

# **Appendix: Archaeology**

## **Annex 1: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment**

T H A M E S   V A L L E Y

ARCHAEOLOGICAL

S E R V I C E S

**Aberfeldy Village, Lighterman Point, Poplar,  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

**Archaeological Desk-based Assessment**

**by Steve Preston**

**Site Code: AVL 20/188  
(TQ 3850 8140)**

**Aberfeldy Village, Lighterman Point, Poplar,  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets**

**Archaeological Desk-based Assessment  
for Ecoworld London**

by Steve Preston  
Thames Valley Archaeological Services Ltd

Site Code AVL 20/188

**December 2020  
revised October 2021**

## Summary

**Site name:** Aberfeldy Village, Lighterman Point, Poplar, London Borough of Tower Hamlets

**Grid reference:** TQ 3850 8140

**Site activity:** Archaeological desk-based assessment

**Project coordinator:** Elspeth St John-Brooks

**Site supervisor:** Steve Preston

**Site code:** AVL20/188

**Area of site:** c. 7.8 ha

**Summary of results:** There are no known heritage assets on the site itself. It is not considered that the development would have any negative impact on the settings of several nearby listed buildings. The site lies in the Lea Valley Archaeological Priority Area which may hold evidence from the earliest prehistory onwards, and in which the chance of exceptional organic survival in waterlogged conditions where the potential for palaeoenvironmental reconstruction is also high. Within the immediate environs of the site, there is significant evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age occupation, although later periods are less well represented, until the important post-medieval industrial and commercial history of the area, chiefly focussed on shipbuilding. The size of the area increases the chances of archaeological remains of some period being present simply by chance. While the area has been repeatedly redeveloped since the late 19th century, which will probably have removed most if not all shallow archaeological remains, previous work in the area has demonstrated the presence of often quite deep alluvial deposits which may have protected archaeologically relevant levels below or within them, and the development of the area may also have involved raising the ground rather than cutting down in some instances, further protecting deeply buried levels. It is considered that it will be necessary to provide further information about the archaeological potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits where necessary.

*This report may be copied for bona fide research or planning purposes without the explicit permission of the copyright holder. All TVAS unpublished fieldwork reports are available on our website: [www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp](http://www.tvas.co.uk/reports/reports.asp).*

Report edited/checked by: Steve Ford ✓ 31.12.20

## Aberfeldy Village, Lighterman Point, Poplar, London Borough of Tower Hamlets Archaeological Desk-based Assessment

by Steve Preston

Report 20/188

### Introduction

This archaeological desk-based assessment has been prepared by Thames Valley Archaeological Services and is submitted in support of a hybrid planning application for the Aberfeldy Village Masterplan. The hybrid planning application is made in relation to the north of East India Dock Road (A13), east of the Blackwall Tunnel Northern Approach Road (A12) and to the south west of Abbot Road (the "Site") on behalf of The Aberfeldy New Village LLP ("The Applicant"). The hybrid planning application is formed of detailed development proposals in respect of Phase A for which no matters are reserved ("Detailed Proposals"), and outline development proposals for the remainder of the Site, with all matters reserved ("Outline Proposals"). The Detailed Proposals and Outline Proposals together are referred to as the "Proposed Development".

The Proposed Development comprises the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site. The Proposed Development will provide new retail and workspace floorspace along with residential dwellings and the pedestrianisation of the A12 Abbott Road vehicular underpass to create a new east to west route. The Development will also provide significant, high quality public realm, including a new Town Square, a new High Street and a public park.

This report is an assessment of the archaeological potential of the Site. The project was commissioned by Ms Gemma Hale of EcoWorld London, 25 Victoria Street London SW1H 0EX and comprises the first stage of a process to determine the presence/absence, extent, character, quality and date of any archaeological remains which may be affected by redevelopment of the area. This assessment will form the basis of an input into an Environmental Statement that will accompany the application in order to inform the planning process with regard to potential archaeological implications.

### Site description, location and geology

The site is located at Aberfeldy Village in Poplar, within the London Borough of Tower Hamlets in central London (Fig. 1) and is formally described as comprising: Abbott Road; Aberfeldy Street; Balmore Close; Blairegowrie House; Heather House; Jura House; Tartan House; Thistle House; Kilbrennan House; Blairgowrie House; Nos. 33-35 Findhorn Street; Nairn Street Estate; while Leven Road Open Space and Braithwaite [Braithwaite] Park are included for their enhancement.

The Site effectively consists of one large irregularly shaped area of land made up of many smaller plots, and three much smaller detached portions to the north, east and south-east, all just south of the river Lea (or Lee), to the north of its confluence with the Thames. Limehouse Cut is also located to the north-west. The overall area is bounded by the A12 (Blackwall Tunnel northern approach) to the west, Blair Street (beyond which is the A13) to the south, and is within an area of mostly modern development (Fig. 2). The smaller area to the north is bounded by Lochnagar Street to the north, Bromley Hall Road to the west and Leven Road to the south. Of the two areas to the east, the smaller is located between Etrick Street and Dee Street and the slightly larger one is on the south side of Blair Street.

The Proposed Development Area is centred on NGR TQ 385 814 and totals some c 7.8ha. A site visit conducted on 27th November 2020 showed that the site covers four distinct zones (Pls 1–6). In the south and south west the area is primarily residential with houses along Etrick Street, Dee Street, Aberfeldy Road, Kirkmichael Road and Baltimore Close. The boundary of this area skirts a park (Millennium Green) to the east and educational facilities in the south. To the east just beyond the proposed development area there is an open space/games area on the east side of Abbott Road and south of Leven Road and another park Brathewaite Park also on Abbott Road. The northern part of the main development area is primarily occupied by large blocks of flats, bounded by Leven Road on the north, Abbott Road to the south, Nairn Road to the east and the A12 to the west. The detached area north of this between Leven Road and Lochnagar Road, is separated from the main area by Bramley Hall School. The site is located on alluvium overlying London Clay, with a thin strip of Kempton Park gravel in the extreme west roughly on the line of the A12 (BGS 1994 and Geotitles). The site lies at a height between approximately 1-7m above Ordnance Datum, the site slightly rises towards the northern end.

