

## 14. Archaeology (Buried Heritage)

### Introduction

- 14.1 This Chapter, which has been prepared by RPS Consulting Services UK Ltd presents an assessment of the likely significant effects and likely residual effects (accounting for recommended mitigation) of the Development on archaeological (buried heritage) resources within the Site.
- 14.2 This Chapter provides a description of the methods used in the assessment and the relevant baseline conditions of the Site. This is followed by an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Development during the demolition, alteration, refurbishment and construction works (the Works). Where appropriate, mitigation measures are identified to avoid, reduce or offset any likely significant adverse effects. Taking account of the mitigation measures, the likely nature and significance of the residual effects are described.
- 14.3 As agreed with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT) through the 2018 EIA scoping process (see **Appendix 2.1: EIA Scoping Report** and **Appendix 2.4: EIA Scoping Opinion**), no assessment was undertaken (or is, indeed necessary) in relation to the completed and operational Development. This is because likely effects to archaeology would result from intrusive ground works only. These would be limited to the Works. Accordingly, there would be no archaeological effects associated with the completed and operational Development.
- 14.4 The preparation of this Chapter has been informed by a below ground Desk Based Archaeological Assessment (DBA), which is presented in **Appendix 14.1**, together with the results of archaeological evaluation and monitoring fieldwork, the report for which is presented at **Appendix 14.2**.
- 14.5 It should be noted that the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Development upon above ground built heritage is presented in **Chapter 15: Built Heritage**.

### Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

#### Assessment Methodology

- 14.6 No standard EIA methodologies exist for heritage and archaeological assessment. However, assessment methodology has been guided by various published documents including: English Heritage's Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance<sup>11</sup>, the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning Advice Note 3<sup>22</sup> and the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges 2019<sup>33</sup>. Although the latter was designed as best-practice for road schemes in particular, it is accepted as best-practice for the assessment of cultural heritage in relation to archaeology, listed buildings and historic landscapes.
- 14.7 This Chapter and supporting documentation have been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the EIA regulations<sup>4</sup>, guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>5</sup> (2021) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>6</sup>, guidance provided by Historic England (Good Practice Advice Documents 2015 and 2017)<sup>7</sup>, and to standards specified by the Chartered Institute of Archaeologists (CIfA)<sup>8</sup> and the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS)<sup>9</sup>.

- 14.8 In summary, the preparation of the DBA and this Chapter has employed the following steps:
- a review of legislative framework and requirements, as well as policy and best practice guidance considerations;
  - undertaking of a comprehensive data search of the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) maintained by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS), for records of previously identified heritage assets (in particular, relevant scheduled monuments, archaeological investigations and find spots). The data search was undertaken for the Site and also within a 750m of the boundary of the Site. For the purposes of this assessment, this data search area is referred to as the 'Study Area';
  - an examination of reports of relevant archaeological investigations, in particular those undertaken within the Site in 1995, 1996, 1999;
  - an examination of other relevant publications, articles, historic maps, plans and other documentary evidence;
  - a walkover survey of the Site undertaken in May 2016 to define the existing ground conditions and the potential for buried heritage assets to survive;
  - the incorporation of the results of archaeological evaluations and archaeological monitoring of site investigation works within the Site undertaken in July and October 2016 (refer to **Appendix 14.2**);
  - identification of the likely significant effects of the Development during the Works;
  - identification of appropriate mitigation associated with any identified significant adverse effects resulting from the Development; and
  - identification of the likely residual effects (and their significance) following the successful implementation of the recommended mitigation.
- 14.9 The DBA focuses on the Stag Brewery part of the Site (Applications A and B) (and not the Chalkers Corner part of the Site to be secured by a Section 278 highways agreement). This is due to the fact that the highway works associated with Chalkers Corner relate to highway improvements (refer to **Chapter 5: The Proposed Development**). Such works are not highly intrusive and would unlikely lead to any significant (if any) below ground works. Accordingly, and based on professional and expert judgement, the S278 works are unlikely to give rise to any significant archaeological effects. The geographical coverage of the DBA is therefore considered to be appropriate and robust for the purposes of the assessment.
- 14.10 In addition to the above, consultation was undertaken with the GLAAS Officer for London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT) regarding the form and content of the DBA and associated field evaluation. Reference to **Appendix 14.1** confirms that the information gathered and presented to date is sufficient for the purposes of the Planning Applications and, therefore, the Development.
- 14.11 Finally, in respect of the assessment of the outline component of the Development, the assessment has considered the maximum allowable spatial parameters sought for approval. This would give rise to the most intrusive ground works and so can be considered to reflect a 'worst-case' assessment. That said, based on professional and expert judgement, it is unlikely that the minimum allowable spatial parameters sought for approval would give rise to materially different archaeological effects. This is because the scale of Works that would be required for both the

