

## Archaeology (Buried Heritage) Statement

### Introduction

This Statement has been prepared to support a planning application for the temporary use of land at the former Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames for film production operations and ancillary activities.

The planning application is for temporary use of the existing buildings and land for a period of five years for film production operations and ancillary activities. The application seeks planning permission for the temporary use of the whole site for filming purposes and associated ancillary activities. Initially, it is envisaged that the operator will only utilise Buildings 11, 12, 14 and 15 as well as yard areas in the east of the site and an external area adjacent to the Maltings building (Building 9). All necessary information has been submitted alongside the application to enable the immediate occupation of these buildings and should other buildings on the site be required to be utilised under the permission, it is envisaged that further details would be required to be provided by way of a suitably worded condition attached to the permission. It should also be noted that the application also includes the temporary erection of external film sets outside of the Maltings building (Building 9).

No intrusive groundworks will be carried out as part of the temporary use.

In support of the recently submitted Hybrid Planning Application (Application A, planning ref: 22/0900/OUT) and Detailed Application School (Application B, planning ref: 22/0902/FUL) for redevelopment of the Site, an Archaeology ES chapter was prepared by RPS Consulting Services UK Ltd in March 2022, which presents an assessment of the likely significant effects and likely residual effects of the proposed Development on archaeological (buried heritage) resources within the Site. The preparation of the ES Chapter was informed by a below ground Desk Based Archaeological Assessment (DBA) together with the results of archaeological evaluation and monitoring fieldwork. These documents have informed this Archaeology Statement and are appended for reference, see **Appendix A**.

### Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

#### Assessment Methodology

In summary, the preparation of the Chapter 9 and accompanying DBA of the March 2022 ES (see **Appendix A**) relating to the redevelopment of the Site (planning refs: 22/0900/OUT and 22/0902/FUL) 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.

- 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;
- 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.

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.

## **Baseline Conditions**

A review of historical maps and other relevant sources indicates that the eastern part of the Site 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 is known to contain the site of the Renaissance mansion of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex.

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. 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.

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.

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.

## **Known Below Ground Heritage**

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

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.

## Mitigation Measures

### The Works

The planning application is for temporary use of the existing buildings and land for a period of five years for film production operations and ancillary activities. As stated above, it is envisaged that at this stage the filming operator will only utilise Buildings 11, 12, 14 and 15 as well as yard areas in the east of the site and an external area adjacent to the Maltings building (Building 9) for the construction of a film set.

No intrusive groundworks will be undertaken as part of the filming activities. Therefore, there will be no impact on below ground archaeology. As there will be no impact on below ground archaeology, no mitigation measures are required.



**Appendix A: March 2022 ES Chapter 14: Archaeology and ES Appendix 14.1  
Archaeological Desk Based Assessment**



## 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.

## **APPENDIX 14.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT**



# **Stag Brewery, Mortlake**

## **Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment**

For Reselton Properties

March 2022

# ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT

Land at Stag Brewery, Mortlake, Richmond upon Thames, Surrey

Project Code: JAC22164  
Land at Stag Brewery, Mortlake  
Planning Issue  
February 2022  
NGR: TQ20371 76022  
Local Planning Authority:  
London Borough of Richmond upon  
Thames

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

### Quality Management

Version	Status	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Date
#1	Draft	RvKM	RvKM	RvKM	January 2022
#2	Planning Issue	RvKM	RvKM	RvKM	February 2022

### Approval for issue

Richard von Kalinowski-Meager



17 February 2022

### File/Model Location

**Document location:** RPS/22164

**Model / Appendices location:** RPS/22164

This report was prepared by RPS within the terms of RPS' engagement with its client and in direct response to a scope of services. This report is supplied for the sole and specific purpose for use by RPS' client. The report does not account for any changes relating the subject matter of the report, or any legislative or regulatory changes that have occurred since the report was produced and that may affect the report. RPS does not accept any responsibility or liability for loss whatsoever to any third party caused by, related to or arising out of any use or reliance on the report.

**Prepared by:**

**RPS**

**Richard von Kalinowski-Meager**  
**BA MA PG Cert FSA FRSA MCifA**  
**Director**

20 Farringdon Street  
London  
EC4A 4AB

**T** 07764830956  
**E** richard.meager@rpsgroup.com

**Prepared for:**

**Reselton Properties Limited**



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Site of the Stag Brewery, Mortlake, Richmond-upon-Thames (hereafter the 'Site') has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.

In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites lie within or in immediate proximity to the Site.

In terms of relevant local designations the Site lies within the Mortlake and Barnes Archaeological Priority Area, as defined by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and their archaeological planning advisors at the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS).

The Site is considered likely to have an archaeological potential for the Medieval, Post Medieval and Modern periods. The eastern part of the Site is known to contain 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 is known to contain the site of the Renaissance mansion of Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex.

Past post-depositional impacts are considered likely to have been severe and cumulative across the Site as a result of previous and existing phases of development, principally relating to the Brewery complex which currently occupies the Site.

Programmes of archaeological fieldwork undertaken across the Site have revealed evidence of Medieval and Post Medieval deposits, together with substantial modern horizontal truncation.

The Applications seek planning permission for:

Application A:

"Hybrid application to include the demolition of existing buildings to allow for comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:

Planning permission is sought in detail for works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:

- a) Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks
- b) Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one to two storeys below ground
- c) Residential apartments
- d) Flexible use floorspace for:

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

---

- i. Retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses
- ii. Offices
- iii. Non-residential institutions and community use
- iv. Boathouse
- e) Hotel / public house with accommodation
- f) Cinema
- g) Offices
- h) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works
- i) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level
- j) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
- k) Flood defence and towpath works
- l) Installation of plant and energy equipment

Planning permission is also sought in outline with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:

- a) The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeys
- b) Residential development
- c) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking
- d) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
- e) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works”

### Application B:

“Detailed planning permission for the erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and other associated works”

Redevelopment of the Site as a whole can be considered likely to have a potential adverse impact on below ground archaeological deposits of potential national significance.

## **ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT**

---

Relevant archaeological measures are therefore proposed in order to mitigate the impact of redevelopment upon the Site's archaeological potential, which have previously been discussed and approved by the planning authorities' archaeological planning advisors at GLAAS. Such work will be secured by appropriate condition(s) attached to the granting of planning consent for redevelopment.

## Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK .....</b>	<b>3</b>
National Planning Policy .....	3
Strategic Planning Policy .....	5
Local Planning Policy .....	5
Relevant Designations .....	6
Planning Background .....	6
The Proposed New Scheme .....	8
GLAAS .....	9
<b>3 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Mapped Geology .....	10
Site Investigation Data .....	10
Archaeological Data .....	10
Deposit Model .....	11
Topography .....	11
<b>4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Timescales used in this report .....	12
Introduction .....	12
Previous Archaeological Work .....	13
Prehistoric – Palaeolithic and Mesolithic .....	13
Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age .....	14
Roman .....	14
Anglo-Saxon .....	14
Medieval .....	15
Post Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise) .....	16
Assessment of Significance (Designated Heritage Assets) .....	21
Assessment of Significance (non-designated Heritage Assets) .....	21
<b>5 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
Site Conditions .....	22
Proposed Development .....	22
Review of Potential Development Impacts on Designated Archaeological Assets .....	24
Review of Potential Development Impacts on Non-Designated Assets .....	24
<b>6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>SOURCES CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>27</b>

## Figures

- Figure 1 Site location
- Figure 2 Cultural Heritage Designations and archaeological findspots (data from GLHER)
- Figure 3 1745 John Rocque's Map of London
- Figure 4 1793 Lindley & Crossley's Map of Surrey

Figure 5	1829 view of Mortlake (including the northern Site frontage) from the River Thames
Figure 6	1839 Mortlake Tithe Map
Figure 7	1865 Ordnance Survey
Figure 8	1865 Plan of Thames Street
Figure 9	1896 Ordnance Survey
Figure 10	1907 GOAD Insurance Plan
Figure 11	1913 Ordnance Survey
Figure 12	1940 Ordnance Survey
Figure 13	1952-1961 Ordnance Survey
Figure 14	1962 aerial photograph
Figure 15	1965-1968 Ordnance Survey
Figure 16	1992-1998 Ordnance Survey
Figure 17	2009 Ordnance Survey
Figure 18	2016 Site survey
Figure 19	Probable extent of Medieval land use zones across the eastern part of the Site
Figure 20	Location of archaeological works undertaken within the Site to date
Figure 21	Deposit model section plan location
Figure 22a	Deposit model section (with proposed development finished floor level OD heights)
Figure 22b	Deposit model section (with proposed development finished floor level OD heights)
Figure 23a	Redevelopment proposals: plan of lower basements east of Ship Lane
Figure 23b	Redevelopment proposals: plan of basement east of Ship Lane
Figure 23c	Redevelopment Proposals: plan of basement east of Ship Lane
Figure 24	Redevelopment proposals: plan of basement west of Ship Lane
Figure 25	Redevelopment proposals: ground floor
Figure 26	Redevelopment proposals: section
Figure 27	Plan overlay of proposed basements and ground floor
Figure 28	Plan showing previous and existing development impacts

## Appendices

Appendix 1	Geotechnical information 1995, 2003, 2015
Appendix 2	GLHER Gazetteer December 2021
Appendix 3	Correspondence with GLAAS re archaeological mitigation

## 1 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

- 1.1 This below ground archaeological assessment has been prepared by RPS on behalf of Reselton Properties Limited (“the Applicant”) in support of two linked planning applications (“the Applications”) for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake (“the Site”) within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).
- 1.2 The Site is centred at TQ20371 76022 within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (see Figures 1, 2 and 18).
- 1.3 The Applications seek planning permission for:

**Application A:**

**“Hybrid application to include the demolition of existing buildings to allow for comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:**

**Planning permission is sought in detail for works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:**

- m) Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks**
- n) Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one and two storeys below ground**
- o) Residential apartments**
- p) Flexible use floorspace for:**
  - v. Retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses**
  - vi. Offices**
  - vii. Non-residential institutions and community use**
  - viii. Boathouse**
- q) Hotel / public house with accommodation**
- r) Cinema**
- s) Offices**
- t) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works**
- u) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level**
- v) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping**
- w) Flood defence and towpath works**
- x) Installation of plant and energy centres**

**Planning permission is also sought in outline with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:**

- f) The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys**
- g) Residential development**

- h) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and service parking**
- i) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping**
- j) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works”**

**Application B:**

**“Detailed planning permission for the erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and all other associated works”**

- 1.4 Together, Applications A and B described above comprise the ‘Proposed Development’.
- 1.5 Figure 2 summarises relevant cultural heritage designations and archaeological findspot references relevant to the study site.
- 1.6 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, as defined below in Section 2 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites have been identified within the Site or its immediate vicinity.
- 1.7 In terms of relevant local designations, the Site lies within the Mortlake and Barnes Archaeological Priority Area (APA), as defined by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and their archaeological advisors at the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS).
- 1.8 Reselton Properties Limited have therefore commissioned RPS to establish the archaeological potential of the Site, to accompany a planning application for redevelopment, and to provide guidance on ways to accommodate any archaeological constraints identified.
- 1.9 In accordance with relevant government policy and guidance on archaeology and planning, and in accordance with the ‘Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessments’ (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2020), this assessment draws together the available archaeological, topographic and land-use information in order to clarify the archaeological potential of the Site.
- 1.10 The assessment comprises an examination of evidence on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) and other sources, including Richmond Local Studies and Archives Centre. The report reviews existing site investigation/geotechnical data, together with the results of archaeological interventions within the Site undertaken in 1995, 1996, 1999 and 2016 (see Section 3, Appendix 1 and Figures 21-22).
- 1.11 The Assessment thus enables relevant parties to understand the archaeological potential of various parts of the Site and to consider the need for design, civil engineering, and archaeological solutions to the archaeological potential identified.

## 2 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 National legislation regarding archaeology, including scheduled monuments, is contained in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, amended by the National Heritage Act 1983 and 2002, updated April 2014.
- 2.2 In March 2012, the government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and it was last updated in July 2021. The NPPF is supported by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), which was published online 6th March 2014 and is periodically updated (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment>).
- 2.3 The NPPF and NPPG are additionally supported by three Good Practice Advice (GPA) documents published by Historic England: GPA 1: The Historic Environment in Local Plans; GPA 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (both published March 2015). The second edition of GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets was published in December 2017.

### National Planning Policy

- 2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF, entitled Conserving and enhancing the historic environment provides guidance for planning authorities, property owners, developers and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. Overall, the objectives of Section 16 of the NPPF can be summarised as seeking the:
- Delivery of sustainable development;
  - Understanding the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits brought by the conservation of the historic environment;
  - Conservation of England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; and
  - Recognition that heritage makes to our knowledge and understanding of the past.
- 2.5 Section 16 of the NPPF recognises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Paragraph 194 states that planning decisions should be based on the significance of the heritage asset and that level of detail supplied by an applicant should be proportionate to the importance of the asset and should be no more than sufficient to review the potential impact of the proposal upon the significance of that asset.
- 2.6 *Heritage Assets* are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process.
- 2.7 Annex 2 also defines *Archaeological Interest* as a heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.



- 2.8 A *Designated Heritage Asset* comprises a: World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.
- 2.9 *Significance* (for heritage policy) is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
- 2.10 *Setting* is defined as: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
- 2.11 In short, government policy provides a framework which:
- Protects nationally important designated Heritage Assets;
  - Protects the settings of such designations;
  - In appropriate circumstances seeks adequate information (from desk based assessment and field evaluation where necessary) to enable informed decisions;
  - Provides for the excavation and investigation of sites not significant enough to merit *in-situ* preservation.
- 2.12 The NPPG reiterates that the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance is a core planning principle, requiring a flexible and thoughtful approach. Furthermore, it highlights that neglect and decay of heritage assets is best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use that is consistent with their conservation. Importantly, the guidance states that if complete, or partial loss of a heritage asset is justified, the aim should then be to capture and record the evidence of the asset's significance and make the interpretation publicly available. Key elements of the guidance relate to assessing harm. An important consideration should be whether the proposed works adversely affect a key element of the heritage asset's special architectural or historic interest. Additionally, it is the degree of harm, rather than the scale of development, that is to be assessed. The level of 'substantial harm' is considered to be a high bar that may not arise in many cases. Essentially, whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the NPPF. Importantly, harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. Setting is defined as the surroundings in which an asset is experienced and may be more extensive than the curtilage. A thorough assessment of the impact of proposals upon setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.
- 2.13 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.