## Planning background and development proposals

Planning permission is to be sought from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Site. The Proposed Development will provide new retail and workspace floorspace along with residential dwellings and the pedestrianisation of the A12 Abbott Road vehicular underpass to create a new east to west route. The Development will also provide significant, high quality public realm, including a new Town Square, a new High Street and a public park.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's *National Planning Policy Framework* as revised in 2021 (NPPF 2021) sets out the framework within which local planning authorities should consider the importance of conserving, or enhancing, aspects of the historic environment, within the planning process. It

requires an applicant for planning consent to provide, as part of any application, sufficient information to enable the local planning authority to assess the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal.

The Historic Environment is defined (NPPF 2021, 67) as:

'All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.'

Paragraphs 194 and 195 state that

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

'195. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'

A 'heritage asset' is defined (NPPF 2021, 67) as

'A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'

'Designated heritage asset' includes (NPPF 2021, 66) any

'World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.'

'Archaeological interest' is glossed (NPPF 2021, 65) as follows:

'There will be archaeological interest in a heritage asset if it holds, or potentially holds, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point.'

Specific guidance on assessing significance and the impact of a proposal is contained in paragraphs 197 to 203:

'197. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

'a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

'b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

'c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'



...

‘199. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

‘200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional<sup>68</sup>.

Footnote 68 extends the application of this provision considerably:

‘Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.’

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

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

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

‘203. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

Paragraph 205 requires local planning authorities to ensure that any loss of heritage assets advances understanding, but stresses that advancing understanding is not by itself sufficient reason to permit the loss of significance:

‘205. Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.’

‘206. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a

positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.’

‘207. Not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 200 or less than substantial harm under paragraph 201, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.’

In determining the potential heritage impact of development proposals, ‘significance’ of an asset is defined (NPPF 2021, 71–2) as:

‘The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.’

while ‘setting’ is defined (NPPF 2021, 71) 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.’

The Tower Hamlets Local Plan (THBC 2020) contains detailed policy (and explanation) relating to heritage and the historic environment:

#### ‘Policy S.DH3 Heritage and the historic environment

‘1. Proposals must preserve or, where appropriate, enhance the borough’s designated and non-designated heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance as key and distinctive elements of the borough’s 24 places.

‘2. Proposals to alter, extend or change the use of a heritage asset or proposals that would affect the setting of a heritage asset will only be permitted where:

‘a. they safeguard the significance of the heritage asset, including its setting, character, fabric or identity

‘b. they are appropriate in terms of design, height, scale, form, detailing and materials in their local context

‘c. they enhance or better reveal the significance of assets or their settings

‘d. they preserve strategic and locally important views and landmarks, as defined in Policy D.DH4, and

‘e. in the case of a change of use from a use for which the building was originally designed, a thorough assessment of the practicability of retaining its existing use has been carried out outlining the wider public benefits of the proposed alternative use.

‘3. Applications affecting the significance of a heritage asset will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposal would contribute to the asset’s conservation. Any harm to the significance of a heritage asset must be justified having regard to the public benefits of the proposal: whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset. Factors that will be considered can include:

- ‘a. The significance of the asset, architecturally, historically and contextually
  - ‘b. The adequacy of efforts made to retain the asset in use, and
  - ‘c. The merits of any alternative proposal for the site.
- ‘4. Substantial harm to or the total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset will only be supported where it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or the following criteria can be satisfied:
- ‘a. The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site
  - ‘b. No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation
  - ‘c. Conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible
  - ‘d. The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- ‘5. Alterations, extensions or changes of use, or development in the vicinity of listed buildings (as shown on the Policies Map) will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings.
- ‘6. Significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of the borough’s conservation areas (as shown on the Policies Map), including their setting. Development within a conservation area will be expected to preserve or, where appropriate, enhance those elements which contribute to their special character or appearance. There will be a presumption in favour of the retention of unlisted buildings that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area. Planning applications should explore opportunities from new development within conservation areas and their setting to enhance or better reveal their significance.
- ‘7. Significant weight will be given to the protection and enhancement of scheduled monuments (as shown on the Policies Map) and other archaeological sites of equivalent importance. Any harm to their significance must be justified having regard to the public benefits of the proposal: whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to sustain the asset.
- ‘8. Applications affecting the significance of the archaeology will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposal would contribute to the asset’s conservation. Where the development includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, field evaluation will be required. Where harm can be fully justified, we will require archaeological excavation and/or recording as appropriate, followed by analysis and publication of the results.
- ‘9. Development that lies in or adjacent to archaeological priority areas (as shown on the Policies Map) will be required to include an archaeological evaluation report and will require any nationally important remains to be preserved permanently in situ, subject to consultation with Historic England.
- ‘10. We will seek to ensure the protection and appropriate enhancement of the borough’s historic parks and gardens (as shown on the Policies Map). Development proposals should therefore safeguard those features which form an integral part of the special character or appearance of the park or garden and ensure they do not detract from the enjoyment, layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the park or garden, key views into and out of the park, or prejudice its future restoration. Where development is likely to affect a historic park and garden or its setting, applications should include a heritage impact assessment setting out the likely impact which it would have upon its significance and the means by which any harm might be mitigated.’

**‘Explanation**

...  
 ‘8.26 Tower Hamlets has a higher proportion of scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas compared to that of other London boroughs. Some of the key elements of the borough’s heritage include:

- ‘a. Military and naval buildings (e.g. Tower of London)
- ‘b. Museums, art galleries, music halls and breweries (e.g. Bethnal Green Museum of Childhood and Wiltens Music Hall)
- ‘c. Squares, cemeteries and parks and gardens
- ‘d. Indoor and outdoor markets (e.g. Spitalfields)
- ‘e. Industrial heritage and archaeology
- ‘f. Residential streets and buildings of Georgian and Victorian origin
- ‘g. Innovative post-war housing (e.g. Keeling House and Balfon Tower)
- ‘h. Religious and education institutions (e.g. Christ Church, Spitalfields and Tonybee Hall).

...  
 ‘8.29 In order to satisfy the criteria set out in Parts 2 to 9, developments will need to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the relevant asset, including the contribution setting makes to its significance, as part of the planning application process. It should also include an assessment of group value, as well as the individual significance of heritage assets. As a minimum, this should include both desktop analysis and on-site investigation, with reference to the Greater London Historic Environment Record and other relevant documentation. The borough has a local history library, which provides a useful resource. Research undertaken into the heritage asset affected should describe the significance of the heritage asset in sufficient detail to determine its historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest to a level proportionate to its importance. The Greater London Historic Environment Record will help inform whether a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest.