maximum and minimum allowable parameters would be similar and due to the finite nature of below ground archaeological resources.

### Methodology for Defining Effects

- 14.12 Receptors are either known designated or non-designated archaeological heritage assets or a perceived potential for archaeological heritage assets.
- 14.13 The determination of the importance of a receptor (an archaeological heritage asset) is based on existing statutory designations and, for non-designated assets, the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria for Scheduling Monuments<sup>10</sup>, Historic England's Conservation Principles<sup>11</sup>, and professional judgement. The NPPF and the NPPG introduce criteria for the assessment of the significance of archaeological heritage assets and these have been factored into this assessment.
- 14.14 The intrinsic importance unique to each heritage asset (including below ground heritage assets) can be defined as the sum of tangible and intangible values which make it important to society. This may consider age, aesthetic and the fabric of an asset as well associations with historic people or events.
- 14.15 The determination of the significance of heritage assets is based upon Historic England guidance which recommends assigning significance via four main categories:
- **Evidential value:** derived from "*...the potential of a place to yield evidence about a past human activity*";
  - **Historical value:** derived from "*...the way in which past people, event and aspect of life can be connected through a place to be present*";
  - **Aesthetic value:** derived from "*...the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place*"; and
  - **Communal value:** derived from "*...the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory*".
- 14.16 The criteria for establishing the importance of the below ground heritage assets at the Site are set out as follows:
- **High:** A feature, space or theme which is significant at national or international level. These will tend to have a high cultural value and form an important element of a building or site;
  - **Medium:** A feature, space or theme which is significant at a regional level. These will tend to have some cultural merit and form a significant part of the building or site;
  - **Low:** A feature, space or theme which is of local significance;
  - **Neutral:** A feature, space or theme which has no cultural significance but is also not considered intrusive to heritage value; and
  - **Intrusive:** A feature, space or theme which detracts from heritage value.
- 14.17 In order to determine the likely effect of the Development on the importance of buried heritage assets, the magnitude of impact brought about by the Development to the buried heritage assets must be understood.
- 14.18 The magnitude of impact is assessed without regard to the importance of the asset. In terms of the judgment of the magnitude of impact, this is based on the principle (established in the NPPF)

that preservation of the asset and its setting is preferred, and that total physical loss of the asset is the least preferred. Determining the magnitude of impact is based on an understanding of how, and to what extent, the Development would impact on the buried archaeological assets.

- 14.19 The magnitude of impact is rated as Major, Moderate, Minor and Negligible. Impacts can be either adverse or beneficial.
- 14.20 Adverse impacts are defined as the removal of at least part of an archaeological site, its research potential or its setting; and beneficial impacts are defined as the positive enhancement of at least part of an archaeological site or its setting.
- 14.21 The survival of archaeological remains is often uncertain without archaeological evaluation and in these circumstances the magnitude of impact can only be estimated or stated as unknown. The magnitude of change resulting from the impact may vary depending on the nature of past development or management effects (e.g. extent of truncation and made ground and the various forms of impact).
- 14.22 Impacts can be direct and indirect. Direct impacts are defined as an impact caused by an action, which generally occurs at the same time and place as that action. They are generally associated with the construction, operation or maintenance of a facility or activity and are usually obvious or quantifiable. Indirect impacts are defined as changes resulting from primary impacts. These changes include impacts to the setting of assets; effects can be short or long-term depending on their persistence or duration.
- 14.23 The criteria for assessing the magnitude of change are set out in **Table 14.1**.