## Strategic Planning Policy

2.14 The relevant strategic planning framework for the study site is provided by The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, adopted March 2021. Within Chapter 7 of the Plan, 'Heritage and Culture', policy HC1 is of most relevance to archaeology at the study site:

### HC1 Heritage and Conservation Growth

- A. **Boroughs should, in consultation with Historic England, local communities and other statutory and relevant organisations, develop evidence that demonstrates a clear understanding of London's historic environment. This evidence should be used for identifying, understanding, conserving, and enhancing the historic environment and heritage assets, and improving access to, and interpretation of, the heritage assets, landscapes and archaeology within their area.**
- B. **Development Plans and strategies should demonstrate a clear understanding of the historic environment and the heritage values of sites or areas and their relationship with their surroundings. This knowledge should be used to inform the effective integration of London's heritage in regenerative change by:**
  - 1. **setting out a clear vision that recognises and embeds the role of heritage in place-making**
  - 2. **utilising the heritage significance of a site or area in the planning and design process**
  - 3. **integrating the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with innovative and creative contextual architectural responses that contribute to their significance and sense of place**
  - 4. **delivering positive benefits that sustain and enhance the historic environment, as well as contributing to the economic viability, accessibility and environmental quality of a place, and to social wellbeing.**
- C. **Development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The cumulative impacts of incremental change from development on heritage assets and their settings, should also be actively managed. Development proposals should avoid harm and identify enhancement opportunities by integrating heritage considerations early on in the design process.**
- D. **Development proposals should identify assets of archaeological significance and use this information to avoid harm or minimise it through design and appropriate mitigation. Where applicable, development should make provision for the protection of significant archaeological assets and landscapes. The protection of undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest equivalent to a scheduled monument should be given equivalent weight to designated heritage assets.**
- E. **Where heritage assets have been identified as being At Risk, boroughs should identify specific opportunities for them to contribute to regeneration and place-making, and they set out strategies for their repair and re-use.**

## Local Planning Policy

2.15 Policies relevant to below ground archaeology at the Site contained within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (adopted July 2018 and March 2020) include the following:

### Policy LP 4

#### Non-Designated Heritage Assets

The Council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit, memorials, particularly war memorials, and other local historic features.

There will be a presumption against the demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

### Policy LP 7

#### Archaeology

The Council will seek to protect, enhance and promote its archaeological heritage (both above and below ground), and will encourage its interpretation and presentation to the public. It will take the necessary measures required to safeguard the archaeological remains found, and refuse planning permission where proposals would adversely affect archaeological remains or their setting.

Desk based assessments and, where necessary, archaeological field evaluation will be required before development proposals are determined, where development is proposed on sites of archaeological significance or potential significance.

- 2.16 Within the Adopted Local Plan, the Council has identified key sites that are considered to assist with the delivery of the Spatial Strategy contained within the Plan. Site S24 comprises the Stag Brewery site, which includes the below policy:

The Council will support the comprehensive redevelopment of this site. An appropriate mix of uses, particularly at ground floor levels, should deliver a new village heart and centre for Mortlake. The provision of an on-site new 6-form entry secondary school, plus sixth form, will be required. Appropriate uses, in addition to educational, include residential (including affordable housing), employment (B uses), commercial such as retail and other employment generating uses, health facilities, community and social infrastructure facilities (such as a museum), river-related uses as well as sport and leisure uses, including the retention and/or re-provision and upgrading of the playing field. The Council will expect the provision of high quality open spaces and public realm, including links through the site to integrate the development into the surrounding area as well as a new publicly accessible green space link to the riverside.

S24 also notes that:

The site is within an Archaeological Priority Area and partially within the Mortlake Conservation Area. The existing Buildings of Townscape Merit should be retained; the reuse of these historic buildings offers an excellent opportunity to ensure the site incorporates and promotes a cultural and historic legacy, for example by providing an on-site museum. Any development should respond positively to the Conservation Area, including the setting of the listed buildings (Grade II) to the north of the site.

### Relevant Designations

- 2.17 In terms of relevant designated heritage assets as defined above in the NPPF, and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck designations lie within, or in immediate proximity, to the Site.
- 2.18 In terms of relevant local designations, the Site is located within an Archaeological Priority Area as designated by the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames and GLAAS.
- 2.19 In line with relevant planning policy and guidance, this desk-based assessment seeks to clarify the study site's archaeological potential, together with the likely significance of that potential, and the need or otherwise for additional mitigation measures.

### Planning Background

- 2.20 The current applications follow earlier planning applications which were refused by the Greater London Authority and the GLA. The refused applications were for:
- a) Application A – hybrid planning application for comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery site consisting of:

i. Land to the east of Ship Lane applied for in detail (referred to as 'Development Area 1' throughout); and

ii. Land to the west of Ship Lane (excluding the school) applied for in outline (referred to as 'Development Area 2' throughout).

a) Application B – detailed planning application for the school (on land to the west of Ship Lane).

b) Application C – detailed planning application for highways and landscape works at Chalkers Corner.

2.21 The LBRuT (the Council) originally resolved to grant planning permission for Applications A and B but refuse Application C.

2.22 Following the LBRuT's resolution to approve applications A and B, the Mayor called-in the Applications and became the determining authority. The Mayor's reasons for calling in the Applications were set out in his Stage II letter (dated 4 May 2020) but specifically related to concerns regarding what he considered was a low percentage of affordable housing being proposed for the Site and the need to secure a highways solution for the scheme following the LBRuT's refusal of Application C.

2.23 Working with the Mayor's team, the Applicant sought to meaningfully respond to the Mayor's concerns on the Applications. A summary of the revisions to the scheme made and submitted to the GLA in July 2020 is as follows:

- i. The Increase in residential unit provision from up to 813 units to up to 1,250 units;
- ii. Increase in affordable housing provision from (up to) 17%, to 30%;
- iii. Increase in height for some buildings of up to three storeys;
- iv. Change to the layout of Blocks 18 and 19, conversion of Block 20 from a terrace row of housing to two four storey buildings;
- v. Reduction in the size of the western basement, resulting in an overall car parking spaces reduction of 186 spaces and introduction of an additional basement storey under Block 1;
- vi. Internal layout changes and removal of the nursing home and assisted living in Development Area 2;
- vii. Landscaping amendments, including canopy removal of four trees on the north west corner of the Site; and
- viii. Alternative options to Chalkers Corner in order to mitigate traffic impacts through works to highway land only and allow the withdrawal of Application C.

2.24 The application was amended to reflect these changes.

- 2.25 Notwithstanding this, and despite GLA officers recommending approval, the Mayor refused the applications in August 2021.
- 2.26 The Mayor's reasons for refusal in respect of Application A were:
- (i) The height, bulk and mass, which would result in an unduly obtrusive and discordant form of development in this 'arcadian' setting which would be harmful to the townscape, character and appearance of the surrounding area;
  - (ii) heritage impact. The proposals, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and massing would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of several listed buildings and conservation areas in the vicinity. The Mayor considered that the less than substantial harm was not clearly and convincingly outweighed by the public benefits, including Affordable Housing, that the proposals would deliver;
  - (iii) neighbouring amenity issues. The proposal, by reason of the excessive bulk, scale and siting of Building 20 and 21 in close proximity to the rear of neighbouring residential properties in Parliament Mews and the rear gardens of properties on Thames Bank, would result in an unacceptable overbearing and unneighbourly impact, including direct overlooking of private amenity spaces. The measures in the Design Code would not sufficiently mitigate these impacts; and
  - (iv) no section 106 agreement in place.
- 2.27 Application B was also refused because it is intrinsically linked with Application A and therefore could not be bought forward in isolation.

### **The Proposed New Scheme**

- 2.28 This 3<sup>rd</sup> iteration of the scheme, seeks to respond directly to the Mayors reasons for refusal and in doing so also addresses a number of the concerns raised by the LBRuT.
- 2.29 The amendments can be summarised as follows:
- i. The A revised energy strategy is proposed in order to address the London Plan (2021) requirements;
  - ii. Several residential blocks have been reduced in height to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront and to respect the setting of the Maltings building, identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) by the LBRuT;
  - iii. Reconfiguration of layout of Buildings 20 and 21 has been undertaken to provide lower rise buildings to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront; and
  - iv. Chalkers Corner light highways mitigation works.

- 2.30 The school proposals (submitted under 'Application B') are unchanged. The Applicant acknowledges LBRuT's identified need for a secondary school at the Site and the applications continue to support the delivery of a school. It is expected that the principles to be agreed under the draft Community Use Agreement (CUA) will be the same as those associated with the refused school application (LBRuT ref: 18/0548/FUL, GLA ref: GLA/4172a/07).
- 2.31 Overall, it is considered that together, the Applications respond successfully to the concerns raised by stakeholders in respect of the previous schemes and during pre-application discussions on the revised Proposed Development. As a result, it is considered that the scheme now represents a balanced development that delivers the principal LBRuT objectives from the Site.

### GLAAS

- 2.32 The Site has previously been reviewed by CgMs/RPS and GLAAS, where a series of archaeological mitigation measures have been reviewed and agreed (see Section 5 and 6 below; also Appendix 3).
- 2.33 The previously agreed archaeological mitigation proposals have subsequently been re-confirmed in subsequent documentation. The GLA hearing report, dated 27 July 2021, confirms the following:

*70 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS): No objection, subject to conditions (included in draft decision).*

*121 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS): The revisions to the applications will not have any additional archaeological impact to that of the original scheme. The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest (Archaeological Priority Area) identified for the Local Plan: Mortlake and Barnes. The archaeological interest should therefore be conserved by attaching recommended informatives and conditions.*

*448 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.*

### 3 GEOLOGY AND TOPOGRAPHY

#### Mapped Geology

- 3.1 The solid geology of the Site is shown by the Institute of Geological Sciences (IGS 1979) as London Clay deposits forming the London Basin. Overlying the London Clay is a series of gravel terraces deposited during periods of glacial and inter-glacial conditions (Bridgland 1996).
- 3.2 The underlying geology of the Site is summarised by British Geological Survey Sheet 270 (South London: 1998) to comprise Kempton Park floodplain Gravels, defined as 'Post-diversionary Thames River Terrace Deposits: gravel, sandy and clayey in part'. A thin strip of alluvium (defined as 'mainly sand, silt and clay') is shown running along the northern boundary of the Site, adjacent to the River Thames.

#### Site Investigation Data

- 3.3 Boreholes undertaken across the Site in the mid 1990s encountered river terrace gravels at 1.95m-3.1m AOD, overlying the London Clay, below made ground (MoLAS 1995a: 11). Site investigations undertaken in 1995, 2003 and 2015 indicate quantities of made ground up c.0.4-3.0m thick, above naturally occurring sands and gravels. The intervention logs and their location plan are reproduced at Appendix 1.

#### Archaeological Data

- 3.4 Archaeological evaluation and monitoring of the eastern part of the Site in 1995, 1996 and 1999 revealed substantial quantities of overburden dated to the Medieval, Post Medieval and Modern periods, above the gravels and alluvium, which had been truncated by concrete basement slabs and walls, brick and concrete footings and foundations, hogging, and service trenches. The top of the alluvial deposits was observed at 3.3-3.92m AOD, with the top of the sands and gravels noted at 2.6-3.6m AOD (MoLA 1995, 1996, 1999; see also Figure 21).
- 3.5 Archaeological evaluation undertaken within the eastern part of the Site in August 2016 revealed quantities of made ground indicating substantial horizontal truncation of the natural sequence. Naturally occurring river gravels were found at c.2.25-4.40m AOD within this part of the Site, with subsoil identified in the western and central areas. Archaeological monitoring of SI works within the eastern part of the Site identified primarily deposits of made ground, with natural deposits identified at c.2.12-4.77m AOD, confirming the increase in the depth of made ground towards the east (PCA 2016).
- 3.6 Archaeological evaluation undertaken within the western part of the Site in August 2016 revealed made ground above natural geological horizons. In the evaluation trenching within this part of the Site, natural gravels were observed at c.5.04-5.06m AOD, with intact subsoil above. Within the test pits, natural gravels were observed at c.4.68-4.76m AOD, with no subsoil, indicating truncation of natural horizons (PCA 2016).



- 3.7 It is important to note that in all of the geotechnical and archaeological interventions undertaken at the Site to date, no deposits of peat were identified.

### **Deposit Model**

- 3.8 The results of the Site investigation logs and the 2016 archaeological evaluation are shown in deposit model format at Figures 21-22, providing a vertical profile of the site's underlying make up and geology. The east-west transect through the Site demonstrates the varying thickness of the made ground and the varying heights of the naturally occurring deposits. As a general trend, the heights of the natural geology drop from west to east, and the thickness of the made ground increases, to the east, however the thickness of the made ground and the height of the made ground does vary across the Site. The short north-south transect also shows varying thicknesses of made ground. The presence of varying thicknesses of made ground beneath the Site represents the varying levels of impact through previous and existing development.

### **Topography**

- 3.9 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 c.4.99-6.40m AOD; the Site to the east of Ship Lane is generally level at c.4.5-6.0m AOD.
- 3.10 However it is believed that the natural topography prior to development included a steeper drop towards the river than is present today, suggesting that substantial landforming and river revetment has been carried out across the northern parts of the Site. This was borne out by the results of an archaeological watching brief carried out in 1996 (MoLA 1996). There may also have been a natural, gradual drop in height from west to east (PCA 2016).
- 3.11 Mortlake lies on the southwestern side of the arc of a bend in the River Thames. The river flows from northwest to northeast beyond the northwestern boundary of the Site, and abuts the northeastern boundary.



## 4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND WITH ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

### Timescales used in this report

#### Prehistoric

Palaeolithic	900,000 -	12,000 BC
Mesolithic	12,000 -	4,000 BC
Neolithic	4,000 -	1,800 BC
Bronze Age	1,800 -	600 BC
Iron Age	600 -	AD 43

#### Historic

Roman	AD 43 -	410
Saxon/Early Medieval	AD 410 -	1066
Medieval	AD 1066 -	1485
Post Medieval	AD 1486 -	1799
Modern	AD 1800 -	Present

### Introduction

- 4.1 What follows is a consideration of archaeological finds and features from within a 750m radius of the Site, also referred to as the study area, held on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER), together with a map regression charting the history of the Site from the eighteenth century until the present day.
- 4.2 In terms of relevant nationally significant designated heritage assets, as defined above in Section 2 and as shown on Figure 2, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites have been identified within the Site or its immediate vicinity.
- 4.3 In terms of relevant local designations, the Site lies within the Mortlake and Barnes Archaeological Priority Area (APA), as defined by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and GLAAS (GLHER ref DLO33477, TQ2125 7615). 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 (DLO33481, TQ1815 7383).
- 4.4 Many of the finds of prehistoric material have been given a generic grid reference (TQ2050 7600) which places their location within the Site. However, it is probable that in fact these discoveries have been made in the general Mortlake area, possibly from the River Thames, and have therefore been 'rounded up' on the designated grid point. Unfortunately, this lessens the effectiveness of these findspots when reviewing potential.

- 4.5 The GLHER indicates that several known archaeological Sites and findspots occur within the Site, most notably the Medieval Archbishop's Palace on the eastern part of the Site, together with the early Post Medieval palace of the Earl of Essex, Thomas Cromwell, on the western part of the Site (see relevant sections below).
- 4.6 Appendix 2 reproduces a Gazetteer of the GLHER entries from within the study area search radius.
- 4.7 Chapter 5 subsequently considers the site conditions and whether the proposed development will impact the theoretical archaeological potential identified below.