...  
 ‘8.31 Where a new heritage asset is discovered, the developer will be expected to work with us to seek a solution that protects the significance of the new discovery, so far as is practicable within the existing scheme. Depending on the importance of the discovery, modifications to the scheme being implemented may be required

‘8.32 In relation to Parts 1 and 4, designated heritage assets include listed buildings and structures, registered parks and gardens and conservation areas. We will not permit harm to or total loss of a designated heritage asset unless the benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm or the criteria set out in Part 4 can be met.

‘8.33 In particular, listed buildings and structures in the borough make an important and valued contribution to the character and appearance of the borough and provide places to live and work in, well-known visitor attractions and cherished local landmarks. We have a duty to preserve and maintain these assets for present and future generations.

‘8.34 Proposals relating to works to a listed building or within the vicinity of a listed building will be required to demonstrate that it will not affect the special interest of the listed building. In addition to planning permission, listed building consent may also be required for works that will affect the special character of a listed building.

‘8.35 When considering proposals within conservation areas, as set out in Part 6, consideration will be given to the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole and its setting.

...  
 ‘8.37 In relation to Part 9, any development in or adjacent to archaeological priority areas is required to investigate and consider any archeological interests in the area. The archaeology of the borough can best be protected if as much information as possible is available at the planning application stage. The evaluation, which may involve fieldwork, is needed so that we can assess the archaeological implications of proposals. Where appropriate, the evaluation may show how developments can be designed so that they do not harm a site of archeological interest and/or how the remains will be preserved at the site, and where appropriate, preserve the archaeological findings at the site.

Policy S.DH5 also deals with heritage but relates specifically to World Heritage Sites, not relevant in this instance. The site lies within the Lea Valley Archaeological Priority Area. There are no Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, nor Registered Parks/Gardens or Battlefields nearby.

## Methodology

The assessment of the site was carried out by the examination of pre-existing information from a number of sources recommended by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' paper *Standards in British Archaeology* covering desk-based studies (CIfA 2020). These sources include historic and modern maps, the Greater London Historic Environment Record, geological maps and any relevant publications or reports.

## Archaeological background

### *General background*

Tower Hamlets was originally part of the county of Middlesex with its southern and eastern boundaries being defined by the rivers Thames and Lea respectively. From the Mesolithic period onwards, a marsh landscape developed along the river valleys. It comprised small areas of dry land separated by numerous water channels. When these marshes were reclaimed in the 19th and 20th centuries, large expanses were buried under made ground, leaving their archaeological content intact. The wetland environment preserves a rich palaeoenvironmental record and there is potential for evidence for human activity to be preserved on contemporary land surfaces and within the peat deposits that are recorded in the borough. The geoarchaeology of the Lea Valley has been extensively studied and modelled in recent years as a result of developments including at the Olympic Park (Single *et al.* 2017, 10-11).

However, evidence for early prehistoric activity in the immediate vicinity of the proposal site is fairly sparse. It comprises several findspots for Palaeolithic flintwork at Bromley-by-Bow and Old Ford while Mesolithic finds have been discovered at Old Ford and Poplar. During the Neolithic period small settlements developed on drier areas in the marsh and the Neolithic burial found on Yabsley Street in Blackwall (Coles *et al.* 2008) indicates the presence of a more permanent settlement in the valleys. Blackwall has also produced a Neolithic axe while finds of Bronze Age metalwork in Bromley indicate activity there. Old Ford and Stepney have produced evidence for Iron Age occupation while Iron Age findspots are recorded at Blackwall (Single *et al.* 2017).

Lying beyond the eastern edge of Roman London, the borough had satellite settlements at Old Ford on the Colchester Road and at Shadwell on a Roman route now followed by The Highway. Well-preserved remains of the Colchester road have been found at Old Ford, where it forded the Lea, along with structural, funerary and agricultural remains dated between the 1st-2nd and 4th centuries. The Shadwell settlement comprised a bath house dating from the mid-2nd to mid-3rd century as well as evidence of riverside commercial activity and a cemetery (Single *et al.* 2017, 12).

Due to its location and the presence of the river, the borough became a main provider of various services for London. The earliest documentary evidence of milling on the Lea dates from the Saxon period. The Lea's mills ground flour for London while other industries included cloth dyeing and fulling as well as livestock for the City's markets. In 1110 the Lea was bridged at Bow, replacing the ford at Old Ford, and the road east from London realigned on a route south of the old Roman road. During the later Middle Ages, there were five monastic sites in the borough including the Benedictine convent of St Leonard's Priory founded in Bromley-by-Bow in the late 11th or early 12th century (Single *et al.* 2017, 13).

Historic maps suggest that the area remained marshland until the late 19th and early 20th centuries, although it was divided into fields from at least the mid-18th century. Reclamation of the land for use as docks would be expected to have required the laying of some depth of made ground. Due to the proximity of London's docks, the area was heavily bombed during the Second World War, with most of the houses and buildings demolished by the late 20th century.

Development of the Aberfeldy Estate has already seen several phases of archaeological investigation (Taylor 2012; McNicoll-Norbury 2015; Wallis 2017). The first two of these revealed nothing of archaeological interest except a buried soil horizon, while the third located a single, poorly dated, prehistoric pit.

The site is within the Lea Valley Archaeological Priority Area (which carries a tier 3, or low, grading). Extensive excavations at the Olympic Park (to the north) demonstrated that the Lower Lea Valley had potential for prehistoric sites, although finds were relatively few, while in later periods the area saw the establishment of numerous industries which required water for power or used the river as a method of transport. The wetland environment may also have high potential for palaeoenvironmental reconstruction and organic survival, though deeply buried (Single *et al.* 2017, 141).



## *Greater London Historic Environment Record*

A search was made on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (HER) on 27th November 2020 for a radius of 750m around the proposal site. This revealed 103 entries within the search radius, comprising: 51 ‘monuments’, 6 Archaeological Priority Areas, 46 ‘events’ (archaeological investigations) within the search radius. Excluding 12 entries for desk-based assessments, these are summarized as Appendix 1 and their locations are plotted on Figure 1, where multiple entries for one site, or sites which are very close together, have been combined.

### Palaeolithic/Mesolithic

There are no GLHER entries relating to the earliest prehistoric periods within the search radius.