Table 14.1: Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of Change	Description
<b>Major</b>	The Development would cause a large change to existing environmental conditions. Change to most or all key archaeological materials, such that the resource is totally altered.
<b>Moderate</b>	The Development would cause a noticeable change to existing environmental conditions. Changes to many key archaeological materials, such that the resource is clearly modified.
<b>Minor</b>	The Development would cause a small change to existing environmental conditions. Changes to key archaeological materials, such that the asset is slightly altered.
<b>Negligible</b>	The Development would cause no discernible change to existing environmental conditions. Very minor changes to archaeological materials.

- 14.24 The significance of the likely effect has been derived from establishing the significance of the buried heritage asset and the magnitude of change as shown in **Table 14.1**.
- 14.25 Effects can be adverse or beneficial and temporary or permanent. It should be noted that effects to archaeology largely arise from the construction works and that, in the case of archaeology, such effects are often permanent. Adverse effects are those that create or amplify existing or new impacts upon the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting and remove or limit the ability to understand and appreciate the importance of the heritage asset. Beneficial effects are

those that mitigate existing impacts and help to restore or enhance the importance/sensitivity of heritage assets or their setting, therefore allowing for greater understanding and appreciation of it.

14.26 **Table 14.2** presents a matrix that demonstrates how the significance of effect has been assessed.

Table 14.2: Level of Effect

Importance / Value of Buried Heritage Assets	Magnitude of Impact			
	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
High	Major	Major / Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Medium	Moderate	Moderate / Minor	Minor	Negligible
Low	Minor	Minor	Minor	Negligible
Neutral	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

14.27 Where preservation of a buried heritage asset in situ is not feasible, as part of the overall design of a development, measures to mitigate likely adverse effects to buried heritage assets would normally consist of design alterations (preservation in situ) or investigation and recording before and during redevelopment (preservation by record). Accordingly, the likely residual effect reflects the success rating for the recommended mitigation. It may be beneficial, insignificant or adverse depending on whether mitigation would enhance or detract from the asset.

14.28 **Table 14.3** provides an indication of the significance of likely residual effects (i.e. likely effects following the implementation of recommended mitigation).

Table 14.3: Likely Residual Effects

Effect	Description
<b>Major adverse effect</b>	Major harm to, or loss of, an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Moderate adverse effect</b>	Less than major harm to an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Minor adverse effect</b>	Limited harm to an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Negligible effect</b>	No appreciable change to an asset's significance.
<b>Minor beneficial effect</b>	Limited improvement of an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Moderate beneficial effect</b>	Notable enhancement of an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Major beneficial effect</b>	Major enhancement of an asset's significance as a result of changes to its physical form or setting.
<b>Uncertain</b>	Significance of effect uncertain due to lack of information on the importance of the asset.

- 14.29 An evaluation of the likely extent, nature and importance of the archaeological resource was undertaken qualitatively, based on the above sources of information, and taking into account existing designations. Where such resource has no formal designation status, professional judgement has been used.
- 14.30 Generally, level of effects that are determined to be Moderate or greater are assessed as significant, but it is ultimately dependent on professional judgement which takes account of site specifics, duration as well as the magnitude of change and sensitivity of the receptor(s).

### **Baseline Conditions**

- 14.31 Full details of the relevant baseline conditions are presented in **Appendix 14.1** and **Appendix 14.2**. A summary of most relevant matters is summarised as follows.
- 14.32 A review of historical maps and other relevant sources indicates that the eastern part of the Site (Development Area 1) is known to have been occupied by the site of the Medieval palace of the Archbishops of Canterbury, together with the site of the fourteenth century parish church, while the western part of the Site (Development Area 2 plus school location) is known to contain the site of the Renaissance mansion of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex.
- 14.33 The earliest mention of the brewing industry associated with Mortlake is in the late fifteenth century and by the early nineteenth century, the Site had undergone significant development for brewery uses. During the twentieth century, the demolition and construction of industrial buildings at the Site was undertaken to allow the expansion of brewery operations. By the second half of the twentieth century the brewery had extended west across Ship Lane.
- 14.34 One of the significant phases of the Site's redevelopment was in the 1970's, which included construction of new brewery buildings across the Site.
- 14.35 The Stag Brewery ceased operations in late 2015 and decommissioning of brewery infrastructure was undertaken following cessation of brewery activities. Works on-Site were undertaken in 2017 to remove brewery fixtures and fittings.