### Previous Archaeological Work

- 4.8 The Site has previously been subject to archaeological desk based assessment, in 1995 (ELO10524, TQ2052 7602), and in 2017 (ELO17441, TQ20393 76001).
- 4.9 Four phases of investigative archaeological works have been undertaken within the Site. Evaluation and two phases of watching brief have been undertaken on the eastern part of the Site in 1995, 1996 and 1999. This work revealed ploughsoils/ garden soils dating from the Medieval period onwards, together with Medieval, Post Medieval and Modern walls and foundations. Most recently, archaeological evaluation within both the western and eastern sides of the Site has revealed extensive horizontal truncation, however with intact subsoil above natural sands and gravels in places, together with traces of nineteenth century buildings, a large piece of decorated masonry which may relate to Medieval/Post Medieval activity, albeit discovered in a modern context, and a cut feature (see paragraphs 4.7.23-4 below; Figure 20; MoLAS 1995, 1996 and 1999; PCA 2016; ELO4480, TQ2046 7606).

### Prehistoric – Palaeolithic and Mesolithic

- 4.10 Kempton Park Gravels, which underlie the study Site, have been categorised as part of the Devensian Stage, the last glacial stage of the British Pleistocene epoch. Organic material within the Kempton Park Gravels has been dated to c.45,000-30,000 BP, within the Middle Devensian Stage. While vertebrate remains have been identified within the Kempton Park Gravels, the identification of archaeological artefacts to date has not been common (Gibbard 1994: 90).
- 4.11 Within the study area, a small Palaeolithic flint flake has been identified southeast of the Site, at a depth of c.4.5m in sand, c.275m from the River Thames (MLO20853, TQ205 755). A small handaxe was also identified in 1903-4, the grid reference places the location of this find within the eastern part of the Site (MLO13286, TQ2050 7600).
- 4.12 Finds of Mesolithic date have included three tranchet axes and Thames Picks, two within the northwestern part of the Site (MLO18147, TQ2030 7610) and another from the general Mortlake area (MLO18370 TQ2050 7600).
- 4.13 In view of the finds identified within the study area the potential of the Site for the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic can be categorised as moderate. It is interesting to note an absence of peat deposits within the site investigation data and from the archaeological fieldwork undertaken to date at the Site; alluvial deposits were recorded in the 1995 archaeological fieldwork (see paragraph 4.8 above; also Section 3 above and Appendix 1).

### Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age

- 4.14 Quantities of Neolithic and Bronze Age artefacts, including pottery, metalwork and flintwork, have been identified in the vicinity of Townmead Road, northwest of the Site (ELO956, MLO76430, TQ19790 76410). Shallow pits, gullies and well abraded pottery dated to the Bronze Age and Iron Age have been identified at 107 Mortlake High Street, east of the Site (ELO4090, MLO67490-91, TQ2085 7600).
- 4.15 Quantities of Prehistoric finds from the general Mortlake area (TQ2050 7600/TQ2000 7600) include Neolithic axeheads (MLO18921) Neolithic pottery (MLO19094) Bronze Age horn hammerheads (MLO18979, MLO19105), Bronze axeheads (MLO18980, MLO23453), and Bronze ingots (MLO14382). An individual Late Neolithic – Early Bronze Age flint blade has been identified from Dukes Meadow to the north of the study site (MLO11797, TQ2080 7650).
- 4.16 Undiagnostic prehistoric finds and features have been identified to the east of the Site along Mortlake High Street, at Nos 61-69 (MLO71683, ELO4056, TQ2070 7600), at Nos 71-75 (ELO10575, TQ20734 75997); Nos 77-91 (ELO161, MLO75659, TQ2071 7599; MLO75660, MLO77301, TQ2077 7601), No 105 (MLO71386, ELO4094, TQ2084 7599), and No 107 (ELO4090, TQ2085 7600).
- 4.17 In view of the finds of Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age date within the study area, the potential of the Site itself for these periods can be identified as moderate. Evidence for land division and agricultural activity may be represented. It is interesting to note an absence of peat deposits within the Site investigation data and from the archaeological fieldwork undertaken to date at the Site; alluvial deposits were recorded in the 1995 archaeological fieldwork (see paragraph 4.2.5 above; also Section 3 above and Appendix 1).

### Roman

- 4.18 No archaeological features of Roman date have been identified on the GLHER within a 750m radius of the Site.
- 4.19 Artefactual discoveries within the study area search radius include a coin from the Thames foreshore adjacent to Chiswick Bridge, northwest of the study site (MLO109551, TQ2041 7615).
- 4.20 A correspondingly low archaeological potential can be identified for the Roman period at the Site itself.

### Anglo-Saxon

- 4.21 The manor and settlement at Mortlake were evidently an extensive and prosperous one in the Late Saxon period, in the ownership of the Archbishops of Canterbury, as indicated by its entry in Domesday Book (1086):

**The Archbishop holds Mortlake himself, in lordship. Before 1066 it answered for 80 hides. The Canons of St Paul's hold 8 of these hides, which paid and pay tax with these. Now they pay tax together for 25 hides. Land for 35 ploughs. In lordship 5 ploughs;**

**80 villagers and 14 smallholders with 28 ploughs.**

**A church; 16 slaves**

**2 mills at 100s; meadow, 20 acres; from the woodland, 55 pigs from pasturage.**

**In London there were 17 dwellings which paid 52d; in Southwark 4 dwellings at 27d; from the village of Putney 20s from tolls.**

---

**1 fishery without dues. Before 1066 Earl Harold had this fishery in Mortlake. Archbishop Stigand had it for a while after 1066. However [the jurors] state that Harold established it by force before 1066 on Kingston land, and on St Paul's land.**

**Value of the whole manor before 1066 £32; later £10; now £38.**

- 4.22 Mortlake is recorded in Domesday Book as *Mortelage*, which is thought to derive from a stream with young salmon, and perhaps refers to the fishery mentioned in the entry, probably situated on a now vanished tributary of the Thames (VCH Surrey 1912: 69-74; Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay 2008: 561).
- 4.23 No finds of Anglo-Saxon date have been identified within a 750m radius of the Site. In view of this the potential for this period at the Site can be categorised as generally low, although evidence of agricultural activity and land division could conceivably be present.

### Medieval

- 4.24 The site of the Medieval Archbishops Palace at Mortlake has been identified on the eastern side of Ship Lane, within the Brewery complex at the Site. It is known to have been a residency of the See of Canterbury from 1099 and remained in the ownership of the Archbishops until the sixteenth century. Brickwork dated to 'the time of the Plantagenets' (i.e. 1154-1485 AD) was identified here in 1817 (MLO19136, TQ2046 7606; Phillips 1817). Also in 1817, a walled up gateway interpreted as part of the Archbishops Palace was noted within the eastern part of the Site (MLO48473, TQ2046 7606); a Chapel was also present within the palace precinct, present since at least 1095 (MLO48474, TQ207 763; MoLAS 1995a: 16), with associated human remains (MLO48488, TQ207 763) and a summerhouse fronting the river (MLO48487, TQ207 763; see below). Figure 5, which reproduces a section of Samuel Leigh's Panorama of the Thames from London to Richmond undertaken in 1829, shows a section of wall east of Ship Lane fronting the river on the northern boundary of the Site, which has been interpreted as part of the Medieval palace precinct wall.
- 4.25 Analysis of documentary sources has identified probable areas of Medieval land use on the eastern side of the Site. The results are reproduced on plan at Figure 19, and demonstrate three principal zones: the site of the Archbishops Palace to the west, the church and cemetery to the east, and residential occupation along both sides of Thames Street to the southeast. It is believed that the western side of the Site, west of Ship Lane, comprised open agricultural and horticultural land during the Medieval period.
- 4.26 The church referred to in Domesday in the Manor of Mortlake is believed to have existed at Wimbledon, c.5 miles to the south of the Site (Manning & Bray 1814: 306; VCH 1912: 69-74; MoLAS 1995a: 14). However, a church was licensed in 1349 and constructed west of the present building in Mortlake, to save the villagers the trip to Wimbledon (VCH 1912: 69-74). This church has been sited within the eastern end of the Site, within the curtilage of the manor house, on the opposite side of the high street from the existing church (MoLAS 1995a: 20-23). It was demolished and moved to its present site, to the southeast of the Site by Henry VIII in 1543 (MLO19129, TQ2084 7599).
- 4.27 Archaeological fieldwork undertaken within the eastern part of the Site, between Ship Lane and Bulls Alley, revealed alluvial deposits containing tile and pottery dating to the Medieval period onwards (MoLAS 1995b) together with ploughsoils of possible Medieval date, truncated by Medieval walls and

foundations (MoLAS 1996; MLO67935, TQ2046 7606). Recent evaluation on the western part of the Site revealed a large piece of decorated masonry which may relate to the documented Medieval/Post Medieval activity, albeit discovered in a modern context (PCA 2016).

- 4.28 Beyond the eastern end of the Site, evidence for dumping thought to demonstrate enwharfment during the Medieval period was identified at 105 Mortlake High Street (MLO71387, TQ2084 7599). Alluvial silts dated to the Medieval period, together with building material, refuse and pottery dated to the 13th-15th centuries has been identified at 107 Mortlake High Street (MLO67492, TQ2085 7600). Two lines of stake and postholes were revealed at 77-91 Mortlake High Street, with remains indicating that from the fifteenth century two burgage plots were developed with buildings (ELO162, MLO77303, MLO77304, TQ2077 7601), and a well, ditches and pits were identified at Tapestry Court (ELO148, MLO75647, MLO77281, TQ2077 7600).
- 4.29 A wharf dated by documentary references to the fifteenth century existed at the northern end of Ship Lane, adjacent to the Site's northern boundary (MLO72098, TQ2040 7610). A sherd of Surrey Hampshire Coarse Borderware pottery was found at 10 Thames Bank, northwest of the Site (MLO72157, TQ2037 7611).
- 4.30 The potential of the eastern part of the Site for the Medieval period can therefore be categorised as high. Figure 19 summarises the Medieval landuse in this area, which potentially includes remains of the Bishops Palace, chapel and manorial centre, the fourteenth century church and associated cemetery, together with residential occupation and activity associated with Mortlake village to the southeast.
- 4.31 The western part of the Site, west of Ship Lane, is most likely to have comprised open land during the Medieval period, used for agriculture and/or horticulture. Archaeological evaluation immediately west of the study site on the west side of Williams Lane revealed residual Medieval pottery together with later evidence (ELO11610, TQ201 760). Evidence of such activity together with land division is most likely to be present on this side of the Site. The archaeological potential of this part of the Site is therefore categorised as generally low.
- 4.32 In spite of the generally negative results of intrusive archaeological fieldwork within the Site, it is considered likely that archaeological remains of Medieval date may remain at depth below the Site, through the identification of fragmentary remains of possible Medieval date, together with intact subsoils above natural sands and gravels.

### **Post Medieval and Modern (including map regression exercise)**

- 4.33 It is thought that brewing was taking place in Mortlake by the very early Post-Medieval period, established by John Morgan c.1487 to supply the household of Henry VII. The site of the brewery is thought to have lain within the eastern part of the Site, adjacent to the Archbishops Palace (Watneys London n/d; Port of London 1984). This brewery is likely to be simply a facility within a palace, rather like a bakery or a blacksmith, instead of a commercial enterprise.
- 4.34 A large house was recorded as being constructed on the east side of Williams Lane, within the western boundary of the Site, after 1493 by a brewer named John Williams. This house is subsequently thought

to have been occupied by Sir Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex (information from Barnes & Mortlake History Society website), and it became known as Cromwell House (MLO1753, TQ2020 7605).

- 4.35 The Archbishop of Canterbury exchanged the manor of Mortlake with Henry VIII for other lands in 1535-6 (VCH 1912: 69-74). The king granted the Manors of Mortlake and Wimbledon to Cromwell in 1536, who is believed to have undertaken much building work there. Cromwell was an English lawyer and statesman, who served as Henry VIII's chief minister 1532-1540. He rose to power as an advocate of the Church of England and presided over the Dissolution of the monasteries (Leithead 2004/2009). A letter from Richard Tomyow to Henry VIII in 1536 references '*Mortlake, where Cromwell's servants are in health and his building ariseth fair*' (VCH 1912: 69-74; Barnes & Mortlake History Society website). It can therefore be conjectured that Cromwell rebuilt or significantly added to the existing house built by John Williams, perhaps utilising materials from the former Archbishops Palace to the east.
- 4.36 The Site of a manor house has been established close to the Thames on the eastern side of Ship Lane, within the central part of the study Site towards the northern boundary, possibly associated with the former Archbishops Palace (VCH 1912: 69-74; Barnes & Mortlake History Society website). Cromwell appears to have sold the manors of Mortlake and Wimbledon back to Henry VIII in 1540, prior to his execution in July of that year.
- 4.37 The king may have utilised Mortlake as a residence after Cromwell's execution; in 1543 he ordered the demolition of the existing church and its reconstruction beyond the Site boundary (MLO19129, TQ2084 7599; VCH 1912: 69-74). In 1543-4 Henry VIII granted the manors of Mortlake and Wimbledon to Katherine Parr and she held the manor until her death in 1548. The manor of Mortlake subsequently became merged with that of Wimbledon, which had become the head manor at the beginning of the 1540s. A succession of owners subsequently possessed the manors (VCH 1912: 69-74).
- 4.38 At least part of the former Bishops Palace is thought to have still been extant in 1663, and by the late seventeenth century the gatehouse and associated buildings were in use as an inn. The Palace is recorded as having been largely demolished after 1700, but garden walls were apparently extant in 1812 (Manning & Bray 1814: 306; MoLAS 1995a). The earliest available map which shows the Site in any detail, John Rocque's Survey of London (Fig 3: 1745) shows the former palace site devoid of buildings, and occupied by market gardens. The site of Cromwell House, towards the centre of the western boundary, is shown occupied a range of buildings fronting a lane running east-west towards the centre of the Site. The southeastern part of the Site and much of the southern boundary has been developed with houses, with a meadow in the southwestern corner, and further areas of market garden present towards the centre of the Site.
- 4.39 Cromwell House, within the western boundary of the Site, remained in occupation throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Upon the death of Valentina Aynscombe in 1841 however, the house fell into disrepair, and it was finally demolished in 1857. Another house named Cromwell House was built to the northwest of the study Site, fronting the river (Barnes & Mortlake History Society website).
- 4.40 Archaeological fieldwork undertaken within the eastern side of the Site, between Ship Lane and Bulls Alley, revealed Post Medieval ploughsoils, walls and foundations, including a wall of probable eighteenth



century date (MoLAS 1995b, 1996). Recent evaluation on the western part of the Site revealed a large piece of decorated masonry which may relate to the documented Medieval/Post Medieval activity, albeit discovered in a modern context (PCA 2016).