### Neolithic/Bronze Age

Archaeological investigations took place as part of previous phases of development at what was then referred to as the Aberfeldy Estate [Fig. 1: 1]. Trial trenches were excavated within the south-western corner of the current proposal area in 2017 (Wallis 2017). These revealed that, other than small undulations in the underlying gravel geology, the area was relatively flat before being covered with alluvial deposits, which may suggest that the area was part of the western floodplain of the River Lea. A possible buried soil or peat horizon was recorded which had also been seen in other work nearby. A small pit was recorded in the north-east part of the site, containing tiny fragments of prehistoric pottery that could belong to the Bronze Age or Iron Age. A similar deposit sequence was also recorded in trenching towards the northern end of the site [5] along with a few cut features possibly of Bronze Age date. More significant evidence came from an excavation at Yabsley Street to the south [3] in 2002 (Coles *et al.* 2008), where an Early Neolithic burial of a possible woman accompanied by pottery and flints was radiocarbon dated to 4220-3979 cal BC. This represented London’s earliest known inhabitant at that time. Peat deposits showed evidence for arable farming, suggesting a settlement may have existed nearby. A hearth near the grave contained early Bronze Age pottery, and analysis of the peat deposits showed the growth of grasslands (and later cereals) and decline in woodland cover through the Middle Bronze Age.

There have been two finds of Bronze age metalwork from the River Thames, a sword and a socketed axe. The location given for these finds [2] is likely imprecise but in any case they could have been moved considerable distances by the river since their original deposition (or loss). Prehistoric pottery and flints were also found at Culloden Street [6] to the south-west.

### Iron Age

There are no records of Iron Age finds or sites in the vicinity.

### Roman

Roman evidence within the search radius is rather sparse. An excavation in 2009 on Gillender Street [7] north-west of the proposal site revealed a single ditch containing early Roman pottery and there is a record for a Roman wine jug donated to the Museum of London in 1912 from the Blackwall area [8], probably to the south. One of a series of Roman watchtowers supposedly stood at Shadwell [9], also to the south, but it is not clear exactly what the evidence for this is.

### Saxon

There are no entries in the GLHER within the search radius relating to the Saxon period.

### Medieval

Much of the medieval evidence recorded in the GLHER for the area is documentary rather than archaeological. This includes entries for the first naming of Blackwall and Poplar in the 14th century [3, 10], and tidal mills being recorded up to the 16th century [3] and general use of the area throughout the medieval period, including known routes of roads [4, 11, 12, 14, 15]. Only one medieval feature has been recorded archaeologically, a pit below what may be chapel walls at St Matthias Centre [10]. Timbers in Bromley Hall [13] to the north-west of the proposal area have been dated by dendrochronology to the period 1482–95 and the building is Listed, Grade II\*. Besides the Lea valley APA, there are two further Archaeological Priority Areas within the search radius, with specific potential for the medieval period, at the Limmo to the south-east [15] and Poplar to the west [16].

### Post-medieval, Victorian

The majority of the GLHER entries in the area are for post-medieval features. Virtually all archaeological investigations in central London uncover evidence for post-medieval, 19th-century and early 20th-century occupation, little of which is of much archaeological significance. In this area, there is much evidence for successive raising of the ground level or efforts at drainage, both designed to permit occupation or industry on the river front and in the tidal zone, recorded in multiple observations, including within the site itself or adjacent to it [5, 17, 27, 36, 37]. Several entries refer to elements associated with the very extensive construction and activity of the East India Docks to the south [21–25, 28]. There are also specific entries for some other industrial sites: a casting hall and kilns were excavated at the Thames Plate Glass Company site in 2007 [18]. A post-medieval fishpond [19] is recorded below the gas holders immediately north of the site. Three gas holders dating from the 1870s, 1920s and 1970s on Leven Road were recorded prior to demolition [29]. The Blackwall Tunnel [31], to the south, dates from the 1890s; its entrance [33] is a listed building.

There are also entries covering documentary evidence for the importance of the shipbuilding industry and other commercial enterprises along the river [3, 10, 15, 16], or continuing post-medieval use of medieval roads

[11, 12, 14, 15]. The medieval gatehouse at Bromley Hall [13] was remodelled after 1700 and more timbers have been dated by dendrochronology to the period from the end of the 17th to early 18th century: these appear to have been imported from Scandinavia. Other 19th-century finds such as masonry foundations are of less interest [32, 36, 37].

Other 19th-century listed buildings include St Michael's Church [34] the East India Dock House [35], and Dowgate Wharf [38].

#### Modern, undated, negative

Dumping to raise the ground level continued in the 20th century and again is recorded in multiple archaeological investigations in the area, along with records for undated alluvial layers [17, 27, 36, 37, 41, 48, 51, 53, 54]. Modern Listed Buildings in the area include the war memorial at St Michael's Church [34], Carradale House [39] and Balfron Tower [42] to the west, Poplar Library [40], where there are also Second World War civil defence structures, the former Bromley Hall School for the Physically Handicapped [43], Glenkerry House, and the former fire station on Gillender Street [44]. A 1970s tower block [45] is also recorded in the HER though not listed.

Many archaeological investigations in the area have revealed modern features and finds, or truncations, or undated features [26, 30, 41, 47–54].

#### *Scheduled Ancient Monuments*

There are no Scheduled Monuments in the immediate area.

### **Cartographic and documentary sources**

The place-name Bromley derives from Old English nouns *broembel* meaning 'bramble' and *lēah* denoting 'a woodland clearing or glade' giving the composite meaning of 'Woodland clearing where brambles grow' (Mills 2010, 35; Mills 2011, 80). It was first recorded in c. 1000 in an Anglo-Saxon charter as *Broembelege*, then as *Brembellee* in the 12th century, *Brambeley* in c. 1128 and *Bromlegh* in 1274 (Mills 2010, 35). In spite of some early confusion of the first element with the Old English noun *brōm* meaning 'broom' spellings with -a- like *Brambeley* are usual up to the end of the 16th century (Mills 2010, 35). Neither Poplar nor Bromley (-by-Bow) is mentioned by name in Domesday Book (though the Bromley in Kent is), while Tower Hamlets is a much later name. In the absence of the definitive Victoria County History for this area, Poplar's early history remains obscure. For more recent times, it is served by the Royal Commission's Survey of London (Hobhouse 1994), although this focuses more on architecture than history. Poplar attracted a succession of notably large-scale

developments, from Blackwall Yard in 1614, and Brunswick Dock in 1789–90, to the West India and East India Docks of 1800–1806. Accompanying these large-scale commercial complexes were more modest developments typical of London's East End riverside: shipbuilding yards, metal-working and food-processing factories, noxious establishments such as tar and chemical works, and much substandard housing. Very little of this survives, however, and almost the whole area has been rebuilt since the Second World War, with only pockets of exceptions.