### **Topography**

- 14.36 The modern topography of the Site is generally level, with a slight drop from south to north, and west to east. The Site to the west of Ship Lane is generally level at circa (c.) 4.99-6.40m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) (Development Area 2). The Site to the east of Ship Lane (Development Area 1) is generally level at c.4.5-6.0m AOD. The natural topography is however believed to comprise a drop towards the river to the north, as well as a drop from west to east.
- 14.37 Mortlake lies on the south-western side of the arc of a bend in the River Thames. The river flows from north-west to north-east beyond the north-western boundary of the Site, and abuts the north eastern boundary.

### **Geology**

- 14.38 The mapped geology of the Site comprises Kempton Park floodplain gravels, with a thin strip of alluvium along the northern boundary with the River Thames. Site investigation and archaeological works (refer to **Appendix 11.2** and **14.2**) within the Site have revealed substantial

quantities of made ground above the natural deposits, associated with previous and existing development, including landforming.

### Designated Heritage Assets

- 14.39 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined in NPPF, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites have been identified within the Site or its immediate vicinity.

### Non-Designated Heritage Assets

- 14.40 In terms of relevant local designations, the whole Site lies within the Mortlake and Barnes Archaeological Priority Area (APA). The northern boundary of the Site abuts the Thames Foreshore and Bank APA, related to archaeology from all past periods of human activity, particularly the prehistoric.

#### Prehistoric

- 14.41 A low to moderate archaeological potential has been identified for the Prehistoric periods within the Site. Primarily, this is due to the proximity of the adjacent water source, the River Thames. Small quantities of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic flintwork artefacts have been identified within the Study Area, together with finds and features of Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age dates.

#### Roman

- 14.42 A low archaeological potential has been identified for the Roman period within the Site. Apart from a residual coin find on the Thames foreshore to the north-west, no archaeological finds or features of Roman date have been identified within the Study Area.

#### Early Medieval

- 14.43 A low archaeological potential has been identified for the Saxon period within the Site. No archaeological finds or features of Saxon date have been identified within the study area search radius. Evidence of agricultural activity and land division could conceivably be present within the archaeological record.

#### Medieval

- 14.44 Within the Site to the east of Ship Lane, a high archaeological potential has been identified for the Medieval period. The site of the palace of the Archbishops of Canterbury is known to have been present, by 1099 until the sixteenth century. The site of a church has also been identified within the Site east of Ship Lane, present by 1349 and demolished by 1543.
- 14.45 Within the Site to the west of Ship Lane, a generally low archaeological potential has been identified for the Medieval period. Evidence of agricultural activity and land division could conceivably be present within the archaeological record.

#### Post Medieval

- 14.46 The potential of the Site for the Post Medieval and Modern periods can be categorised as high. Remains of a Renaissance mansion owned by Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex (Cromwell House



c.1491-1857) may survive within the north-western boundary of the Site. Remains associated with the former Archbishop's Palace may survive east of Ship Lane (apparently extant until the early / mid nineteenth century) together with village activity and occupation in the south eastern corner, prior to absorption into the brewery complex in 1865.

#### Industrial Age - Present Day

- 14.47 Documentary sources relating to commercial brewing at Mortlake date from 1765 onwards. Major expansion of the Brewery complex appears to have taken place in the mid nineteenth century, and also during the twentieth century.
- 14.48 Across the whole of the Site, remains associated with previous phases of the brewery dating from the eighteenth century onwards are likely to survive below the existing facility, where not truncated by later development.

#### Known Below Ground Heritage

- 14.49 The Site is known to have been previously occupied by a Medieval bishop's palace and parish church to the east of Ship Lane, and by a Post Medieval mansion to the west of Ship Lane. It is possible that remains of a low, medium, or high importance may be present at the Site.