- 4.41 Documentary references to commercial brewing at Mortlake date to 1765, when court rolls mention two small breweries adjacent to each other on either side of Thames Street, within the southeastern part of the study Site (Brown 1997: 34). It is this brewery, rather than the fifteenth century establishment, which is the most likely origin of the existing brewing facility.
- 4.42 The Lindley & Crossley Map of Surrey (Figure 4: 1793) shows little change within the Site from Rocque's survey. In 1807, James Weatherstone and his partner extended their brewery fronting Thames Street northwards to the river (Brown 1997: 34).
- 4.43 Observations made in 1817 referred to upstanding masonry dated 'to the time of the Plantagenets' on the site of the Medieval Archbishops Palace east of Ship Lane fronting the river (see paragraph 4.6.1 above). A painting of the river at Mortlake by WH Harriot, dated 1824, together with Samuel Leigh's Panorama of the Thames from London to Richmond undertaken in 1829 (Figure 5), both appear to show survival of the precinct wall around the former Medieval palace, including buttresses and the feature identified as a summer house, fronting the river on the Site's northern boundary.
- 4.44 The Mortlake Tithe Map (Figure 6: 1839) and the associated Award shows the Site occupied by brewery buildings at the eastern end, with buildings fronting the west side of Ship Lane which runs through the centre of the Site, Mortlake High Street on the southern boundary, and the road running east-west through the centre of the Site. The bulk of the remainder of the Site comprises horticultural land and meadow. The parcel of land in the southeastern corner, between Thames Street and the High Street, is shown fully developed.
- 4.45 In 1852, the Mortlake brewery was bought by Charles John Phillips, who expanded the facility significantly (Brown 1997: 35).
- 4.46 The First Edition Ordnance Survey (Figure 7: 1865) shows the expansion of the brewery towards the river from the road to the south. A large house named The Cedars is shown adjacent, which is known to have been basemented (information from Richmond Local Studies Library). A riding school is shown to the east of Ship Lane, where an L-shaped lane has been laid out. Further residential development is shown along the southern boundary. The site of Cromwell House is indicated within the western boundary of the Site, while the extent of the Bishops Palace is shown on the eastern part of the Site, fronting the river. The land between Thames Street and Mortlake High Street to the southeast is shown partially cleared to the west, with intact brewery buildings to the east.
- 4.47 The line of Thames Street, within the southeastern part of the Site, was absorbed into the brewery complex in 1865. Figure 8 comprises a plan showing the extent of what became part of the Site. Phillips acquired the freehold of substantial areas of land along the riverside in 1865, after which buildings including a tithe barn (probably of Late Medieval origin) docking house, shop and stable, slaughterhouse, lofts and blacksmiths workshop were demolished. The new brewery included the brick wall still present along the north side of Mortlake High Street (Brown 1997: 36; Cherry & Pevsner 1999: 514-5.)

- 4.48 The Second Edition Ordnance Survey (Figure 9: 1896) shows the absorption of Thames Street within the Site, and the brewery's dominance east of Ship Lane. Further development is shown along Cromwell Road, which runs east of Ship Lane. West of Ship Lane, a building labelled Fairfax, probably a large house, has been built towards the centre of the Site, with buildings formerly fronting the west side of Ship Lane now demolished.
- 4.49 The brewery at Mortlake was taken over by Watneys in 1898. In 1903, an eight storey maltings was constructed on the river frontage (Brown 1997: 36; Port of London 1984). This was constructed on the Site of the riding school, on the east side of Ship Lane fronting the river.
- 4.50 The 1907 GOAD Insurance Plan (Figure 10) shows the eastern part of the Site, between Ship Lane and Bulls Alley, occupied by the Watney Coombe Reid & Co Limited Mortlake Brewery. The functions of various buildings within the brewery complex are shown, which at this time included beer stores, engine rooms, tun rooms, bottling and sugar stores, cask washing areas, wheelwrights, smithy, stables and paint shops, with the 1903 malthouse shown in the northwestern corner. Basements are shown beneath "E" Beer Store No 4 towards the eastern end, and beneath the tun rooms fronting the river, with buildings varying in height from one to eight storeys. Residential houses are shown fronting Guildford Place (formerly Cromwell Road) within the centre of the Site.
- 4.51 The Third Edition Ordnance Survey (Figure 11: 1913) shows little change across the eastern part of the Site from the earlier GOAD plan. Through the middle of the Site, between Aynscombe Lane and Ship Lane, West Street has been laid out, with houses either side and allotment gardens to the north. The western part of the Site remains primarily open land.
- 4.52 The Revised Ordnance Survey (Figure 12: 1940) shows alterations within the main brewery complex, together with the replacement of the allotment gardens north of West Road, in the centre of the Site, with a single large building. Buildings have also been constructed on the northern edge of the cricket ground, including a pavilion on the western boundary. The site of the brewery is thought to have received only minor damage during World War Two (James 1963: 168; Barnes & Mortlake Historical Society 2004).
- 4.53 The 1952-1961 composite Ordnance Survey (Figure 13) shows redevelopment of the northwestern part of the brewery, east of Ship Lane between 1953 and 1961, and additions to the pavilion in the northwestern corner of the sports ground. Figure 14 reproduces an aerial photo of 1962 which shows in the foreground two large pavilions occupying the northwestern and northeastern corners of the sports ground.
- 4.54 The bulk of the mid nineteenth century and later brewery buildings were demolished in the 1970s and replaced by the modern industrial brewing facility occupying the Site today. Several alleys, streets and paddocks were removed in the process, which extended the brewery west of Ship Lane (Brown 1997: 36; Cherry & Pevsner 1999: 515). There were several significant fires at the Brewery complex during the later twentieth century, which resulted in significant reconstruction (information from Richmond Local Studies Library).
- 4.55 The 1965-1968 composite Ordnance Survey (Figure 15) shows the repositioning of the pavilion within the northeast corner of the cricket ground, the demolition of buildings along the southern boundary and



- the construction of a circular building at the main entrance. The buildings fronting Mortlake High Street on the southeastern boundary have been modified, and a new building constructed at the eastern end.
- 4.56 Three phases of fieldwork were carried out by the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS) including an evaluation in 1995, followed by monitoring programmes during 1996 and 1999. The reports indicate that in-situ river terrace gravels were observed, together with ploughsoils, garden soils, walls and foundations dating from the Medieval period to the eighteenth century (MoLAS 1995b, 1996, 1999).
- 4.57 The above work was carried out prior to the construction of the lager bottling plant currently occupying the centre of the eastern part of the Site. The plant comprises an open plan warehouse with a raft base and piled foundations, and required the reduction of the ground level by 1.2m within its footprint (MoLAS 1995a).
- 4.58 Archaeological evaluation undertaken across the Site in 2016 revealed traces of nineteenth century buildings together with Post Medieval and Modern truncation (PCA 2016).
- 4.59 The 1992-1998 composite Ordnance Survey (Figure 16) shows the redevelopment of the eastern side of the Site in progress. Substantial detached brewery buildings have been constructed through the centre of the Site, replacing West Street and its associated structures. Additional buildings have also been constructed in the northwestern corner, and a new club house has been constructed on the eastern boundary of the sports ground. The building formerly known as Fairfax on the northern boundary west of Ship Lane has been demolished.
- 4.60 The 2009 Ordnance Survey (Figure 17) shows the Site largely as it remains today, occupied by the buildings of the brewery, with the sports ground and pavilion to the southwest. In comparison with the 1992-1998 survey the scale of recent redevelopment on the eastern side of the Site is clearly evident.
- 4.61 The current Site survey (Figure 18) shows no substantial changes within the Site.
- 4.62 The potential of the Site for the Post Medieval and Modern periods can be categorised as high. Remains of Cromwell House (c.1491-1857) may survive within the northwestern boundary of the Site; remains associated with the former Archbishops Palace may survive east of Ship Lane (apparently extant until the early/mid nineteenth century) together with village activity and occupation in the southeastern corner, prior to absorption into the brewery complex in 1865. Across the whole of the Site, remains associated with previous phases of the brewery dating from the eighteenth century are likely to survive below the existing facility.
- 4.63 In spite of the generally negative results of intrusive archaeological fieldwork within the Site, it is considered likely that archaeological remains of Post Medieval date may remain at depth below the Site, through the identification of fragmentary remains of possible Post Medieval date, together with intact subsoils above natural sands and gravels.

**Assessment of Significance (Designated Heritage Assets)**

- 4.64 Existing national policy guidance for archaeology (the NPPF as referenced in section 2) enshrines the concept of the ‘significance’ of heritage assets. Significance as defined in the NPPF centres on the value of an archaeological or historic asset for its ‘heritage interest’ to this or future generations.
- 4.65 No archaeological designated heritage assets as defined in the NPPF are recorded on or in close proximity to the Site.
- 4.66 In view of the above it is concluded that the redevelopment proposals will have no direct archaeological impact upon relevant designated heritage assets.

**Assessment of Significance (non-designated Heritage Assets)**

- 4.67 In terms of local designations, the Site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and GLAAS.
- 4.68 Overall, it is possible that archaeological remains of national significance may be present within the Site boundary, relating to the known presence of the Site of the Medieval palace and parish church, together with village settlement, within the eastern part of the Site, and the Renaissance mansion within the western boundary.
- 4.69 As identified by desk-based work, including a synthesis of previous fieldwork, archaeological potential by period and the likely significance of any archaeological remains which may be present is summarised in table form below:

<b>Period:</b>	<b>Identified Archaeological Potential</b>	<b>Identified Archaeological Significance</b>
Palaeolithic	Low	Low (local)
Mesolithic	Low to moderate	Local (low)
Neolithic	Low to moderate	Low (local)
Bronze Age	Low to moderate	Low (local)
Iron Age	Low to moderate	Low (local)
Roman	Low	Low (local)
Anglo-Saxon	Low	Low (local)
Medieval	Low (west of Ship Lane) High (east of Ship Lane)	Low (local)/ moderate (regional)/ high (national)
Post Medieval	High	Low (local)/ moderate (regional)/ high (national)
Modern	High	Low (local)

## 5 SITE CONDITIONS, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSETS

### Site Conditions

- 5.1 The Site is currently occupied by the buildings of the former Mortlake Brewery complex, dating to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with a sports ground and pavilion occupying the southwestern corner (Figure 18).
- 5.2 The construction of the existing brewing facility is considered likely to have had a cumulative, severe destructive impact on underlying archaeological deposits.
- 5.3 The construction and demolition of buildings formerly occupying the Site can be considered likely to have had a severe negative impact on any underlying archaeological deposits through the cutting of foundations and services, and in particular any basements or cellars formerly present. This will include previous phases of the brewery together with domestic buildings (see Section 4 above).
- 5.4 The negative impact of previous and existing development is demonstrated by the results of archaeological works undertaken within the Site to date (see paragraph 4.8 above). Figures 21-22 reproduce the deposit model which demonstrates the extent of made ground across the Site, while Figure 27 identifies areas of existing and previous basements.
- 5.5 Phases of landforming across the Site, including revetment along the Thames frontage of the Site and levelling of the natural topography, are thought to have been carried out from the Medieval period into the eighteenth century. These are considered likely to have buried the original land surface of the northern part of the Site below several metres of made ground (see paragraph 3.4.2 above). This process has the potential to have preserved archaeological remains at depth.
- 5.6 The bulk of the sports ground occupying the southwestern corner of the Site appears to have remained undeveloped within its documented history. The insertion of drainage and any floodlighting measures can be considered to have had a severe but localised archaeological impact through the cutting of services.
- 5.7 Any agricultural and/or horticultural use of the Site prior to development can be considered to have had a moderate, widespread negative archaeological impact.

### Proposed Development

- 5.8 The Applications seek planning permission for:

#### Application A:

**“Hybrid application to include the demolition of existing buildings to allow for comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:**

**Planning permission is sought in detail for works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:**

- a) Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks
- b) Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one to two storeys below ground
- c) Residential apartments
- d) Flexible use floorspace for:
  - ix. Retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses
  - x. Offices
  - xi. Non-residential institutions and community use
  - xii. Boathouse
- e) Hotel / public house with accommodation
- f) Cinema
- g) Offices
- h) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works
- i) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level
- j) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
- k) Flood defence and towpath works
- l) Installation of plant and energy equipment

Planning permission is also sought in outline with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:

- k) The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeys
- l) Residential development
- m) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking
- n) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
- o) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works”

**Application B:**

“Detailed planning permission for the erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and other associated works”

5.9 Figures 23-27 reproduce relevant drawings associated with the Site’s proposed redevelopment.

### **Review of Potential Development Impacts on Designated Archaeological Assets**

- 5.10 In terms of relevant nationally significant designated heritage assets, as defined above and as shown on Figure 2, no nationally designated World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck sites lie within the vicinity of the study site.
- 5.11 In view of the above it is concluded that the redevelopment proposals will have no direct archaeological impact upon relevant designated heritage assets.

### **Review of Potential Development Impacts on Non-Designated Assets**

- 5.12 In view of the Site's known archaeological potential, combining the Medieval palace, church and part of Mortlake village to the east, with the early Post Medieval mansion of Cromwell House to the west, together with related activity, any redevelopment of the Site could potentially have a detrimental archaeological impact upon remains deemed to be of national significance.
- 5.13 Previous archaeological work within the Site has indicated significant truncation as a result of successive phases of the brewery which has occupied the Site since the eighteenth century (see section 3 above and Figs 21-22). However, surviving Medieval and Post Medieval deposits have been noted below modern development, together with intact subsoil and natural sands and gravels, where archaeological remains may be present.
- 5.14 The bottom of the proposed basement slab within the eastern part of the Stag Brewery component of the Site (east of Ship Lane) would be set at 0.76m OD, save for the proposed cinema in the southwestern corner, which has a proposed double basement. This area of the Site recorded natural terrace gravels at between 4.4m and 2.68m OD, so the proposed basement would likely impact on any archaeological structures or deposits present (see Figure 22). The proposed foundation design for all buildings founded at ground level within the detailed element of the Stag Brewery component of the Site, east of Ship Lane) would comprise a 1m deep piled raft. The proposed cinema building which has a two-level basement and large column grid, would also be founded on a 1 m deep piled raft. Below the foundations, these buildings would have an expanse of piles (3 to 5 per column) that would be 600mm in diameter and extending down approximately 25m in length.
- 5.15 The maximum extent for the proposed basement within the west part of the Stag Brewery component 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 (see also Figure 22).
- 5.16 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 top level of the sheet pile wall would be set at -1m AOD.
- 5.17 It is considered that the archaeological fieldwork and desk based assessment undertaken to date has sufficiently characterised the Site. Site restrictions due to the presence of existing buildings together with associated internal and external plant also preclude the application of additional targeted exploratory archaeological fieldwork, prior to demolition.

