

Chapter 2

Planning Archaeology in World Cities: Looking at London

Hana Morel, Joseph Flatman and Kim Stabler

Introduction

Cities are dynamic organisms, and London is not alone in experiencing changes—brought on by today’s rapid urbanisation and global economy—to both the urban fabric and the society that inhabits it. The vast majority of archaeological work undertaken in England sits within a national planning framework, which itself is also under constant flux in response to the political setting of the nation at any given time (London Consensus 2014). The devolved governance structures of the UK particularly impact upon this planning framework: England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland all have different planning regimes and in many cases also different Acts of Parliament underlying these regimes. London’s particular systems thus sit as part of the English planning system that is similar to but legislatively distinct from that of the other ‘home nations’, as the four constituent parts of the UK are referred to. As such, any appreciation of the current set-up of London’s archaeology necessitates an equal understanding of the political and economic circumstances that unfold alongside it.

This chapter considers how London manages the protection of its archaeology through various institutional relationships, and addresses relatively recent changes to legislation that impact the practice of archaeology; reference is made to the wider

H. Morel (✉)

Institute of Archaeology, University College London, 31-34 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0PY, UK
e-mail: hana.morel@ucl.ac.uk

J. Flatman

Historic England, 1 Waterhouse Square, 138-42 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST, UK
e-mail: joseph.flatman@historicengland.org.uk

K. Stabler

Stabler Heritage, 61 Broadway West, Newcastle Upon Tyne, London NE3 2NE, UK
e-mail: kim@stablerheritage.co.uk

historic environment including buildings, parks, gardens and monuments, but the focus is on the archaeological resource. Key to this discussion is the fact that London—unlike many of its European neighbours—does not have a municipal archaeology programme or central, state-funded national archaeological service, and thus has and continues to develop through an evolving community of practitioners and interested parties. Below we explore the highlights and drawbacks of how London has developed its approaches to archaeology and archaeological resource management, and thus contribute, we hope, to a discussion of how to improve the management of city archaeology in general.

A Brief Introduction to Greater London

London is a varied and multicultural environment and one of the world's leading global cities. Greater London is 1569 km² and, according to the London Census 2011, its population is just over 8 million with a foreign-born immigrant population of 36.7%, similar to the population size and ethnic and cultural diversity of New York City (NYC Department of Planning 2000).

Politically and geographically Greater London consists of 33 inner and outer boroughs (Fig. 2.1): one of which is the City Corporation of London—the original City at the physical, geopolitical and economic 'heart' of the larger city. The boroughs were amalgamated into Greater London following the 1963 London Government Act. This Act created a new local two-tier government structure for London, the basic structure of which is still in place today, albeit with modifications. The 1963 Act created the present boroughs by absorbing land from a number of counties—Kent, Essex, Surrey and Middlesex—as well as the historic core of London. Greater London remains bordered by these counties today.

In 2000, the Greater London Authority (GLA) was established as the 'strategic' level of local government, which is headed by an elected mayor. The borough councils provide the majority of local government services, such as housing, planning, social services, environmental health and waste services, libraries and leisure and recreational facilities. With few exceptions, archaeological planning advice throughout England is provided at the county level by in-house archaeological advisors situated within the county councils. Several major cities—Birmingham and York, for example, and Edinburgh in Scotland—have independent City Archaeologist roles that sit separate from the County Archaeologist positions. In London, however, the absence of a county structure has led to the evolution of the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS), which is run and funded by the London division of Historic England—England's national heritage advisory service (as of 31 March 2015 English Heritage split into two organisations: a charitable trust that kept the name English Heritage responsible for managing historic sites owned by the State, and Historic England, England's national heritage advisory service) (Historic England 2016). In this unique arrangement, GLAAS provides archaeological advice in a strategic and cost-effective manner to 31 of the London boroughs, some of which are too small to support a



Fig. 2.1 Map of Greater London with different boroughs highlighted. Attributed to Wikimedia commons

dedicated officer. The City of London and the south-central borough of Southwark (an historic Roman settlement with significant prehistoric and also post-Roman archaeology) both maintain and fund their own archaeological advisory services alongside that provided by GLAAS. Scheduled Monuments, those remains officially designated by Historic England as being of national or international significance (under the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act), are managed through separate legislation and officers. Meanwhile, London is home to Europe's largest archaeological archive, the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC). It holds thousands of records and deposits from over 8500 excavations. The LAARC plays a huge role in the consistency and standardisation of deposits and in doing so has helped improve consistencies during excavations and reporting.