The long riverside on the Thames and the Lea was the dominant influence on the area's economy until the late 20th century. The general pattern of development established by the late 15th century remained largely unchanged until a period of expansion during the mid-19th century. There was settlement along Poplar High Street and, by the 17th century at Blackwall. Ship repairing was established at Blackwall before 1500, and the area was chosen by the East India Company for its shipbuilding yard, constructed between 1614 and 1617. The yard was the largest commercial employer in London, and remained the basis of Poplar's economy throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. However, employment was almost all casual and despite the bustle, did not generate much prosperity for the area, while fluctuations in the demand for ships often led to widespread unemployment (Hobhouse 1994) and by the later 19th century there was a prolonged period of decline in the industry, though also a surging population growth. By the end of the century Poplar was recognised as one of the poorest parts of the capital (Hobhouse 1994, 7).

A range of Ordnance Survey and other historical maps of the area were consulted online in order to ascertain what activity had been taking place throughout the site's later history and whether this may have affected any possible archaeological deposits within the proposal area (see Appendix 2). Due to the COVID restrictions, some maps such as tithe and enclosure were not available to view.

The earliest map available of the area is Saxton's map of Middlesex, 1575 (Fig. 3). At this scale little detail is afforded, but the general location of the site can be suggested showing a close proximity to the confluence of the rivers Thames and Lea. 'Stretfort Bowe' and Stepney are the closest settlements named. Norden's map of Middlesex from 152–3 adds several more of the hamlets, including Blackwall (Fig. 4) but still shows no detail for the area of the site. Speed's 1610 update of Norden's map adds no new detail for this area except to name Osulston Hundred (not illustrated). Other 17th-century maps (listed in Appendix 2, not illustrated) show some of the growth of London but add no detail for this area until Ogilby's county map of 1672 (Fig. 5) which shows Bromley for the first time. The 18th-century maps show London's continuing growth but tend to be no more



informative for the area of interest here. A notable exception is the map by Warburton from 1749 (Fig. 6) which shows the outline of the road layout and names Bromley Hall, allowing the site to be located a little more closely. It appears to have remained undeveloped. Rocque's map of 1762 (Fig. 7) appears to show much more detail including the layout of fields, but it is suspected that much of this is schematic rather than accurately surveyed. Nonetheless, the site's location can be pinpointed a little better on this map, and it appears to be undeveloped. Bromley Hall is not noted but there is a Copperas House to the north. What appears to be an earthwork of some sort to the south-east is unexplained. Cary's map of 1801 (Fig. 8) shows a little more detail on the roads, and the Limehouse to Bromley canal whose more direct route would have cut off the long sweep south around the Isle of Dogs.

The First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1872 (Fig. 9) provides the first detailed mapping of the site and surroundings. Much of the layout of the area is recognizable but almost nothing within the site is in its current form. The East India Docks dominates the vicinity. Brunswick Road marks more or less the course of the modern A12 and four blocks of four houses along its east side are just within the site boundary, though the houses on the north side of Blair Street are beyond the site. The rest of the site appears to be fields, partly within Bromley Marsh and part probably belonging to Mackintosh's farm, though the farmhouse itself is outside the site. There is a small group of other buildings set back from Brunswick Road towards the west of the site.

The site and environs have almost completely changed by the Second Edition of 1894 (Fig. 10) and present as very close to its modern overall layout with many of the streets already in place and bearing their current names. The whole of the site area is under housing on these streets, apparently all terraced though it is difficult to be sure if these blocks are accurate or just the cartographic style. The blocks at the west edge of the site on Brunswick Road are recognizably those from the previous map, but everything else in the proposed development area is new. The 1920 map (Fig. 11) shows some minor change to buildings (just off the site) between Dee Street and Culloden Street (probably schools) and one new building probably also a school, south of Lochnagar street, but all else remains the same. By 1955 (Fig. 12) there has again been some demolition in the Ettrick Street, Dee Street and Culloden Street area, south of the site, perhaps clearance of war-time bomb damage, and modifications to the school buildings in the north but little other change within the site. By 1965 (Fig.13) new housing has arisen on Ettrick Street, Dee Street and Culloden Street but other changes appear only to be in cartographic style. Maps of the 1970s (1973 illustrated as Fig. 14) show more dramatic change, with Brunswick Road now rerouted and houses along it demolished, along with the whole blocks either side of Nairn Street. The

school to the north has been wholly rebuilt and no longer occupies any part of the site. Culloden Street and the school on Dee Street have both vanished, replaced by another school slightly to the south of the site.

By 1981 (Fig. 15) the former Nairn Street area has been redeveloped and much of the housing along Abbot Road and Lochnagar Street demolished. By 1989 (Fig. 16) there has been more development in the north of the site along the western edge, and more space cleared between Abbot Road and Leven Road to the east. The Ordnance Survey map of 2001 (Fig. 17) shows a major new building on Dee Street to the south of the site but no change within it. By 2020 (Fig. 18) this new building has expanded and the road layout here remodelled. There has also been further demolition at the south-eastern detached portion of the area.

### **Listed buildings**

There are 19 listed buildings within 750m of this site, as listed in Appendix 1 and detailed above, many of which are intervisible with it and therefore in positions where their settings may be affected by the development. The most significant of these are the Grade II\* listed Bromley Hall, East India Dock House, Balfron Tower and Glenkerry House. All of the listed buildings are located in positions where their settings are already thoroughly modern, bustling city landscapes, subject to almost continuous change. Any contribution made by their settings to the heritage significance of these assets lies in this vibrant modern urban scene. While no detailed plans of the proposed redevelopment were available at time of writing, it is anticipated that it will not in any way alter the essential character of this landscape and thus will have no detrimental effect on the heritage significance of any nearby heritage asset and may positively reinforce it.

### **Registered Parks and Gardens; Registered Battlefields**

There are no registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within close proximity of the site.

### **Historic Hedgerows**

There are no hedgerows, historic or otherwise, on the site.

### **Aerial Photographs, LiDAR**

The site area lies within an urban area which has been heavily developed since before the advent of aerial photography. No photographic collections nor LiDAR data have therefore been consulted.