- 5.18 Given the absence to date of identified appropriate geological horizons, it is not proposed to progress geoarchaeological/palaeoenvironmental work at the Site.
- 5.19 Given the likely archaeological potential, further archaeological works are proposed in the form of a phased evaluation programme, following demolition, with further works dependant upon the results of the evaluation. Additionally it is anticipated that a programme of historic building recording for the extant Brewery buildings will also be required. Such work can follow the granting of planning consent, secured by condition.
- 5.20 Archaeological mitigation proposals as set out above have previously been discussed and approved by the GLAAS officer for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (see Appendix 3).
- 5.21 The previously agreed archaeological mitigation proposals have subsequently been re-confirmed in subsequent documentation. The GLA hearing report, dated 27 July 2021, confirms the following:

*70 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS): No objection, subject to conditions (included in draft decision).*

*121 Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS): The revisions to the applications will not have any additional archaeological impact to that of the original scheme. The planning application lies in an area of archaeological interest (Archaeological Priority Area) identified for the Local Plan: Mortlake and Barnes. The archaeological interest should therefore be conserved by attaching recommended informatives and conditions.*

*448 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.*

## 6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The Site of the Stag Brewery, Mortlake, has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.
- 6.2 In accordance with relevant government planning policy and guidance, a desk based assessment has been undertaken to clarify the archaeological potential of the study area.
- 6.3 In terms of relevant nationally designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites lie within or in immediate proximity to the Site.
- 6.4 In terms of relevant local designations the Site lies within the Mortlake and Barnes Archaeological Priority Area, as defined by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and GLAAS.
- 6.5 The Site is considered likely to have a moderate potential for the Prehistoric periods. Original land surfaces within the Site are thought to be buried beneath made ground and later structures, where not truncated by subsequent development.
- 6.6 The Site is considered likely to have a generally low potential for the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.
- 6.7 The eastern side of the Site is considered likely to have a high potential for the Medieval period. The eastern part of the Site is known to contain the site of an Archbishops Palace, together with a chapel or church, with part of the Medieval village to the southeast. The western part of the Site is understood to have comprised principally open fields during the Medieval period, with a correspondingly generally low archaeological potential.
- 6.8 The Site is considered likely to have a high potential for the Post Medieval and Modern periods. The Renaissance mansion of Sir Thomas Cromwell is known to lie on the western part of the Site, while the brewery developed on the eastern part from the eighteenth century onwards.
- 6.9 Past post-depositional impacts within the Site are considered to have been severe and cumulative as a result of previous and existing phases of development, particularly the construction and demolition of phases of the Mortlake Brewery across the Site during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
- 6.10 Programmes of archaeological fieldwork undertaken across the Site have revealed Medieval and Post Medieval deposits, together with substantial modern deposits and post depositional impacts.
- 6.11 Redevelopment of the Site can be considered likely to have an adverse archaeological impact.
- 6.12 On the basis of the available information it is proposed to progress archaeological mitigation measures in the form of a phased archaeological evaluation programme, following demolition and Site clearance, with further excavation work dependant upon the results of evaluation. Additionally, a programme of historic building recording on the extant Brewery buildings is also anticipated.
- 6.13 The above mitigation strategy has previously been discussed and approved by the planning authorities' archaeological advisor (GLAAS).
- 6.14 Such work would necessarily follow the granting of planning consent, secured by relevant condition(s).



## SOURCES CONSULTED

### General

British Library  
Greater London Historic Environment Record  
London & Metropolitan Archives  
The National Archive  
Barnes & Mortlake History Society (website)  
London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre  
Richmond Local Studies Library  
Society of Antiquaries Library

### Internet

Archaeological Data Service: <http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk>  
Aerial photography: <http://www.britainfromabove.org.uk/>  
British Geological Survey: <http://www.bgs.ac.uk/discoveringGeology/geologyOfBritain/viewer.html>  
British History: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>  
Domesday Book: <https://opendomesday.org.uk>  
Historic England (National Heritage List): <https://www.historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list>  
Past Scape: <http://www.pastscape.org.uk>  
Portable Antiquities Database: <https://finds.org.uk/database/>  
NPPG: <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk>  
World War Two bomb damage: <http://www.bombsight.org/bombs/>  
<http://www.barnes-history.org.uk/BandMmap/Cromwell.html>

### Bibliographic

Anderson *A History of Mortlake* 1886  
Barnes & Mortlake History Society *Watneys at War* unpublished talk April 2004  
Brown *Barnes and Mortlake Past with East Sheen* 1997  
Bridgland Quaternary River terrace deposits as a framework for the Lower Palaeolithic record in Gamble & Lawson (eds.) *The English Palaeolithic Reviewed* 1996  
British Geological Survey *British Regional Geology London and the Thames Valley* Fourth Edition 1996  
CgMs Consulting *Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Evaluation Stag Brewery Mortlake* June 2016 unpublished document  
Chartered Institute for Archaeologists *Standard & Guidance for historic environment desk based assessment* 2014, revised 2020 unpublished document  
Cherry, Nairn & Pevsner *Buildings of England Surrey* 2nd Edition 1971  
Cherry & Pevsner *Buildings of England London 2 South* 1999



## ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

---

- Department of Communities and Local Government *Scheduled Monuments and Nationally Important Non-Scheduled Monuments* 2013
- Department of Communities and Local Government *National Planning Policy Framework* 2012 (revised July 2021)
- Department of Communities and Local Government/Department of Culture Media and Sport/English Heritage *PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide* 2010
- Domesday Book Surrey* 1975 Phillimore Edition
- Gibbard *The Pleistocene History of the Lower Thames Valley* 1994
- Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service *Standards for Archaeological Work* February 2014 unpublished document
- Hedgecock *Hand in Hand Watneys Mortlake World* 2007
- Historic England *Archaeological Priority Area Guidelines* July 2016 unpublished document
- Historic England (formerly English Heritage) *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment* 2008 (new draft 2017)
- Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 1 The Historic Environment in Local Plans* July 2015 unpublished document
- Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment* July 2015 unpublished document
- Historic England *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets* December 2017 unpublished document
- James *The Red Barrel A History of Watney Mann* 1963
- Leigh *The Panorama of the Thames from London to Richmond* 1829
- Leithead *Cromwell, Thomas, earl of Essex* in Dictionary of National Biography 2004/2009
- London County Council *Names and Streets and Places in the Administrative County of London* 1955
- London Topographical Society/London & Metropolitan Archives *The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps 1939-1945*, 2005
- Loobey *Britain in Old Photographs Barnes, Mortlake and Sheen* 1995
- Manning & Bray *The History and Antiquities of Surrey* Volume 3 1814
- Margary *Roman Roads in Britain* 1955
- Mills *Dictionary of London Place Names* 2010
- MoLAS/English Heritage *A Research Framework for London Archaeology* 2002
- MoLAS/English Heritage *The Archaeology of Greater London: An Assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area now covered by Greater London* 2000
- Museum of London Archaeology Service *The Stag Brewery High Street Mortlake An Archaeological Impact Assessment* unpublished document 1995
- Museum of London Archaeology Service *The Stag Brewery High Street Mortlake An Archaeological Evaluation* unpublished document March 1995
- Museum of London Archaeology Service *The Stag Brewery High Street Mortlake An Archaeological Watching Brief* unpublished document March 1996
- Museum of London Archaeology Service *The Stag Brewery High Street Mortlake An Archaeological Watching Brief* unpublished document July 1999
- Museum of London *A research framework for London archaeology* 2002

Phillips *Walk from London to Kew* 1817

Port of London *Mortlake Brewery* 1984

Pre-Construct Archaeology *An Archaeological Evaluation at the Stag Brewery, Lower Richmond Road, Mortlake, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames SW14 7ET* November 2016 unpublished document

*Richmond & Twickenham Times* 1 October 1982

*Richmond & Twickenham Times* 8 December 1995

Serocold (ed.) *The Story of Watneys* 1949

Victoria County History *Surrey Volume 4* 1912

Ward *The London County Council Bomb Damage Maps 1939-1945* 2015

*Watneys London - Mortlake Brewery* n/d

Weinreb, Hibbert & Keay (eds.) *The London Encyclopaedia* 2008

Wymer *The Lower Palaeolithic Occupation of Britain* 2 volumes 1999

### Cartographic

1745 John Rocque's Map of London

1768 John Rocque's Map of Surrey

1793 Lindley & Crossley's Map of Surrey

1823 Charles & John Greenwood's Map of Surrey

1839 Mortlake Tithe Map

1865 Ordnance Survey

1865 Plan of Thames Street Mortlake

1894-6 Ordnance Survey

1907 GOAD Insurance Plan

1913 Ordnance Survey

1940 Ordnance Survey

1948 Ordnance Survey

1952 Ordnance Survey

1953 Ordnance Survey

1958 Ordnance Survey

1961 Ordnance Survey

1965 Ordnance Survey

1967 Ordnance Survey

1968 Ordnance Survey

1973 Ordnance Survey

1976 Ordnance Survey

1977 Ordnance Survey

1982 Ordnance Survey

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESK BASED ASSESSMENT

---

1987 Ordnance Survey

1988 Ordnance Survey



1991 Ordnance Survey

1992 Ordnance Survey

1993 Ordnance Survey

1998 British Geological Survey Sheet 270 (South London)

2009 Ordnance Survey



 Site Boundary




0 100 200m  
Scale at A4: 1:8,000




Figure 1

Site Location






- Legend**
- Site Boundary
  - Search Radius 750m
- Designated Heritage Assets:**
- Listed Buildings
  - Conservation Areas
- Non-designated Heritage Assets:**
- HER Record (point)**
- + Findspot
  - / Maritime
  - Monuments
- HER Record (polygon)**
- Monument
  - Historic Parks and Gardens
- Archaeological Priority Areas**
- DLO33011 The River Thames Bank and Foreshore
  - DLO33477 Mortlake and Barnes
  - DLO33481 Thames Foreshore and Bank
- Previous Archaeological Work:**
- Event Record (point)
  - Event Record (linear)
  - Event Record (polygon)



**Figure 2**  
 Summary of Cultural Heritage Designations  
 (data from GLHER)

Project Ref: N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Maping\GIS\Projects\RPS\Figure 2.mxd





 Site Boundary (approximate)




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only




Figure 3

1745 John Rocque's Map of London






 Site Boundary (approximate)



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 4  
1793 Lindley & Crossley's Map of Surrey





N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\PPS\Figures.dwg



Figure 5  
 1829 View of Mortlake  
 (including the northern site  
 frontage) from the River Thames





 Site Boundary (approximate)




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 6

1839 Mortlake Tithe Map



 Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 7

1865 Ordnance Survey Map



# PLAN OF PART OF THE VILLAGE OF MORTLAKE

*Showing THAMES STREET & BREWHOUSE ALLEY  
to be diverted and stopped up, the new highway  
to be opened by adding its width of BULLS ALLEY  
and widening of HIGH STREET as proposed by  
Messrs. Phillips and Wiggin*

*Thames Street and Brewhouse Alley retained brown.  
The portions of land to be thrown into and added  
to Bulls Alley and High Street retained red.*





Figure 8  
1865 Plan of Thames Street



 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 9

1896 Ordnance Survey Map






Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 10

1907 GOAD Insurance Plan



 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 11

1913 Ordnance Survey Map





 Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 12

1940 Ordnance Survey Map



 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 13

1952-61 Ordnance Survey Map






Legend

 Site Boundary (approximate)



Figure 14  
1962 Aerial Photograph





 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 15

1965-68 Ordnance Survey Map



 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 16

1992-98 Ordnance Survey Map



 Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 17

2009 Ordnance Survey Map





 Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 18  
2016 Site Survey





Legend

- Site Boundary
- Church and Cemetery
- Palace Precinct
- High Street Frontage
- Line of Thames St. absorbed into brewery in 1865
- Site of Sixteenth Century Cromwell House



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only




Figure 19

Probable extent of Medieval land use zones across the eastern part of the site

N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\RP\S\Figures.dwg





Legend

- Site Boundary
- Area of watching brief, 1995
- Evaluation test-pits, 1995
- Areas of watching brief, 1998
- Evaluation test-pits and trenching, 2016

N  
 Not to Scale:  
 Illustrative Only




Figure 20  
 Location of archaeological works undertaken within the Site to date

N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\RPS\Figures.dwg



N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Montlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\PPS\Figures.dwg




- Legend**
- Site Boundary
  - + Borehole Location (1995-2015)
  - Evaluation Trench Location (2016)
  - Proposed Basement Footprint

N  
 Not to Scale:  
 Illustrative Only



Figure 21  
 Deposit model section plan location






- Legend**
- Site Boundary
  - ⊕ Borehole Location (1995-2015)
  - Evaluation Trench Location (2016)
  - Proposed Basement Impacts
- Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only

	MADE GROUND
	CLAY/SILT
	SAND/GRAVEL
	GRAVEL



**Figure 22a**  
Deposit Model Section  
(with proposed development finished floor level heights)

N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\RPS\Figures.dwg



Legend

Site Boundary

Borehole Location (1995-2015)

Evaluation Trench Location (2016)

Proposed Basement Impacts

Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only




Figure 22b

Deposit Model Section  
(with proposed development finished floor level heights)

Legend

 Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only




Figure 23a

Redevelopment Proposals:  
plan of lower basement east of  
Ship Lane

Legend

Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 23b


Redevelopment Proposals:  
plan of basement east of  
Ship Lane





Legend

Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 23c  
Redevelopment Proposals:  
plan of basement east of Ship Lane

Legend

Site Boundary




Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 24

Redevelopment Proposals:  
plan of basement west of Ship Lane





Studio	BIKE STORE
1B2P	CAR PARK ENTRANCE
2B3P	CINEMA
2B4P	FLEXIBLE USE
3B4P	GAS METER ROOM
3B5P	HOTEL
3B6P	LV SWITCHROOM
4B8P	OFFICE
1B2P SR	REFUSE STORE
2B3P SR	SCHOOL
2B4P SR	SUBSTATION
3B5P SR	
3B6P SR	

Legend

Site Boundary



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 25


Redevelopment Proposals:  
Ground Floor

N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\RP\S\Figures.dwg




Legend


Site Boundary




1 Basement Section\_Phase 01\_002  
1 : 500




2 Basement Section\_Development Area 01\_Podium  
1 : 100



4 Basement Section\_Development Area 01\_Slab Step  
1 : 100



3 Basement Section\_Development Area 01\_Boulevard  
1 : 100




5 Basement Section\_Development Area 01\_Main Street  
1 : 100

N  
Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only



Figure 26  
Redevelopment Proposals:  
Section





Legend

- Site Boundary
- Proposed Basement



Not to Scale:  
Illustrative Only




Figure 27

Plan overlay of proposed basements  
and ground floor

N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\RPS\Figures.dwg



N:\22000-22999\22164 - Stag Brewery Mortlake\Figures\Mapping\CAD\PPS\Figures.dwg



Legend

- Site Boundary
- Extent of Existing and Former Basements

N  
 Not to Scale:  
 Illustrative Only



- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Medieval Land Use Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: #90EE90; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Church and Cemetery</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: #D8BFD8; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Palace Precinct</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: #FFDAB9; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> High Street Frontage</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: #ADD8E6; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Thames Street</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 10px; background-color: #FF6347; border: 1px solid black; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Thomas Cromwell's House</li> </ul> | <p>LEGEND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Trade Sewers</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px dashed green; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Trade Connections to buildings (Unsurveyed)</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid red; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Foul Sewers</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid blue; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Surface Water Sewers</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid cyan; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Gully Connections</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px dashed cyan; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Assumed Gully Connections</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid purple; margin-right: 5px;"></span> Redundant</li> <li><span style="display: inline-block; width: 20px; border-bottom: 1px solid darkgreen; margin-right: 5px;"></span> New, Stainless Steel</li> </ul> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Figure 28  
 Plan showing previous and existing development impacts



## APPENDICES

## Appendix 1


### Geotechnical information 1995, 2003, 2015





**AREA KEY**

- GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL NETWORK - DATES & BOREHOLE NO'S & DATA
- BH21A - ADDITIONAL GROUNDWATER MONITORING WELL - AECOM 2015
- 1.950 GROUNDWATER CONTOUR
- 1.594 GROUNDWATER ELEVATION
- \* (ANOMALOUS) DATE, PERCHED WATER
- ↑ GROUNDWATER FLOW DIRECTION



**AECOM**  
 CONSULTING ENGINEERS  
 URS Infrastructure & Environment UK LTD,  
 St George's House, 3rd Floor, SW13 4DR  
 5 St. George's Road, Wimbledon, London SW13 4DR  
 Tel: 020 7963 9800 Fax: 020 7963 9801

CLIENT  
 AB INBEV

PROJECT  
 PHASE 2 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE  
 ASSESSMENT - SEPTEMBER 2015

DRAWING TITLE  
 FIGURE 4 - GROUNDWATER CONTOUR PLAN,  
 28TH AUGUST 2015, FULL DIP ROUND

DATE	BY	CHECKED	APPROVED	DATE
05/09/15	UCS	JMM	BM	05/09/15
AS SHOWN	UCS	NO	NO	REV
		DOC No	47074683	



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH109A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 28-08-15 End Date 28-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	Sheet 1 of 1
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig		

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Termination
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	
					(0.35) 0.35	CONCRETE	
0.5		<0.1			(0.35) 0.70	MADE GROUND: Brown, grey, sandy, fine to coarse, angular to subangular gravel. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is concrete, red and yellow brick and natural stone.	Dry NVO
1.0	BH109A_0.8	<0.1			(0.50) 1.20	Soft, dark brown, sandy, gravelly clay. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to medium, angular to subangular of flint.	Damp NVO
1.5		<0.1			(0.70) 1.90	Brown, sandy, slightly gravelly CLAY. Sand is fine to coarse. Gravel is fine to medium subrounded of flint.	Damp NVO
2.0		<0.1			2.10	Brown, sandy fine to medium, subrounded to subangular GRAVEL of flint. Sand is fine to coarse.	Damp NVO
2.5		<0.1			(0.70) 2.80	Brown, grey, slightly gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine, subrounded of flint.	Damp NVO
3.0		<0.1			(0.70) 3.50	Brown/orange, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium, subangular to subrounded of flint.	Damp NVO
3.5		<0.1				Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

TE 06/02/16 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/9/15

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandy gravelly CLAY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandy Gravel Groundwater Table Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH201</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 20-08-15 End Date 20-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
0.5					0.25	TARMAC over CONCRETE		[Cross-hatch pattern]
				(0.45)	0.70	MADE GROUND: Dense, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of brick and concrete. Sand is fine to coarse.	Dry NVO.	[Cross-hatch pattern]
							Borehole terminated at 0.7m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

TE 08.02.16 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/08/15

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal	<b>Sample Details</b>	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  <small>NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination, m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 0.7mbgl</small>
Logged By <span style="float: right;">CG</span>		Approved By <span style="float: right;">MM</span>	

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH201A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 24-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	Sheet 1 of 1
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger.		