#### Truncation and Potential for Survival

- 14.50 The post-depositional impact within the Site, primarily as a result of the development of the Brewery, is considered likely to have been severe. The significant quantities of made ground identified in the site investigation and archaeological evaluation and monitoring work is indicative of truncation of archaeological remains.
- 14.51 The phases of archaeological works previously undertaken within the Site (in 1995, 1996 and 1999) revealed ploughsoils / garden soils dating from the Medieval period onwards, together with Medieval, Post Medieval and Modern walls and foundations. Most recently, archaeological evaluation and monitoring within both the western and eastern sides of the Site in 2016 (refer to **Appendix 14.2**) revealed evidence of extensive horizontal truncation. Intact subsoil above natural sands and gravels were noted in places, together with traces of nineteenth century buildings, and a large piece of decorated masonry which may relate to Medieval / Post Medieval activity, albeit discovered in a modern context, to the west of Ship Lane.

#### Likely Significant Effects

##### The Works

- 14.52 The Works required to facilitate the Development have the potential to impact upon below ground archaeological remains through the following activities (as described in **Chapter 6: The Development Programme, Demolition, Alteration, Refurbishment and Construction**):
- demolition of the majority of existing structures and buildings, with the exception of the Maltings and the façade of the Former Hotel and Former Bottling building;
  - grubbing out of existing foundations, basement areas and other features associated with the existing buildings;



- landforming / excavation associated with the proposed basements. Within the Site, proposed basements are extensive across the principal area of the Site east of Ship Lane (Development Area 1). To the west of Ship Lane, areas of basement are proposed within the central / northern parts of this part of the Site (Development Area 2). No basement is proposed underneath the school location and play facilities;
  - pile probing, the insertion of pile caps and ground beams;
  - the cutting of other associated foundations and footings; and
  - the cutting of services.
- 14.53 The bottom of the proposed basement slab within the east part of the Site (east of Ship Lane) would be set at 0.76m OD. This area of the Site recorded natural terrace gravel at between 4.4m and 2.68m OD, so the proposed basement would likely impact on any archaeological structures or deposits present.
- 14.54 The maximum extent for the proposed basement within the west part of the Site (west of Ship Lane), would be set at 2.45m OD. The natural gravel in this area of the Site was recorded at between 5.6 and 4.68m OD, so the proposed basement would also likely impact on any archaeological structures or deposits present in this area of the Site.
- 14.55 The proposed foundation design for all buildings within the detailed element of the Site would comprise a 1m deep piled raft, with the exception of the proposed cinema area which would be founded in 1m deep local pile caps with 1 m deep ground beams. Below the foundations, all buildings would have an expanse of piles (3 to 5 per column) that would be 600mm in diameter and extending down 25m in length.
- 14.56 In addition to the above, the new river wall would be formed of a sheet pile wall with an in-situ reinforced concrete capping beam. The toe level of the sheet pile wall would be set at -1m AOD.
- 14.57 All relevant construction activities have been considered, and a worst-case scenario is assumed, comprising the complete loss of archaeological remains during these works. This would comprise a direct, permanent, adverse, Major magnitude of impact to below ground known and potential resources.
- 14.58 Potential remains of possibly high importance include the Medieval archbishop's palace, and church with burial ground, with associated features on the east side of the Site, and the Post Medieval mansion with possible associated features on the west side of the Site. If remains of high importance were present and subject to a Major Magnitude of Impact, this may result in a **Major** effect of significance.
- 14.59 Archaeological remains of low importance dating to the Prehistoric, Roman, or Saxon periods could conceivably be present at the Site. If such remains were present and subject to a Major Magnitude of Impact, this may result in a **Minor** insignificant effect.
- 14.60 Across areas of the Site where archaeological remains can be demonstrated to have been truncated by previous and existing development, associated with the brewery, the Works of the Development are likely to have Negligible Magnitude of Impact on archaeological remains, which would result in a **Negligible** insignificant effect.

## Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects

### The Works

- 14.61 Given the potential for significant adverse effects of the Works, the following measures are proposed in order to mitigate such effects:
- implementation of a phased archaeological evaluation programme, following demolition and Site clearance, moving across the Site behind the demolition; and
  - implementation of further excavation work dependent upon the results of the evaluation recommended above.
- 14.62 The above mitigation strategy has been discussed and agreed with the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (“GLAAS”) Officer for LBRuT (refer to **Appendix 14.1**). Furthermore, it has been agreed that it would be appropriate to secure such mitigation via an appropriate planning condition. This was confirmed as part of consultation in 2018 and again in previous ES addendums for scheme revisions in 2019 and 2020. The GLA report, dated 27<sup>th</sup> July 2021, for the 2020 Planning Applications stated the following GLAAS response:
- “The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has reviewed the previous and amended proposals and confirmed that the revisions to the applications will not have any additional archaeological impact to that of the original scheme, which was supported. The findings of the desk based assessment are sound, and potential damage to the archaeological interest of the application site would be sufficiently mitigated by the above measures. Conditions of approval are proposed which secure archaeological mitigation measures as described above, and the scheme is acceptable in this regard.”*
- 14.63 Where archaeological remains will be preserved by record, the analysis and reporting of the results of the archaeological works will occur off-Site; however, the results will be published in a variety of technical and non-technical formats. The preservation by record of archaeological remains does not reduce the effect upon those remains, as they will still be subject to total loss – this loss remains an adverse effect. Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no further adverse residual effects are anticipated.
- 14.64 Residual effects are those that are predicted to remain after implementation of the mitigation measures described above. It is important to demonstrate that any measures included as part of the mitigation package to respond to adverse effects can be delivered in practice, the measures correspond with planning policy and therefore that there is confidence that they will be implemented.
- 14.65 There is the possibility of significant effects through the loss of archaeological remains of up to a potentially high importance. In addition, there remains the possibility of further archaeological receptors of a likely local importance being present, the loss of which would not comprise a significant effect but would still require mitigation in advance of development. Mitigation measures will be undertaken to preserve remains by record, prior to any adverse construction effects. Whilst the ability to undertake archaeological fieldwork does not reduce the adverse effect upon the archaeological remains, appropriate fieldwork followed by dissemination of the acquired data would be considered a residual beneficial effect (the level of effect will be determined following fieldwork mitigation).

## Summary

14.66 **Table 14.4** summarises the likely significant effects, mitigation measures, and likely residual effects identified within this Chapter.

Table 14.4: Summary of Likely Significant Effects, Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects

Issue	Likely Effect	Significant or not	Mitigation Measures	Likely Residual Effect
<b>The Works</b>				
Archaeological remains of national importance (medieval and post-medieval remains).	<b>Direct, permanent, adverse major</b> effect of significance.	Yes	Implementation of a phased archaeological evaluation programme, following demolition and Site clearance, moving across the Site behind the demolition.	<b>Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no further residual effects are anticipated.</b>
Archaeological remains from the pre-historic, Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.	<b>Direct, permanent, adverse minor</b> effect, that is considered insignificant.	No	Implementation of further excavation work dependent upon the results of the evaluation recommended above.	<b>Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no further residual effects are anticipated.</b>
Archaeological remains likely to have been previously truncated by existing development i.e. the Stag Brewery.	<b>Negligible.</b>	No		<b>Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no further residual effects are anticipated.</b>

## References

---

- 1 English Heritage, (2008). Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance.
- 2 Historic England, (2017). Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets.
- 3 National Highways (2019). Design Manual for Roads and Highways.
- 4 Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) 2017. The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2017 (amended in 2018 and 2020).
- 5 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, (2021). National Planning Policy Framework. July 2021.
- 6 Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, (2016, last updated 2021), Planning Practice Guidance.
- 7 Historic England (2015 and 2017) Good Practice Advice documents 1-3.
- 8 Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014, updated 2020); 'Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists: Reading'.
- 9 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (2015); 'Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London'.
- 10 Department for Culture, Media and Sport, (2013). Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important Non-Scheduled Monuments.
- 11 English Heritage, (2008). Conservation Principles, Policy and Guidance.