## Geoarchaeological Modelling

There were 3 phases of evaluation completed in 2012 (Taylor 2012), 2015 (McNicol-Norbury 2015) and 2017 (Wallis 2017) which covered 3 parcels of land to the south of the proposed site. Phase 1 consisted of waste ground with areas of Tarmac and a concrete slab from a previously demolished hotel present (Fig. 2). The proposal site is only a part of larger overall site (not shown). Topographically, the site lies on the valley floor of the River Lea close to its confluence with the River Thames. This low-lying setting is reflected on the local geology map which indicated alluvium overlying Kempton Park Gravel (BGS 1994). There has been a small number of boreholes and trial pits excavated within the redline area of the site and a high concentration of boreholes, trial pits, window samples and three archaeological investigations completed just south of the redline area. In summary the results show that the Kempton Park gravel is reached consistently at an average of 2.5-3.5m depth. This can vary, in some areas the gravels are not reached until 5.5m. Above the gravel there is either a thick layer of alluvium which in areas includes some peat deposits and then most often made ground which ranged from 0.5m to 2m in depth, sometimes fully removing the alluvial unit before the gravels. To the south of the Site basements were demolished which have fully truncated the gravels and completely removed the alluvial unit between. It is not advisable to extrapolate too widely beyond this necessarily localised information, and it would be prudent to establish the depth of made ground over a larger portion the site as a whole (St. John-Brooks TBC).

## Discussion

There are no known heritage assets on the site but there are several listed buildings in positions where their settings may be liable to be affected by its development. The discussion above suggests that the heritage significance of these listed buildings will suffer no measurable harm from the proposed development and could potentially be enhanced. It remains therefore to establish if there may be potential for previously unknown heritage assets, that is, below-ground archaeological remains.

In considering the archaeological potential of the study area, various factors must be taken into account, including previously recorded archaeological sites, previous land-use and disturbance and future land-use including the proposed development.

In general, the site lies in an area of high archaeological potential as recognized by its designation as part of the Lea Valley Archaeological Priority Area. This area is known to hold evidence from the earliest prehistory onwards, in which the chance of exceptional organic survival in waterlogged conditions, and the potential for

palaeoenvironmental reconstruction is also high. Within the immediate environs of the site, there is significant evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age occupation, although later periods are perhaps surprisingly less well represented until we reach the important post-medieval industrial and commercial history of the area, chiefly focussed on ship-building. Even without this specific potential, the sheer size of the area increases the probability of archaeological remains of some periods simply by chance.

Previous phases of development in Aberfeldy have allowed some archaeological investigation and while on the whole this has not been very productive, some prehistoric features have been recorded and the work has demonstrated the existence of (sometimes quite deep) peat and alluvial deposits which may have protected archaeological levels even in areas of extensive modern truncation.

The entire site area has been developed and redeveloped repeatedly since the late 19th century. While it is reasonable to predict that this will have removed any shallow archaeological remains, there is the possibility that deposits and features could survive below or within any deeper peat or alluvial layers. The constant redevelopment of the area may also have involved raising the ground rather than cutting down in some instances, further protecting deeply buried levels.

No detailed development plans are available but it is understood that at least part of the development will involve basements and thus inevitably have the potential to impact the archaeologically relevant level, assuming this survives anywhere on the site.

It will be necessary to provide further information about the potential of the site from field observations in order to draw up a scheme to mitigate the impact of development on any below-ground archaeological deposits if necessary. A scheme for this evaluation will need to be drawn up and approved by the archaeological advisers to the Borough and implemented by a competent archaeological contractor.

## References

- BGS, 1994, *British Geological Survey*, 1:50000, Sheet **256**, Solid and Drift Edition, Keyworth.
- CIfA, 2020, *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment*, Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, Reading
- Coles, S, Ford, S and Taylor, A, 2008, 'An Early Neolithic grave and occupation, and an Early Bronze Age hearth on the Thames foreshore at Yabsley Street, Blackwall, London', *Proc Prehist Soc* **74**, 215-33.
- Corcoran, J, Halsey, C, Spurr, G, Burton, E, and Jamieson, J, 2011, *Mapping Past Landscapes in the Lower Lea Valley*, MOLA Monogr **55**, London
- FA, 2008, *From Hunter-gatherers to Huntsmen: A History of the Stansted Landscape*, Framework Archaeology, Oxford and Salisbury
- GLA, 2016, *The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011*, Greater London Authority, London
- Hobhouse, H, 1994, 'General introduction', in RCHM(E), *Survey of London*, Vol **43/44**, Poplar, Blackwall and Isle of Dogs, London, 1-20. [<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vols43-4/pp1-20>, accessed 8 December 2020].

McNicoll-Norbury, J, 2015, 'Aberfeldy Estate (Phase 2), East India Dock Road, South Bromley, London Borough of Tower Hamlets - an archaeological evaluation', TVAS unpubl rep **12/112b**, Reading

Meddens, F M, 1996, 'Sites from the Thames Estuary, England and their Bronze Age use', *Antiquity*, **70**, 325–34

Mills, A D, 1998, *Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Oxford

MoLAS, 2000, *The Archaeology of Greater London; an assessment of archaeological evidence for human presence in the area now covered by Greater London*, Museum of London Archaeology Service Monogr, London

NPPF, 2021, *National Planning Policy Framework* (revised), Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, London

Single A, Taylor, J, Kidd, S, Sidell, J, Bright, I and Booth, P, 2017, *London Borough of Tower Hamlets Archaeological Priority Areas Appraisal*, Historic England

Stafford, E, 2012, *Landscape and Prehistory of the East London Wetlands*, Oxford Archaeology Monogr **17**, Oxford

St. John-Brooks, E, TBC, *Aberfeldy Village, Lighterman Point, Poplar, London Borough of Tower Hamlets: Deposit Modelling*. Thames Valley Archaeological Services report

Taylor, A, 2012, 'Aberfeldy Estate (Phase 1), East India Dock Road, South Bromley, London Borough of Tower Hamlets: An Archaeological Evaluation', TVAS unpubl rep **12/112**, Reading

THBC, 2020, *Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 adopted January 2020 Managing growth and sharing the benefits*, Tower Hamlets Borough Council, London

VCH, 1969, *Victoria History of the Counties of England: Middlesex*, **i**, London

Wallis, S, 2017, 'Aberfeldy Estate (Phase 3), East India Dock Road, South Bromley, London Borough of Tower Hamlets: An Archaeological Evaluation', TVAS unpubl rep **12/112c**, Reading

Williams, A and Martin, G H, 2002, *Domesday Book, A complete Translation*, London