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	
0.25						TARMAC over CONCRETE	
0.5	BH201A 0.7	<0.1			(0.95)	MADE GROUND: Brown/red/ yellow, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-coarse, angular-subangular of brick, flint and natural stone.	Damp NVO
1.0		<0.1			1.20	Light brown, dense, medium-fine SAND with occasional rounded flint.	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1					
2.0	BH201A 1.9-2.0	<0.1			(2.00)		
2.5		<0.1					
3.0		<0.1					
3.5		<0.1			3.20	SAND and GRAVEL. Gravel is medium-coarse flint. Sand is fine-coarse dense light brown.	Wet from 3.7mbgl NVO
4.0		<0.1					
4.5		<0.1					
5.0		<0.1			5.10		
5.5		<0.1			(0.90)	Grey, mottled dark brown, possibly stiff CLAY (LONDON CLAY).	Dry, NVO.
6.0					6.00	Borehole terminated at 6.0m bgl.	

TE 08 02 10 STAG LOGS - FULL.GPJ AGSS3 ALL.GDT 22/0/15

<b>Backfill</b> Cement seal riser Bentonite seal riser Filter pack riser Filter pack screen Hole Collapse	<b>Sample Details</b> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> Ashphalt Sand Clay Made Ground Silty/clayey PEAT Groundwater Table Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG/MM		Approved By GM	



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH202</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 24-08-15 End Date 24-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	
0.5		<0.1		0.25	TARMAC over CONCRETE		█
				(0.35)	MADE GROUND: Grey, dense, sand and gravel of concrete. Sand is fine-coarse. Gravel is fine-medium, angular-subangular.	Dry NVO	█
				0.60	MADE GROUND: Brown, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of concrete. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO	
				0.80	Borehole terminated at 0.8m bgl due to refusal on concrete.		

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b>  	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  <small>NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl</small>
Logged By <span style="float: right;">CG</span>		Approved By <span style="float: right;">MM</span>	

TE 08.02.16 STAG LOGS - FULL.GPJ AGS3 ALL.GDT 22/08/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH202A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 24-08-15 End Date 24-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.25	TARMAC over CONCRETE	
0.5	BH202A 0.8	<0.1			(0.35)	MADE GROUND: Grey, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of concrete. Sand is fine-coarse.	Wet NVO
1.0		<0.1			0.60	MADE GROUND: Brown, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded of concrete.	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1			(1.20)		
					1.80	Borehole terminated at 1.8m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By MM

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH203</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 20-08-15 End Date 20-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
0.5		<0.1			0.20	TARMAC over CONCRETE	Dry NVO	
					(0.70)	MADE GROUND: Very dense, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of yellow and red brick, granite and concrete.		
					0.90			
					1.00	Concrete / possible granite slab. No recovery.		
					(2.00)			
					3.00	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl due to refusal on concrete.		

<b>Backfill</b> Cement seal riser Bentonite seal riser Filter pack riser Filter pack screen	<b>Sample Details</b> 	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/8/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH203A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 20-08-15 End Date 20-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	Sheet 1 of 1
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger.		

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
0.20					0.20	TARMAC over CONCRETE	
0.5	BH203A_0.5	<0.1			(0.70)	MADE GROUND: Very dense, sandy, angular to sub-angular gravel of brick, granite and concrete.	Dry NVO
0.90					0.90		
1.0		<0.1			1.00	Concrete / granite slab.	Damp, NVO.
1.5		<0.1					
2.0		<0.1					
2.5		<0.1			(2.50)		
3.0							
3.5					3.50	Concrete / granite slab.	Damp, NVO.
4.0					3.60	No recovery.	
4.5					(1.20)		
5.0					4.80	Possibly CLAY (no recovery).	Wet. NVO.
					5.00	Borehole terminated at 5.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> Cement seal riser Bentonite seal riser Filter pack riser Filter pack screen		<b>Sample Details</b> Small disturbed sample		<b>Legend</b> Asphalt Concrete Made Ground Clay Groundwater Table Groundwater Strike		<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl			
Logged By				CG		Approved By		MM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FILL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/0/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH204</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 21-08-15 End Date 21-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ()		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.28	TARMAC over CONCRETE	Dry NVO
					0.40	MADE GROUND: Pea shingle.	Dry NVO
0.5					0.70	CONCRETE	Dry NVO
		<0.1			0.80	MADE GROUND: Red bricks.	Dry NVO
1.0					(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Brown/ red, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular brick gravel.	Dry NVO
	BH204 1.3	<0.1			1.20	MADE GROUND: Very soft, brown/ red, very sandy clay. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO
1.5					1.50	MADE GROUND: Dark grey/ black, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of flint. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO
2.0		<0.1			(1.50)		
2.5					3.00		
3.0		<0.1			3.20	Orange/ yellow, fine-coarse SAND.	Dry NVO
	BH204 3.3	<0.1			3.50	Brown, sandy, fine-medium, subangular-subrounded GRAVEL.	Damp NVO
3.5						Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL.GPJ AGS3 ALL.GDT 22/8/15

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Sand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sandy Gravel <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH205</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 21-08-15 End Date 21-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.27	CONCRETE	
0.5					(0.53)	MADE GROUND: Grey, dense, fine to coarse sand and gravel of concrete.	Dry NVO
1.0	BH205 1.0	<0.1			0.80	MADE GROUND: Very dense, brown, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of brick, concrete, flint, glass. Sand is fine-coarse. Little recovery.	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1			(1.70)		
2.0		<0.1					
2.5	BH205 2.5	<0.1			2.50	Brown/ orange, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded, becoming more gravelly with depth. Little recovery.	Dry NVO
3.0		<0.1			(0.50)		
					3.00	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FILL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/01/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH206</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 21-08-15 End Date 21-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ()		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
0.20						TARMAC over CONCRETE	
0.5					(0.80)	MADE GROUND: Grey, dense, fine to coarse sand and gravel of concrete.	Dry, NVO.
1.0	BH206 1.1	<0.1			1.00	MADE GROUND: Soft brown sandy clay. Gravel is fine-medium, angular-subangular of brick and concrete.	Dry, NVO.
1.5		<0.1			(0.80)		
					1.80	Borehole terminated at 1.8m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GBT 22/9/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH207</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
0.20					0.20	TARMAC	
0.5	BH207 0.7	<0.1			(0.90)	MADE GROUND: Grey/red, dense, fine to coarse sand and gravel of concrete and brick.	Dry, NVO.
1.10		<0.1			1.10	Soft, gravelly, brown CLAY. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded of flint. (Possibly reworked)	Dry, NVO.
1.5		<0.1			(1.50)		
2.60	BH207 2.6-3.5	<0.1			2.60	Brown, dense, gravelly SAND. Gravel fine, occasionally medium of flint. Sand is fine to medium.	Dry, NVO.
3.0		<0.1			(0.90)		
3.5		<0.1			3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Clay <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL.GPJ AGS3 ALL.GDT 22/8/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH208</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
0.5		<0.1			0.25	CONCRETE		
				(0.55)	MADE GROUND: Brown, sandy, medium gravel of concrete, brick and flint.	Dry, NVO.		
						0.80	Borehole terminated at 0.8m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b>  	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  <small>NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination.          m bgl - meters below ground level.          Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl</small>
Logged By <span style="float: right;">CG</span>		Approved By <span style="float: right;">MM</span>	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/0/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH208A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Termination
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	
					0.25	CONCRETE	
0.5		<0.1			0.50	MADE GROUND: Fine to medium, angular to subangular concrete gravel.	Dry NVO
1.0	BH208A_0.8 BH208A_1.1	<0.1			(0.50) 1.00	MADE GROUND: Dark brown, slightly clayey, gravelly, fine to coarse sand. Gravel fine occasionally coarse, subangular to subrounded of brick and flint.	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1				Medium density, brown, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium, subangular to subrounded of flint. Very sandy between 1.5m and 1.9m.	Dry NVO
2.0		<0.1			(2.50)		
2.5		<0.1					
3.0		<0.1					
3.5		<0.1			3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08 02 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AG53 ALL GDT 22/8/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH209</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
0.27					0.27	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH209_0.5	<0.1			(2.43)	MADE GROUND: Brown, grey/ black, gravelly, fine to coarse sand. Gravel is fine to coarse, angular to subangular of brick and concrete. Becoming	Dry NVO
2.70	BH209_2.7-3.4	<0.1			(0.70)	Brown, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium, subangular to subrounded of flint. Very little gravel between 3.0 -3.2m. Poor recovery between 1.2m - 3.4m. Driller noted it becoming dense at 2.7m.	Dry NVO
3.40						Borehole terminated at 3.4m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL.GPJ AGS3 ALL.GDT 22/8/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH210</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 26-08-15 End Date 26-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.30	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH210_0.8	<0.1			(0.90)	MADE GROUND: Dense, brown, sandy, fine to coarse, subangular to rounded gravel of natural stones.	Dry NVO
1.0		<0.1			(0.90)	Soft, brown, sandy CLAY (possibly reworked clay).	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1			2.10		
2.0	BH210_2.2-2.8	<0.1			(1.40)	Brown, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium to subrounded of flint. Becoming more gravelly with depth.	Dry NVO
2.5		<0.1			3.50		
3.0		<0.1					
3.5		<0.1				Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Clay <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGSS ALL GOT 22/9/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location <b>Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14</b>			Client <b>AB Inbev</b>		<b>BOREHOLE No BH211</b>
Job No <b>47075502</b>	Date Start Date <b>26-08-15</b> End Date <b>26-08-15</b>	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor <b>ESL</b>		Method / Plant Used <b>Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.</b>			Sheet <b>1 of 1</b>

STRATA							
Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
				[Concrete Symbol]	0.25	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH211 0.7	<0.1		[Made Ground Symbol]	(1.25)	MADE GROUND: Brown, sandy, fine to coarse, subangular to rounded gravel of natural stone, wood and occasional brick. Becoming clayey with depth.	Dry NVO
1.0				[Gravelly Sandy Clay Symbol]	1.50	Soft, brown, grey, sandy, gravelly CLAY. Gravel is fine to medium, subangular to angular and subrounded of flint. Sand is fine to coarse. (possibly reworked clay)	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1		[Gravelly Sand Symbol]	(0.60)		
2.0	BH211 2.2	<0.1		[Gravelly Sand Symbol]	2.10	Brown, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium, subangular to rounded of flint. Becoming more gravelly with depth.	Dry NVO
		<0.1		[Gravelly Sand Symbol]	(1.40)		
				[Gravelly Sand Symbol]	3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <table style="width:100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Concrete</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sandy Clay</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Concrete	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground	<input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sandy Clay	<input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
<input type="checkbox"/> Concrete	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground								
<input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sandy Clay	<input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand								
<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike								
Logged By <b>CG</b>		Approved By <b>MM</b>							

TE 08 03 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/9/16

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH212</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 27-08-15 End Date 27-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

STRATA							
Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.30	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH212_0.6	<0.1			(1.40)	MADE GROUND: Pink / red, gravelly, fine to coarse sand. Gravel is fine to medium of flint with occasional coarse brick and crushed concrete.	Dry NVO
1.0		<0.1					
1.5		<0.1					
2.0	BH212_1.8-2.5	<0.1			(1.80)	Dense, brown, gravelly fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium subangular to rounded. Becoming more gravelly with depth.	Dry NVO
2.5		<0.1					
3.0		<0.1					
3.5		<0.1			3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill		<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small sample <input type="checkbox"/> disturbed		<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike		<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl	
Logged By				CG		Approved By	
						MM	

TE 08 02 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GOT 27/015





### Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH213</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 27-08-15 End Date 27-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.24	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH213_0.6	<0.1			(0.76)	MADE GROUND: Brown / grey, slightly clayey, sandy, fine to coarse, angular to subangular gravel of brick, concrete, tile and plastic. Sand is fine to coarse.	Damp NVO
1.0		<0.1			(0.60)	Soft brown grey slightly gravelly CLAY. (Possibly reworked clay)	
1.5	BH213_1.7-2.0	<0.1			(1.40)	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine to coarse SAND. Gravel is fine to medium, angular to subrounded of flint. Occasional sand and gravel pockets throughout.	Damp NVO
2.0		<0.1					
2.5		<0.1					
3.0		<0.1				Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Clay <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08.02.18 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AG53 ALL GDT 22/8/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH214</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ()		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger.			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
					0.05	TARMAC		
					0.20	CONCRETE		
0.5	BH214_0_85	<0.1			(0.60)	MADE GROUND: Light brown, dense, sandy gravel. Sand is medium to coarse. Gravel is medium to coarse, subangular to subrounded of flint and concrete.	Dry NVO	
1.0					0.80	MADE GROUND: Light brown, dense gravelly sand. Sand is medium to coarse. Gravel is medium to coarse, subangular to subrounded of flint and concrete.	Dry NVO	
1.5					(1.80)			
2.0								
2.5					2.60	Borehole terminated at 2.6m bgl due to refusal on concrete.		