Archaeology and Planning

The vast majority of archaeological work in London and throughout the UK is commercially led and funded through development activity. In 2006, for example, 93% of all archaeological investigations in the UK were initiated through the

planning process (Aitchison 2009). Archaeology, or more accurately the impact to significant archaeological assets, has been a ‘material consideration’ under the planning process in the UK since 1991, which means that prior to receiving planning permission, the developer must ensure that they have sought expert opinion on whether there is significant archaeology present or not (Flatman and Perring 2012; Flatman 2012).

Today, all national planning policies, including policies surrounding archaeology and built heritage, are delivered through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which came into effect in March 2012. The NPPF consolidated a substantial amount of existing legislation in favour of a streamlined, single-policy approach to planning that would be faster and fairer and would, it was argued, aid development and thus economic growth; those against such reform highlighted in contrast the risk of diminishing or entirely destroying the many hard-won ‘checks and balances’ of the previous systems, including many of the advances towards the protection of the historic environment that had been won over the preceding decades (Sheppard 1991; Marsden 1996; Flatman and Perring 2012; Aitchison 2012). In terms of the historic environment, the NPPF sets out the government’s aspirations for the protection of all heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, which are considered of having heritage value. Policies specifically associated with heritage and archaeology stress the need to assess the significance of any heritage asset in order to fully understand the impact of development proposals and inform on how to manage change, using local historic environment records and expert advice (section 12 of the NPPF paragraphs 126–141). Most importantly, however, the high-level positioning of the historic environment within national planning policy is in itself a victory.

The major themes and issues presented in national planning policy are further expanded and articulated in local development frameworks, which are better suited to address local issues and development concerns. Within the London boroughs, local archaeological policies require developers to consult the Greater London Record, a GIS database of all assets and archaeological intervention within the region, prior to the submission of a planning application. The policies generally state that the boroughs will seek expert archaeological advice, such as that offered by GLAAS or the City or Southwark archaeology advisors, when determining planning applications. This advice may range from a series of pre-determination intrusive or non-intrusive assessments, depending on the archaeological potential and significance of a site, through to the recommendation of planning conditions attached to any consent, preservation in situ, or the refusal of planning applications. For example, in 2013–14, a total of 79,837 planning applications were submitted in Greater London; GLAAS carried out detailed assessments on the archaeological impact on 2188 of the applications. Further work—excavation or building recording—was recommended in 790 cases. GLAAS advisors and their borough colleagues also monitor the implementation of planning conditions, including fieldwork, post-excavation assessment, publication and archiving. While archaeology advisors do have the right to seek prosecution for offences provided under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, Planning Act 1990 and

the National Heritage Act 2002, they are considered to only have soft power and work under the Local Authority Planning Officer, who makes the final decision on whether or not ‘conditions’ (the British equivalent of the US permit system, including specifically for archaeology) have been met, and who pursues any enforcement action, either directly through the planning system or indirectly, and with greater severity, through the courts in more extreme cases of developer misbehaviour. So regardless of the law being quite strong clarifying a series of obligations and roles, England’s current sidelining of environmental and cultural considerations during the planning process, and its cuts to resources, are increasingly making it easier for developers to find loopholes in the law.

The Background of London’s Archaeology

Part I: An Issue of Access and Funding

The current high level of urbanisation and increasing agglomeration of economies in politically and economically strategic cities such as London has, since the 1950s, generated an extraordinarily fast pace of change on the urban environment, demanding an exponential growth of infrastructure as the population’s needs and requirements increase.

London’s archaeology in such a context followed from the devastation of World War II and the consequential global economic boom that went on until the early 1970s recession. During this time, London went through an intensive period of post-war reconstruction and development. The bombing from the war, which destroyed more than a third of the City, and subsequent redevelopment uncovered numerous archaeological sites across London, providing an opportunity for various archaeological societies scattered around the city to do limited excavations (Sheldon and Haynes 2008). Some seminal sites were excavated in the immediate post-war period, including the third century Roman Temple of Mithras, uncovered in 1954 by Professor William Francis Grimes, the then director of the Museum of London, as part of an informal programme recording Blitz sites prior to wholesale clearance and redevelopment of the City of London. The Mithraeum remains one of the best-known archaeological remains from Roman London (Shepherd 1998; Lyon 2007). Recent excavations from 2010 to 2013 by the Museum of London as part of the larger redevelopment of the site undertaken through the planning system outlined above completed Grimes’ work on the site and will enable the statuary and remains of the temple to be returned to their original location and accessible to the public (Walbrook Discovery 2016).

