1.1 The evaluation has shown that the potential for further survival of post-medieval structural remains-particularly basements associated with multiple phases of late Georgian/Victorian workhouse is high across the site. Foundation depths across the site are not currently well understood, but the earliest phase of workhouse would appear to be basemented.
- 4.1.2 No evidence was found for burials associated with the workhouse, although it should be noted that most of the areas evaluated were either far from the burial grounds to the south (Trench 1) or entirely within buildings Trenches 2 and 3.
- 4.1.3 No evidence was found for deposits pre-dating the development of the site and no residual pottery or finds earlier than the 19th century were recovered.

4.2 Significance

- 4.2.1 Well-preserved structural remains associated with multiple phases of workhouse from 1809 onwards were recorded across the site, these are currently deemed of low to medium significance.
- 4.2.2 The latest phase of workhouse *c*. 1871 appears to be unbasemented and no comparable floor levels survived; these remains give little insight into the lives of those who occupied the workhouse and are therefore of limited significance.

4.3 Assessment of the evaluation

- 4.3.1 The evaluation consisted of 3 large trenches covering an area of 211m² (approximately 0.2% of total area-estimated at *c.* 10,000m²) located with a bias to the north-western area of the site.
- 4.3.2 Given the consistent results from each trench it is highly likely that an accurate picture of the underlying stratigraphy preservation has been achieved, and that the evaluation has produced an accurate reflection of archaeological survival, as the sequence of deposits recorded within each intervention is consistent and relatively predictable.

5 Proposed development impact and conclusions

- 5.1.1 The current building scheme involves sitewide ground reduction of 3m resulting in the complete removal/destruction of archaeological remains across the site.
- 5.1.2 MOLA therefore concludes that further archaeological work will be necessary in response to the new development. This would involve a controlled archaeological excavation targeted over the primary phase of workhouse, and a watching brief to cover further ground reduction.
- 5.1.3 Further mitigation may be required if significant deposits are identified during the watching brief. These could include pits containing rubbish associated with the inhabitants of the workhouse, or earlier features such as drainage ditches, or indeed early phases of the workhouse which were subsequently replaced.
- 5.1.4 The decision on the need for archaeological mitigation to the deposits revealed rests with the Local Planning Authority.



Fig 4 Archaeological features in Trench 3 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map



Fig 3 Archaeological features in Trench 2 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map



Fig 2 Archaeological features in Trench 1 overlaid onto St Pancras 1871 OS Town Map



aecom.com

ecom.com