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		MM	Approved By
			GM

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GOT 22/8/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH214A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Solid Stem Auger.			Sheet 1 of 1

STRATA						
Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	Legend	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.05 TARMAC	
					0.20 CONCRETE	Dry NVO
0.5					(0.60) MADE GROUND: Light brown, dense, sandy gravel. Sand is medium to coarse. Gravel is medium to coarse, subangular to subrounded of flint and concrete.	Dry NVO
1.0					(1.20) MADE GROUND: Light brown, dense gravelly sand. Sand is medium to coarse. Gravel is medium to coarse, subangular to subrounded of flint and concrete.	
1.5						
2.0					2.00 Borehole terminated at 2.0m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b>	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Asphalt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By      MM		Approved By      GM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGSS ALL GDT 22/9/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH2A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 25-08-15 End Date 25-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.25	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH2A 0.5	<0.1			(0.55)	MADE GROUND: Brown sandy fine-medium angular gravel of flint and crushed concrete. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO
					0.80	CONCRETE	Dry NVO
1.0		<0.1			1.10	Soft, brown, sandy CLAY. (Possibly reworked clay)	Dry NVO
1.5	BH2A 1.5	<0.1			(1.40)		
2.0		<0.1			2.50	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded of flint.	Dry NVO
2.5		<0.1			(1.00)		
3.0		<0.1			3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.5m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill		<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample		<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Clay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike		<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl	
Logged By				CG		Approved By	
						MM	

TE 08 03 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/8/15



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH3A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 28-08-15 End Date 28-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.			Sheet 1 of 1




Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.25	CONCRETE.	
0.5	BH3A_0.5	<0.1			(1.25)	MADE GROUND: Brown, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-medium, occasionally coarse, angular-subangular of brick, glass and concrete.	Dry NVO
1.0		<0.1					
1.5		<0.1			(0.50)	Dense, brown, sandy, fine-medium, subangular-subrounded GRAVEL of flint. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO
2.0		<0.1			2.00	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is subangular-subrounded fine-coarse of flint.	Dry NVO
2.5		<0.1			(1.00)		
3.0		<0.1			3.00	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Gravel <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

TE 08 02 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AG53 ALL GDT 22/0/15

## Borehole Log




Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH4A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 27-08-15 End Date 27-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1


Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
0.5		<0.1			(1.30)	MADE GROUND: Brown, grey, slightly clayey, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-medium, angular-subangular of concrete, brick tile and rootlets.	Dry. Possible asbestos fragments.	
1.0	BH4A_0.9	<0.1			1.30			
1.5		<0.1			(2.70)	Brown, very gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded of flint.	Dry NVO	
2.0		<0.1						
2.5		<0.1						
3.0		<0.1						
3.5	BH4A_3.5-4.0	<0.1						
4.0		<0.1				Borehole terminated at 4.0m bgl.		

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH5A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 28-08-15 End Date 28-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
0.5	BH5A_0.5	<0.1			0.10 (1.70)	MADE GROUND: Pea gravel. MADE GROUND: Brown, slightly clayey, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-medium, occasionally coarse, subangular-subrounded of red brick.	Dry NVO	
1.0		<0.1			1.80	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-rounded of flint.	Dry NVO	
1.5		<0.1						
2.0		<0.1			(1.20)			
2.5		<0.1						
3.0		<0.1			3.00	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.		

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table  Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By CG		Approved By MM	

TE 08.02.10 STAG LOGGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/9/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH7A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 27-08-15 End Date 27-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Insulation
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	
					(0.55)	CONCRETE	
0.5	BH7A_0.7	<0.1			0.55	MADE GROUND: Soft, dark brown/grey, slightly gravelly, silty clay. Gravel is fine and subangular of red brick with fragments of wood.	Damp NVO
1.0		<0.1			1.20	Brown, slightly gravelly CLAY. Gravel is medium to coarse of flint.	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1			1.50	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel content increases with depth. Gravel is fine-medium, subangular-subrounded of flint.	Dry NVO
2.0		<0.1			(1.50)		
2.5	BH7A_2.5-3.0	<0.1					
3.0		<0.1			3.00	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Clay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination. m bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM



## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH7B</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 27-08-15 End Date 27-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer.		Sheet 1 of 1

STRATA						
Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	Legend	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
0.5				0.20	CONCRETE	
				0.30	MADE GROUND: Brown, sandy, fine-medium, angular-subangular gravel of flint and concrete. Sand is fine-coarse.	Dry NVO
				0.60	CONCRETE with rebar. Borehole terminated at 0.6m bgl due to refusal on concrete.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal	<b>Sample Details</b>	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 0.6mbgl
Logged By <span style="float: right;">CG</span>		Approved By <span style="float: right;">MM</span>	

TE 08 02 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ AGS3 ALL GDT 22/9/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14			Client AB Inbev		<b>BOREHOLE No</b>  <b>BH8A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 26-08-15 End Date 26-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )		
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig			Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
					0.20	CONCRETE	
					0.40	MADE GROUND: Grey, sandy, fine-medium gravel of concrete.	Dry NVO
0.5	BH8A	2.1			(0.40)	MADE GROUND: Black sand and gravel. Gravel is medium to coarse, angular to sub-rounded of flint. Sand is fine-coarse of ash.	Dry. Black ash noted.
1.0		<0.1			0.80	Soft, brown/ grey, sandy, gravelly CLAY. (Possibly reworked clay).	Dry NVO
1.5		<0.1			(1.40)		
2.0		<0.1					
2.5		<0.1			2.20	Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse SAND. Gravel is fine-medium subangular-rounded of flint.	Dry NVO
3.0	BH8A_3.0-3.5	<0.1			(1.30)		
3.5		<0.1			3.50	Borehole terminated at 3.0m bgl.	

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill	<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample	<b>Legend</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sandy Clay <input type="checkbox"/> Gravelly Sand  <input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike	<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b>  NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl
Logged By		CG	Approved By
			MM

TE 08 07 10 STAG LOGS - FULL GPJ ASS3 ALL GOT 22/8/15

## Borehole Log

Project Name and Site Location Stag Brewery, Mortlake, London SW14		Client AB Inbev		BOREHOLE No <b>BH9A</b>
Job No 47075502	Date Start Date 26-08-15 End Date 26-08-15	Ground Level (m)	Co-Ordinates ( )	
Contractor ESL		Method / Plant Used Concrete Corer and Premier Rig.		Sheet 1 of 1

Depth BGL	Sample / Test Details	PID (ppm)	Water	STRATA			Installation	
				Legend	Depth (Thickness)	DESCRIPTION		COMMENTS
					0.30	CONCRETE		
0.5	BH9A_0.5	<0.1			(1.90)	MADE GROUND: Dense, brown, gravelly, fine-coarse sand. Gravel is fine-medium, subrounded-rounded of natural stone, becoming clayey with depth. Poor recovery.	Dry NVO	
1.0		<0.1						
2.0					2.20	MADE GROUND: Black, sandy, fine-medium, angular, red/grey gravel of flint and crushed concrete. Sand is fine-coarse. Poor recovery.	Wet NVO	
2.5	BH9A_2.2-3.3				(1.10)			
3.0					3.30	Borehole terminated at 3.3m bgl due to refusal on concrete.		

<b>Backfill</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cement seal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bentonite Fill		<b>Sample Details</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small disturbed sample		<b>Legend</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Made Ground  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Table <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Strike		<b>GENERAL REMARKS</b> NVO - No visual or Olfactory Evidence of Contamination in bgl - meters below ground level. Hand pitted to 1.2mbgl		
Logged By			CG		Approved By			MM

TE 05.02.10 STAG LOGS - FULL LOG AGS3 ALL GOT 22/9/15

## Appendix 2

### GLHER Gazetteer December 2021



## Gazetteer

## HER Record (point)

MonUID	PrefRef	Name	MonType	PeriodRang
MLO11797	050900/00/00	DUKES MEADOWS	FINDSPOT	Late Neolithic to Early Bronze Age
MLO13286	MLO13286	Mortlake High Street,[Mortlake Brewery], Mortlake, Richmond {Palaeolithic handaxe}	FINDSPOT	Palaeolithic
MLO14382	021021/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Early Bronze Age to Late Bronze Age
MLO1753	021147/00/00	WILLIAMS LA	MANOR HOUSE; MANOR HOUSE	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO18147	020884/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Mesolithic
MLO18370	020903/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT; FINDSPOT	Mesolithic
MLO18921	MLO18921	Mortlake High Street/Lower Richmond Road, Mortlake {Jadeite? Axe}	FINDSPOT	Neolithic
MLO18979	021022/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Early Bronze Age to Late Bronze Age
MLO18980	021024/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Early Bronze Age to Late Bronze Age
MLO19094	020981/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Neolithic
MLO19105	021023/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT; FINDSPOT	Early Bronze Age to Late Bronze Age
MLO19129	021115/00/00	MORTLAKE HIGH ST	CHURCH; CHURCH	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO19136	021129/00/00	MORTLAKE BREWERY	PALACE; PALACE	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO23453	020994/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT; FINDSPOT	Early Bronze Age to Late Bronze Age
MLO4503	021271/00/00	LOWER RICHMOND RD	SETTLEMENT	Post Medieval
MLO4515	021272/00/00	LOWER RICHMOND RD	WATERCOURSE; STREAM	Unknown
MLO48473	021129/01/00	MORTLAKE BREWERY	GATE; WALL	Medieval
MLO48474	021129/03/00	MORTLAKE BREWERY	CHAPEL	Medieval
MLO48487	021129/02/00	MORTLAKE BREWERY (ADJACENT TO RIVER )	SUMMERHOUSE	Medieval
MLO48488	021129/04/00	MORTLAKE BREWERY	INHUMATION; CEMETERY; CEMETERY; INHUMATION	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO66038	022066/00/00	HIGH ST	BUILDING	Post Medieval
MLO67490	022226/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Prehistoric pits}	PIT	Prehistoric
MLO67491	022227/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Prehistoric gully}	GULLY	Early Bronze Age to Late Iron Age
MLO67492	022228/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Medieval flood deposit}	FLOOD DEPOSIT	Medieval
MLO67494	022229/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Post medieval buildings}	BUILDING; PATH; FLOOR; SURFACE	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO67496	022230/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Post medieval malt house}	MALT HOUSE	Post Medieval
MLO67497	022231/00/00	Mortlake High Street (107) {Post medieval industrial building and furnace}	FURNACE; METAL WORKS; BUILDING	Post Medieval
MLO6753	020853/00/00	MORTLAKE	FINDSPOT	Palaeolithic
MLO67935	022283/00/00	HIGH ST	WALL	Medieval
MLO68060	022292/00/00	75 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	FINDSPOT; FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69796	022531/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69798	022533/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED; FOREST	Unknown
MLO69799	022534/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	MOORING BOLLARD; STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69800	022535/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69801	022536/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69802	022537/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Prehistoric
MLO69803	022538/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69808	022543/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Unknown
MLO69809	022544/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Prehistoric
MLO69810	022545/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69811	022546/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	REVTMENT; STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69812	022547/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Prehistoric
MLO69813	022548/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69814	022549/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69815	022550/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FISH TRAP	Medieval
MLO69816	022551/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69817	022552/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69818	022553/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	DEPOSIT UNCLASSIFIED	Post Medieval
MLO69820	022555/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69821	022556/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO69822	022557/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	STRUCTURE	Unknown
MLO69823	022558/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	MOORING BOLLARD	Post Medieval
MLO69824	022559/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	MOORING BOLLARD	Post Medieval
MLO69826	022561/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69827	022562/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69829	022564/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69830	022565/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69831	022566/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69832	022567/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	FINDSPOT	Post Medieval
MLO69834	022569/00/00	THAMES FORESHORE	LANDING STAGE; HARD	Post Medieval
MLO71386	023147/00/00	105 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	POST HOLE; GULLY; STAKE HOLE	Prehistoric

MLO71387	023148/00/00	105 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	LAND RECLAMATION; DUMP; DUMP; LAND RECLAMATION	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO71388	023149/00/00	105 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	BUILDING	Post Medieval
MLO71683	023201/00/00	61-69 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	PIT; PIT	Prehistoric
MLO71684	023202/00/00	61-69 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	SUGAR REFINERY; STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO71685	023203/00/00	Mortlake High Street (Nos 61-69) {Mortlake delftware pottery manufacturing site}	SHAFT; POTTERY MANUFACTURING SITE	Post Medieval
MLO71686	023203/01/00	61-69 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	BUILDING; WALL	Post Medieval
MLO71687	023203/02/00	61-69 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	DRAIN	Post Medieval
MLO71688	023204/00/00	61-69 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	MALT HOUSE	Post Medieval
MLO72097	023253/00/00	MORTLAKE	STREAM	Unknown
MLO72098	023254/00/00	SHIP LANE	WHARF	Medieval
MLO72099	023255/00/00	99 MORTLAKE HIGH ST	WORKSHOP; TAPESTRY WEAVING WORKSHOP	Post Medieval
MLO72157	025272/00/00	10 THAMES BANK SW14	FINDSPOT	Medieval
MLO72158	025273/00/00	10 THAMES BANK SW14	RUBBISH PIT	Post Medieval
MLO72159	025274/00/00	10 THAMES BANK SW14	GULLY	Post Medieval
MLO72160	025275/00/00	10 THAMES BANK SW14	PIT	Post Medieval
MLO72668	054518/00/00	GREAT CHERTSEYRD (DUKES MEADOW )	LANDFILL SITE	Post Medieval
MLO72669	054519/00/00	HARTINGTON RD (SPORTS GROUND )	LANDFILL SITE	Post Medieval
MLO72675	054524/00/00	HARTINGTON RD CUBITTS BASIN	LANDFILL SITE	Post Medieval
MLO72696	054541/00/00	IBIS LA IBIS ROWING CLUB	LANDFILL SITE	Post Medieval
MLO75285	MLO75285	Mortlake Logboat	BOAT UNCLASSIFIED	Unknown
MLO75285	MLO75285	Mortlake Logboat	BOAT UNCLASSIFIED	Unknown
MLO75647	MLO75647	Tapestry Court	DITCH	Medieval
MLO75659	MLO75659	77-91 Mortlake High Street	GULLY	Prehistoric
MLO75660	MLO75660	77-91 Mortlake High Street	PIT	Prehistoric
MLO76079	MLO76079	Quintin Hogg Memorial Sports Ground	MADE GROUND	Modern
MLO76430	MLO76430	Kew Riverside, Townmead Road, Richmond	FINDSPOT	Prehistoric
MLO77281	MLO77281	Tapestry Court	PIT	Medieval
MLO77282	MLO77282	Tapestry Court	BUILDING	Post Medieval
MLO77291	MLO77291	Kew Riverside, Townmead Road, Richmond	QUARRY PIT	Post Medieval to Modern
MLO77301	MLO77301	77-91 Mortlake High Street	PIT	Prehistoric
MLO77302	MLO77302	77-91 Mortlake High Street	WALL	Post Medieval
MLO77303	MLO77303	77-91 Mortlake High Street	POST/STAKE HOLE ALIGNMENT	Medieval
MLO77304	MLO77304	77-91 Mortlake High Street	BUILDING	Medieval to Post Medieval
MLO77305	MLO77305	77-91 Mortlake High Street	STRUCTURE	Post Medieval
MLO78258	MLO78258	5 James Terrace, Mortlake	HOUSE; WELL	Post Medieval
MLO109551	MLO109551	Chiswick Bridge, Mortlake, Richmond upon Thames {Roman coin}	FINDSPOT	Roman