It was clear that, despite interest from the major museums, learned societies and the general public, the rate of change across London, coupled with the limited resources (from government or negotiated with some developers) available for archaeological investigation, meant that an increasing number of potentially significant sites were being lost without appropriate recording. At that time, there was no full-time professional coverage of archaeological sites in the Greater London

area; the odd project was executed by museums, the occasional university, or by local archaeological societies. These projects, despite their invaluable contribution, were geographically patchy, and, despite keen interest and enthusiasm from those practitioners, the hardships that they stood against included fundamental challenges such as the lack of any legislative requirement by developers to undertake archaeology, and the difficulty of receiving funding or even access to set up city projects. Access to sites and any funding was generally negotiated on an individual basis without consistent application. It was gradually realised that key to providing means to investigate and preserve archaeological deposits was creating a formal relationship between the archaeological community, planning authorities and commercial developers.

Part II: The Rescue Movement and the Setting up of Archaeological Units

This political environment of the 1970s provided the right conditions for archaeologists to agitate for change against the increasing impacts of such intense development in historic cities across the country, not just in London. With the push from Philip Barker at Birmingham University, the organisation RESCUE was founded in 1971 with the aim of excavating as many threatened sites as they could and ensuring preservation for some (RESCUE 2016).

With the aims of the ‘rescue archaeology’ movement gaining momentum across England, RESCUE itself was promoting archaeology and informing the public on the devastating damage that was being done to England’s archaeological heritage, alongside ‘sister’ organisations such as SAVE Britain’s Heritage (founded in 1975) campaigning to protect historic buildings (SAVE Britain’s Heritage 2016). One of the most influential publications of the time was *The Future of London’s Past* (Biddle et al. 1973), which suggested that a City of London Archaeology Unit be established for the investigation and recording of the remaining evidence of London’s past before it was lost to development. This Unit was thought to be best organised under the auspices of the Museum of London (MoL) which was then being built as a city museum amalgamating both the London Museum and the Guildhall Museum under the Museum of London Act 1965. It opened in December 1976 and was agreed that costs would be divided by the City of London, The Exchequer and the City Corporation. The previous year, the Department of Urban Archaeology (DUA) was set up and based in the City of London as part of the Guildhall Museum, until the opening of the MoL. The DUA was only to cover the City of London under the funds of the Corporation of London and was only one of many organisations operational at the time; indeed, the 1970s saw something of a zeitgeist in the provision of archaeological services throughout Greater London. Units operational in the early 1970s were often based in local museums or sponsored by planning authorities or learned societies. This included the Southwark and

Lambeth Archaeological Excavation Committee (1973); the South West London Archaeological Unit (1974); the West London Archaeological Unit; the Inner London Archaeological Unit (1974); Passmore Edwards Museum; and the Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit. These organisations all worked within particular geographical areas in or close to London and provided planning advice to local authorities, determined what work needed to be done, conducted the fieldwork, and would also negotiate with developers requesting either time slots or financial assistance for conducting archaeological work they would advise as necessary. Unlike more recent work, these organisations both made the determinations for the need for work and undertook the work themselves, rather than the split system of government advice and contracted archaeological units that later emerged. Depending on the unit, artefacts would be stored in various available spaces, in some cases in local museums or archives, in other cases in long-term storage.

A more regular system of engagement fuelled the number of excavations undertaken, and many influential sites were investigated and published during this time that demonstrated the importance of London's archaeology. Much work was focused on the identification and exploration of the Roman settlement of Londinium as a major mercantile and administrative centre for the Roman Empire (Merrifield 1965; Bird et al. 1978; Marsden 1980). Similarly, in the 1980s, extensive investigations in the Covent Garden area of London allowed for the identification of the Saxon settlement of Lundenwic (Biddle 1984; Cowie and Whytehead 1989). Such fieldwork included limited opportunities for public engagement, something that was not seen as a priority, neither in terms of time nor funding, at that time.

This landscape of many small and disparate local units providing archaeological services continued until 1983. At that time, the Greater London Council provided central government funding to establish a full archaeological service for all of London. While the Department of Urban Archaeology continued its jurisdiction in the City of London, the rest of the London units were pulled together as the Department of Greater London Archaeology (DGLA), also based at the Museum of London. This move consolidated, for the first time, the operating excavation units, the Sites and Monuments Record and the archaeological archive. This was the first—and arguably the last—time that all three wings were completely integrated.