**APPENDIX 1: Historic Environment Records within a 750m search radius of the development site**

No	HER Ref	Grid Ref (TQ)	Type	Period	Comment
1	ELO18795	3855 8119	Evaluation	Prehistoric	In 2017 four trenches were excavated in the Aberfeldy Estate, revealing one pit containing flint and pottery.
2	MLO2541 MLO25630 FLO6267	39 81	Find Spot	Bronze Age	A Late Bronze Age sword of Wilburton type was found at Bow Creek. Unstratified artefact near Leamouth Road consisting of a Bronze Age socketed axehead made of copper alloy.
3	DLO37840	3849 8057	Excavation Background	Neolithic Bronze Age Medieval Post-medieval Modern	Yabsley Street, Early Neolithic burial (radiocarbon dated to 4220-3979BC). Peat deposits showing evidence for arable farming during the Neolithic suggesting a settlement may have existed nearby. Sea levels rising caused intertidal activity in the form of timber trackways (Neolithic/Bronze Age). Archaeological Priority Area: Blackwall is named in the 14 <sup>th</sup> century along with tidal mills until the 16 <sup>th</sup> century. Important for ship building and the area preserves remains of Blackwall's significant industrial and commercial power from the middle ages until the 19th century.
4	DLO37857	3792 8280	Background	Prehistoric Medieval Post-medieval Modern	Archaeological Priority Area: Lea Valley. The area has been extensively excavated showing deeply buried islands, gravel terraces, channels and wetlands exploited since early prehistory.
5	ELO2630 MLO744	3841 8148	Evaluation Find Spot	Prehistoric Post-medieval	An evaluation in 2000 discovered a sequence of alluvial deposits associated with the River Lea floodplain and a palaeochannel. Peat deposits containing burnt flint and sealing a few cut features were possibly mid-late Bronze Age. Two post-medieval channels or ditches presumably for drainage. A gully and a shallow feature were cut into a possible buried land surface with burnt flint.
6	ELO3739 MLO6392 FLO15513 FLO15514	3833 8107 3830 8120	Evaluation Findspot	Prehistoric Post-medieval	Excavations in 1993 around Abbey Mills. At Culloden Street unstratified finds of fire cracked flint and a single pot sherd. At 13 St Leonards Road, three shafts were dug and a 19th century cellar was identified. At No. 12 Culloden Street, prehistoric potsherds and flint were found.
7	ELO10470 MLO101087 FLO15603	38190 81852	Excavation	Roman	Excavation on Gillender Street found a 1 <sup>st</sup> century Roman ditch cutting alluvium, this included 18 sherds of Grey Ware pottery.
8	MLO3851 FLO1102	386 807	Find Spot	Roman	A Roman miniature oenochoe (wine vessel) was found.
9	MLO3893	389 809	Monument	Roman	Roman watchtower, one of a series.
10	ELO8767 MLO100465 MLO100466 FLO13235 MLO3931	38189 80961 381 809 382 810	Watching Brief Background	Medieval Post-medieval Victorian	In 2008 geotechnical pits were dug at St Matthias Centre, showing the foundation walls and basement of a potential house also walls where it is believed a Chapel was located along with a medieval pit below the foundations. Finds included Post-medieval pottery. The village of Poplar was so named by at least 1327 and expanded with the shipping industry.
11	MLO9170	377 813	Road	Medieval Post-medieval	Road from Poplar High Street to Bromley.
12	MLO1125	3719 8082	Street	Medieval Post-medieval	Limehouse Causeway, Narrow Street to Poplar High Street road.
13	DLO28414 ELO20319 ELO20318 ELO20232 ELO7890 MLO93430 ELO7890 MLO93430 MLO3738	3817 8190 38173 81908 3816 8192	Dendrochronology Listed Building Building Recording	Medieval Post-medieval Victorian Modern	Timbers associated with Bromley Hall have been dated from 1482-95 to the late 17th or early 18th century. Bromley Hall is Grade II* listed including the walls, house and tower house. A building survey concluded the existence of a medieval gatehouse (c. 1482-95), evidence and details about the previous towered house (3 stories) and its remodelling after 1700. Use after this period is documented up until damage in WW2 and reconstruction in 1951. A post-medieval gate lodge on Brunswick Road
14	MLO9164	3815 8185	Street	Medieval Post-medieval	St Leonard Street from Bromley to Blackwall along the west side of Lea.
15	DLO37841	3906 8091	Background	Medieval Post-medieval Modern	Archaeological Priority Area. The Limmo occupies the west bank of the mouth of the River Lea and its confluence with the Thames which has great potential for the area's historic industry.
16	DLO37839	3771 8085	Background	Medieval	Archaeological Priority Area. The historic settlement