#### HER Record (polygon)

MonUID	PrefRef	Name	MonType	PeriodRang
MLO102883	MLO102883	Prince's Road [Dissenters Burial Ground], East Sheen, Richmond SW14 {Former burial ground of East Sheen Congregational Church}	NONCONFORMIST CEMETERY; PUBLIC PARK	Post Medieval to Modern
MLO102895	MLO102895	Sheen Lane/Lower Richmond Road Mortlake [Mortlake Green], Richmond SW14 7HA {Public open space}	PUBLIC PARK	Post Medieval to Modern
MLO103982	MLO103982	Clifford Avenue/Mortlake Road [Hammersmith New Cemetery] Mortlake, Richmond, SW14 7BU {20th century cemetery}	CEMETERY; CEMETERY CHAPEL; CEMETERY LODGE	Modern
MLO104129	MLO104129	Tangier Road [Tangier Green] Richmond, TW10 {public space}	PARK	Post Medieval to Modern
MLO69033	MLO69033	Lower Richmond Road/Mortlake Road [North Sheen Cemetery] Mortlake, Richmond, TW9 4LL {20th century cemetery}	CEMETERY; CEMETERY LODGE; GARDEN OF REST; CEME	Modern
MLO69034	MLO69034	South Worple Way/ Avenue Gardens [Old Mortlake Burial Ground] Richmond SW14 {19th century Cemetery}	CEMETERY; MORTUARY CHAPEL; TREE AVENUE; GATE; R	Post Medieval to Modern
MLO69104	MLO69104	North Worple Way/Worple Street [Mortlake Roman Catholic Cemetery], Mortlake, SW14 8PR {19th century cemetery}	CEMETERY	Post Medieval to Modern

#### Event Record (point)

EvUID	Name	Organisation
ELO148	Tapestry Court, Mortlake High Street, Mortlake: Excavation	Pre-Construct Archaeology
ELO161	Mortlake High Street (Nos 77-91), Mortlake: Evaluation	Pre-Construct Archaeology
ELO162	Mortlake High Street (Nos 77-91), Mortlake: Excavation	Pre-Construct Archaeology
ELO3123	Cromwell House: Evaluation	Department of Greater London Archaeology
ELO4076	Mortlake Green School	
ELO581	Quintin Hogg Memorial Sports Ground	AOC Archaeology Group
ELO5965	Mortlake High Street (No 20), Mortlake, SW14: Watching Brief	Sutton Archaeological Services
ELO5975	James Terrace (No 5), [Land adjacent to], Vineyard Path, Mortlake: Watching Brief	AOC Archaeology Group
ELO956	Townmead Road, [Kew Riverside], TW9: Evaluation	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO1193	The River Thames Greater London: Survey	Thames Archaeological Survey
ELO21277	Lower Richmond Road, [Former Stag Brewery], Mortlake, SW14: Evaluation and watching brief	Pre-Construct Archaeology

#### Event Record (linear)

EvUID	Name	Organisation
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East

ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East
ELO11610	Williams Lane, London, SW14: Evaluation	Archaeology South East

**Event Record (polygon)**

EvUID	Name	Organisation
ELO11612	Worple Street [St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary School], Mortlake, Richmond, SW14 8HE	Compass Archaeology
ELO16293	Williams Lane, Mortlake, Richmond: Desk Based Assessment	CgMs Consulting
ELO4090	Mortlake High Street (107): Evaluation	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO5690	Mortlake [Thames Tidal Defences, Mortlake Embayment] London: Desk based assessment	Black & Veatch Ltd
ELO10565	West Hall Road/Mortlake Road [Kew Sewage Treatment Works] Kew: Watching Brief	Thames Valley Archaeological Services
ELO10568	Mortlake Road [Kew Sewage Treatment Works] Kew: Desk based assessment	Thames Valley Archaeological Services
ELO3819	West Hall Road/Mortlake Road [Kew Sewage Treatment Works] Kew: Evaluation	Thames Valley Archaeological Services
ELO18567	Lower Richmond Road [The Stag Brewery] Mortlake London SW14 7ET: Built Heritage Assessment	Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Ltd
ELO4094	Mortlake High Street (No. 105) Mortlake London: Excavation	AOC Archaeology Group
ELO4056	Mortlake High Street (Nos 61-69) London SW14: Evaluation and Excavation	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO10671	Townmead Road [Kew Riverside] Richmond Greater London TW9: Desk based assessment	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO10671	Townmead Road [Kew Riverside] Richmond Greater London TW9: Desk based assessment	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO10575	Mortlake High Street (Nos 71-75) London SW14: Excavation	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO3669	High Street (No 75) [Lord Napier Public House] Mortlake London: Evaluation	Wessex Archaeology
ELO4480	High Street [Stag Brewery] Mortlake London: Watching Brief	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO17441	Mortlake High Street [Stag Brewery] Mortlake London: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment	CgMs Consulting
ELO4681	Thames Bank (No 10) [The Ship Tavern] Mortlake London: Evaluation	AOC Archaeology Group
ELO10398	Mortlake High Street (Nos 61-69) London SW14: Desk based assessment	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO10489	Hanson Close/Lower Richmond Road [Mortlake Schook, site of] Mortlake London: Evaluation	Museum of London Archaeology Service
ELO10524	High Street [The Stag Brewery] Mortlake London: Desk based assessment	Museum of London Archaeology Service

**Appendix 3**

**Correspondence with GLAAS re archaeological mitigation**



**From:** O'Gorman, Laura  
**To:** [Richard von Kalinowski-Meager](#)  
**Subject:** [EXT] RE: Stag Brewery, Mortlake  
**Date:** 16 August 2017 15:26:28

---

Hi Richard,

I have finally managed to get around to reviewing the current draft, and I'm pleased to say that the additional assessment, including the new past impact plan and transects are really useful. The assessment helps to give us a clearer steer and the next phase of archaeological investigation. Your client will need to submit this along with the evaluation report as part of their application. When consulted by the borough I will then recommend a 2 stage condition, with the first stage comprising further evaluation in order to refine the mitigation strategy. It would be good for us to sit down in due course to work out the best evaluation scope in light of the most recent assessment.

Please get in touch if you have questions.

Regards,  
Laura

Laura O'Gorman  
Assistant Archaeology Advisor  
Planning Group: London  
Historic England | 1 Waterhouse Square, 138-142 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST  
Direct Dial: 0207 973 3242      Mobile: 07789 928 817

*Historic England is changing the way GLAAS engages in Pre-application advice. From 1st July 2017 this free service will change to a free cycle of advice to prospective applicants for planning permission affecting undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest in Greater London outside the City of London & Southwark (where we do not provide such advice). Our free Initial Pre-application written advice will say if we recommend taking up charged-for Extended Pre-application advice. Extended Pre-application advice is discretionary and operates on a cost-recovery basis; we do not make a profit from it. Further information and our Pricing Schedule will be provided on our website.*



We help people understand, enjoy and value the historic environment, and protect it for the future. [Historic England](#) is a public body, and we champion everyone's heritage, across England.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)    Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

Help us create a list of the 100 places which tell England's remarkable story and its impact

on the world. [A History of England in 100 Places](#) sponsored by [Ecclesiastical](#).

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available.

---

**From:** Richard von Kalinowski-Meager [mailto:Richard.von-Kalinowski-Meager@cgms.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 16 August 2017 11:19  
**To:** O'Gorman, Laura  
**Subject:** RE: Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Hi Laura,

I was wondering how your deliberations were progressing re the Stag Brewery site, and whether you needed any further information?

Regards,

Richard

**Richard von Kalinowski-Meager BA MA PG Cert FSA MCI fA**  
**Director**  
**Archaeology**  
**Direct Dial: 020 7832 1487**  
**Email Address: [richard.meager@cgms.co.uk](mailto:richard.meager@cgms.co.uk)**  
**Mobile: 07764 830956**

Please note that I will be on annual leave from the end of Wednesday 23 August until the morning of Monday 4 September 2017.

**CgMs Consulting**

Part of RPS Group plc

**Planning, Archaeology & Historic Buildings Consultants**

11<sup>th</sup> Floor, 140 London Wall, London EC2Y 5DN

**Tel: 020 7583 6767**

**Fax: 020 7583 2231**

Co. Reg No. 3303376

[www.cgms.co.uk](http://www.cgms.co.uk)



---

**From:** Richard von Kalinowski-Meager  
**Sent:** 09 August 2017 11:16  
**To:** 'O'Gorman, Laura'  
**Subject:** RE: Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Laura,

I attach the updated DBA for the Stag Brewery site, for your review and comment (the full report size is nearly 30MB and you will shortly receive a weblink from my secretary Karen to download

this from).

I would draw your attention to the 1962 aerial photograph, reproduced at Figure 14, which shows the full extent of development within the northwestern and northeastern corners of the playing field to the southwest, which has not previously been identified.

Figures 21-22 comprise the deposit model, crossing the whole site, which now also show the current proposed basement depths – it is clear from this that large parts of the site have undergone substantial impacts.

In addition, Figure 29 indicates the known previous and existing areas of basement, together with the quantities of services which run across the whole of the site, and which were an important deciding factor in placing the 2016 evaluation trenches. Unfortunately we have not been able to ascertain the foundation details for the buildings within the western part of the site.

I have been notified that while some soft strip of the buildings across the site is ongoing, the majority of strip out and demolition work will not be undertaken prior to planning submission.

The proposed basement and ground floor redevelopment plans are now included, at Figures 23-28, with Figure 28 overlaying the proposed basement and ground floor plans to clarify proposed locations. Proposed basements west of Ship Lane are focussed in two areas and are not as extensive as the area of proposed basement to the east of Ship Lane.

I would be grateful for your comment re the above and attached, at your earliest convenience – I trust that you are now able to confirm that further works can be conditioned to the granting of planning consent.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Many thanks,

Regards,

Richard

**Richard von Kalinowski-Meager BA MA PG Cert FSA MCI fA**  
**Director**  
**Archaeology**  
**Direct Dial: 020 7832 1487**  
**Email Address: [richard.meager@cgms.co.uk](mailto:richard.meager@cgms.co.uk)**  
**Mobile: 07764 830956**

**CgMs Consulting**

Part of RPS Group plc

**Planning, Archaeology & Historic Buildings Consultants**

11<sup>th</sup> Floor, 140 London Wall, London EC2Y 5DN

**Tel: 020 7583 6767**

**Fax: 020 7583 2231**

Co. Reg No. 3303376

[www.cgms.co.uk](http://www.cgms.co.uk)



---

**From:** O'Gorman, Laura [mailto:Laura.O'Gorman@HistoricEngland.org.uk]

**Sent:** 29 June 2017 11:59

**To:** Christopher Clarke (London Wall); Abrams, Diane

**Cc:** Richard Meager

**Subject:** [EXT] RE: Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Richard/Chris,

Thank you for sending through the updated DBA. I welcome the additional information however I still feel there needs to be a little bit more done to help draw out the conclusions and reasoning for condition led mitigation.

What would be really useful for me and also to help formulate an archaeological fieldwork strategy as we go forward, is for the assessment to include a plan which highlights areas of archaeological survival. This should include:

1. Areas where we believe there is no archaeological, owing to past/existing basements. Figure 3 with the old 1995 MOLAS assessment provides some useful information on the basements that were then known to be present. The Goad map also provides useful information on which buildings had basement.
2. Areas where there is some/moderate survival – for example below the 1996 warehouse building where there could be fragmentary survival between piled foundations. Also buildings shown on historic maps where we are uncertain if they had basement and so could also have survival between their foundations.
3. Areas where there is likely to be good archaeological survival – e.g. areas which have not been developed.

I would still also like to see information regarding the foundations on which the building in the location of Cromwell's house was constructed, in order to provide further indication on the likely level of survival at this location.

I welcome the inclusion of the proposed basement plans however as it stands it is impossible to identify where these will be located within the site. At the moment they are just floating in space!

Last of all could you also include the ground floor proposal plans so that it is clear where there would be impacts outside the proposed basement footprints?

Once I have the above additional information I should hopefully be in a better position in which to make a comfortable decision.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above.

Regards,  
Laura



Laura O’Gorman

Assistant Archaeology Advisor

Planning Group: London

Historic England | 1 Waterhouse Square, 138-142 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST

Direct Dial: 0207 973 3242      Mobile: 07789 928 817

*Historic England is changing the way GLAAS engages in Pre-application advice. From 1st July 2017 this free service will change to a free cycle of advice to prospective applicants for planning permission affecting undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest in Greater London outside the City of London & Southwark (where we do not provide such advice). Our free Initial Pre-application written advice will say if we recommend taking up charged-for Extended Pre-application advice. Extended Pre-application advice is discretionary and operates on a cost-recovery basis; we do not make a profit from it. Further information and our Pricing Schedule will be provided on our website.*



We help people understand, enjoy and value the historic environment, and protect it for the future. [Historic England](#) is a public body, and we champion everyone’s heritage, across England.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)    Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

Help us create a list of the 100 places which tell England's remarkable story and its impact on the world. [A History of England in 100 Places.](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available.

---

**From:** Christopher Clarke (London Wall) [<mailto:chris.clarke@cgms.co.uk>]

**Sent:** 21 June 2017 10:19

**To:** Abrams, Diane; O’Gorman, Laura

**Cc:** Richard Meager

**Subject:** Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Morning Diane/Laura,

Further to previous discussions relating to the site at the Stag Brewery, Mortlake, and on behalf of my colleague Richard who is on annual leave, please find attached an updated version of the DBA for review. The DBA has yet to be finalised with the full final proposed design details, but hopefully this should facilitated further discussions.

Please note that the proposed basement designs have now been included. Plus QUEST have undertaken a review of the available data and have established that there is limited Palaeolithic potential within the site.

If you are able to review and provide further comment to Richard, that would be appreciated.


Regards,  
Chris

**Chris Clarke BSc (Hons) MA MCIFA**  
**Senior Associate Director**  
**Direct Dial: 020 7832 0253**  
**Mobile: 07881 020428**  
**Email Address: [chris.clarke@cgms.co.uk](mailto:chris.clarke@cgms.co.uk)**

## **CgMs Consulting**

Part of RPS Group Plc  
*Planning & Heritage Consultants*  
140 London Wall, London EC2Y 5DN  
**Tel: 020 7583 6767**  
**Fax: 020 7583 2231**  
Co. Reg No. 3303376  
[www.cgms.co.uk](http://www.cgms.co.uk)

This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the addressee. If you are not the addressee please note that any distribution, copying or use of this communication, or any information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by reply.



Registered Offices: 5-11 Mortimer Street, London, W1T 3HS  
Registered in England: No. 3303376

To help create a sustainable environment please think carefully before you print this e-mail. Do not print it unless it is really necessary

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Planning and Development Limited, company number: 02947164 (England). Registered office: 20 Western Avenue Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4SH.

RPS Group Plc web link: <http://www.rpsgroup.com>

This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Planning and Development Limited, company number: 02947164 (England). Registered office: 20 Western Avenue Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4SH.

RPS Group Plc web link: <http://www.rpsgroup.com>



[rpsgroup.com](http://rpsgroup.com)