No	HER Ref	Grid Ref (TQ)	Type	Period	Comment
				Post-medieval Modern	of Poplar with Medieval origins, includes buildings, burial grounds, settlements and flood defences associated with the seafaring industry. Survival of ironworks is fair.
17	ELO19643	3891 8196	Watching Brief Evaluation	Post-medieval Modern	Fieldwork in 2006 on the Olympic and Paralympic Park Undergrounding Shafts East-1 and West-1. In the west alluvial clays and a peat band was observed underlying dark modern debris layers. East showed alluvial gravels underlying modern demolition and levelling.
18	ELO18549	3930 8131	Excavation	Post-medieval	Thames Plate Glass Company excavation in 2007. found the full extent of the casting hall and adjacent kilns including details of construction and surviving foundations and walls.
19	MLO3029	3830 8180	Structure	Post-medieval	A post-medieval fishpond underlying later gas tanks.
20	DLO28095 MLO93111 DLO28425 MLO93441	38421 80914 38616 80811 3880 26/877	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian	Early 19th century dock and boundary wall to the East India Docks including a gateway
21	DLO28468 MLO93484	38899 81122	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian	East India Dock Pumping Station mid 19th century
22	MLO104373 MLO93108 MLO104374 MLO93502 DLO28423 MLO93439	3807 8093 38076 80937	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian	All Saints' Church on East India Dock Road with 19th century railings, gate piers and churchyard, cemetery, Garden of Rest and Park along with the Newby Place All Saints' Rectory.
23	MLO7284	3870 8100	Cartographic	Post-medieval Victorian	Landfill site from the Eastern Dock.
24	DLO27730 MLO92759	38431 80854 3880 26/888	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian	Embankment wall, railings and steps on Naval Row associated with the East India Docks.
25	DLO28347 MLO93363	38908 81144	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian	Gate pier and wall called Blackwall Goods Yard II, was an original entrance to the East India Company's Cos Pepper group of Warehouses.
26	ELO18131	3926 8115	Evaluation	Post-medieval Victorian	The Thames Plate Glass Company 12 evaluation trenches dug in 2007, with further stripping of 5 trenches where remains were found.
27	ELO19609	3885 8110	Evaluation	Post-medieval Victorian	East India Dock: evaluation in 2006 discovered the dock wall and areas of built up ground. Modern concrete yard and with modern dumps.
28	DLO28093 MLO93109	38399 81000 3881 19/685	Listed Building	Post-medieval Victorian Modern	A plaque on the modern dock wall
29	ELO20230	3870 8157	Building Recording	Post-medieval Modern	Gasholder Station on Leven Road surveyed in 2015 in advance of demolition.
30	ELO19817	3818 8213	Watching Brief Evaluation	Post-medieval Victorian Modern	Fieldwork in 2019 on Barratt Industrial Estate with five trenches and four test pits finding masonry and brick structures
31	DLO33367 MLO7485	3871 8010	Structure	Victorian Modern	The Blackwall Tunnel built between 1892 and 1897. This included a north and south gatehouse, one of which survives today (south). A second tunnel was built in 1937.
32	ELO2693 MLO7151 084132/00/00	3828 8100	Evaluation	Victorian	In 1997 trenches on the north side of Ashton Street found two 19th century walls.
33	DLO27667 MLO92696	38394 80782	Listed Building	Victorian	Blackwall Tunnel northern portal and parapet.
34	DLO27644 MLO92673 DLO28499 MLO93515	38066 81583 3881 19/701 38079 81534 3881 19/700	Listed Building	Victorian Modern	St Michael's Church, includes south tower and a short spire. A war memorial also listed.
35	DLO38147 MLO107687	3850 8102	Listed Building	Victorian Modern	East India Dock House former Financial Times Print Works Grade II* Listed.
36	ELO3868 MLO749	3872 8138	Evaluation	Victorian Modern	In 2000 a channel was recorded cutting natural gravel and sandy layers were succeeded by peaty deposits. Above these were 19th century dumped deposits.
37	ELO4234 MLO67565 ELO7575 MLO98915	3925 8105 39312 81089	Watching Brief Building Recording	Victorian Modern	Watching Brief at Orchard Place where alluvial deposits were overlain by backyards and walls dating to the Victorian period and later. Building recording on Orchard Place, before demolition of warehouses.
38	DLO27646 MLO92675	38165 82087	Listed Building	Victorian Modern	Early/Mid 19th century brick warehouse at Dowgate Wharf, P.B. Burgoyne and Company Limited Warehouse

No	HER Ref	Grid Ref (TQ)	Type	Period	Comment
39	DLO28234 MLO93250	38228 81343	Listed Building	Modern	Concrete framed building called Carradale House.
40	DLO28070 MLO93086 ELO1031 ELO1034 MLO75402	38192 81869 3881 19/683 38212 81872	Listed Building Field Survey Building Recording	Modern	Poplar Public Library and two Second World War civil defence structures at the rear of Poplar Library. Two excavations in 2001 to expose features and access the interiors.
41	ELO10939 MLO741 FLO19744	3847 8112	Test Pit	Modern	Only remains found were 19 <sup>th</sup> /20 <sup>th</sup> century made ground/dumps and a sequence of alluvial layers including peat.
42	MLO93337	38266 81277	Listed Building	Modern	Balfour Tower on St Leonard's Road is a concrete framed Grade II* listed building (flats).
43	MLO102830	38309 81697	Listed Building	Modern	Former Bromley Hall School for the Physically Handicapped.
44	DLO37943 MLO107594	3813 8133	Listed Building	Modern	Concrete framed building on Burcham Street, Glenkerry House on Brownfield Estate, Grade II*.
45	DLO35262 MLO93430	38186 81966	Listed Building	Modern	Former Fire Station on Gillender Street.
46	MLO107824	3827 8083	Building	Modern	Tower block on Woolmore Street/Robin Hood Lane/Poplar High Street/Cotton Street, c. 1970s.
47	ELO7559	37888 81475	Watching Brief	Undated	Undertaken at Langdon Park DLR Station for new platform construction, no archaeology found.
48	ELO13384	38816 81271	Evaluation	Undated	Aberfeldy Estate 3 trenches excavated in 2012, with no archaeological remains but deep alluvial deposits.
49	ELO10385	3876 8084	Borehole Survey	Undated	In 2009 a geoarchaeological investigation was undertaken at the DLR East India Station totalling 2 boreholes. Only truncation noted.
50	ELO17461	38503 81554	Borehole Survey	Undated	In 2015 a geoarchaeological survey was carried out made up of 18 boreholes showing inorganic alluvial deposits with 2 boreholes capturing peat.
51	ELO19826	3870 8157	Borehole Survey	Undated	Around Leven Road 40 boreholes were put down in 2019. These were used to produce an up-to-date detailed geoarchaeological deposit model. Pleistocene deposits were discovered with overlying Holocene deposits, the later consisted of alluvial deposits with infrequent peats, the alluvial deposits were truncated in certain areas by made ground.
52	ELO2760	3890 8181	Watching Brief	Undated	A total of 26 test pits with no archaeology found. The area was contaminated and highly truncated.
53	ELO10128	394 813	Evaluation	Undated	Canning Town Station evaluation in 1991. Included well preserved organic deposits and well stratified alluvium deposits.
54	ELO2642 MLO6432	3857 8130	Watching Brief	Undated	Watching brief at Ada Gardens in 1993 found alluvial deposits with peat layers.

Listed Buildings Grade II unless stated.



APPENDIX 2: Historic and modern maps consulted

1575	Saxton's map of Middlesex (Fig. 3)
1593	Norden's map of Middlesex (Fig. 4)
1610	Speed's map of Middlesex
1645	Anonymous, map of Middlesex
1672	Blome's map of Middlesex
1672	Ogilby's map of Middlesex (Fig. 5)
1749	Warburton's map of Middlesex (Fig. 6)
1762	Rocque's map of Middlesex (Fig. 7)
1785	Bowles' map of Middlesex
1801	Cary's map of Middlesex *Fig. 8)
1872	Ordnance Survey First Edition (Fig. 9)
1894	Ordnance Survey Second Edition (Fig. 10)
1920	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 11)
1955	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 12)
1965	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 13)
1973	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 14)
1981	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 15)
1989	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 16)
2001	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 17)
2020	Ordnance Survey Third Edition (Fig. 18)