The 1980s saw a massive development boom in London, partly led by changes in the deregulation of the City of London financial corporations. This saw a significant uplift in the number of major City sites under excavation, when developer funding overtook public grants as the means of resourcing archaeological works and offset a continuous erosion of public funding. The Museum of London issued site codes—registered codes to identify sites—for archaeological work undertaken in Greater London from the 1960s onwards. Although a simplistic measure, the overall increase in archaeological sites is easy to trace. In the 1970s, 538 site codes were issued, in the 1980s 871 and the 1990s 2800 (Sidell 2012). This model was, however, heavily dependent on the voluntary cooperation of the development community. Government guidance lagged considerably behind what was being established as standard professional practice: a government circular (Department of the Environment Circular 1/85) allowed access to archaeologists, but the issue of obligatory funding was yet to

be addressed. The length of time available for excavation was also fluid and was most likely based upon tight development timescales rather than the completion of archaeological works to an agreed professional standard. The DUA and DGLA were very successful in obtaining funding on a case-by-case basis, but as they were also providing planning advice, without the support of a clear regulatory framework, there was an increasing tension between all parties, with the museum services open to accusations of conflict of interest (Sheldon and Clark 2008, p. 256). When a developer did not want to undertake archaeology, there was only limited recourse to the law in order to enforce a bare minimum of work under the terms of the DoE Circular 1/85. This often meant the most rudimentary of archaeological investigation, with little or no post-excavation analysis, conservation or publication, and no public engagement in the process at all.

At the same time, and fuelled by the success of some recent excavations, the public awareness of the value and fragility of London's archaeology was increasing. Londoners have always had a complex relationship with the past—ancient cultural traditions and customs are steeped into current social and political constructs, historic places and buildings rest alongside steel and glass high-rise towers, the rate of change is fast yet the desire to protect is also strong, which creates an ongoing tension between 'modernisation' and retention. The concept of preservation in situ, where significant sites are retained despite development interest, was perhaps first implemented in London in 1848, when the remains of the Billingsgate Roman bath house were found during the construction of the Coal Exchange in what is now Lower Thames Street, parallel to the north bank of the Thames. The remains of the baths, which include the *frigidarium*, *tepidarium*, *caldarium*, furnaces and hypocaust systems, were preserved by order of the then City Architect J B Brunning (Sidell 2012). The remains are currently part of the basement of an office block. The opportunity to view remains of Londinium in situ, particularly when during the course of excavation, has also always been of enormous popular interest, with numbers of over 30,000 being recorded as queuing for glimpses of Roman mosaics or baths. The British fondness for lengthy queues is indeed a well-noted phenomenon, no less for archaeological sites. An estimated 50,000 people visited the Bucklersbury mosaic over a course of 3 days when exposed in 1869 (see Museum of London Archaeology 2014 for an in-depth analysis). Similarly, almost 100 years later, a recorded 30,000 queued to see the Temple of Mithras remains in 1954, an event that has since become a crucial part of the cultural history of London's archaeological community (Sidell 2012: 378), and which was itself the subject of an oral history project in 2014–15 (Museum of London Archaeology 2014).

In the late 1980s, two particular sites brought these issues to the fore: Huggin Hill Bath in the City of London and the Rose Theatre Playhouse in Southwark. Huggin Hill baths are part of a massive public building complex from the first AD. The baths are terraced into the banks of the Thames to make use of the natural water supply and drainage. Elements of the hypocaust systems, marble mosaic floors, numerous rooms and wall survive, some to a height of c. 3 m. The Rose Playhouse was built in 1587 and was where Shakespeare and Marlowe, amongst others, wrote and performed.

The footprint of the Rose is intact, including the stage area. A large number of artefacts recovered from the excavation has contributed significantly to understanding of the Elizabethan age and literature (Fig. 2.2). Both sites contained important, and in the case of the Rose internationally significant, remains preserved to a very high standard. It was estimated that revoking the consents at Huggin Hill, for example, could have left English Heritage open to claims of between £7 and



Fig. 2.2 An overview of the Rose Theatre excavation. Courtesy of Rose Theatre Trust, 1989

£70 m (in 1980s prices), which would have been equal to its annual budget (Orton 1989). Both were also subject to high-profile development schemes, and although negotiations had taken place to allow DUA archaeologists on to the sites for limited periods of time, the value of the remains was such that public opinion demanded they be retained. As planning consents had been granted for both developments, the cost of compensation was simply too high to consider revoking permissions as the quality of the remains became revealed. The Rose Theatre foundations are currently under water to help preserve it and continue to be monitored, while the Huggin Hill Roman bath house is scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.

In the face of mounting public pressure, including dramatic protests and sit-ins, questions were asked in Parliament about the lack of planning regulation in a system that enabled such destruction to take place (Fig. 2.3). There needed to be a fundamental shift in including archaeological remains as a consideration when granting planning permission, and making the development community responsible for the impacts that they were creating.



Fig. 2.3 Public demonstrating against the demolition of the Rose Theatre. Courtesy of Rose Theatre Trust, 1989

Part III: A Change in the Organisational Landscape

Finally, through Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990), archaeology was for the first time identified through policy as a material consideration during the process of approving development projects. The guidance note also secured preservation in situ as the first option for nationally significant remains and emphasised the need for proper assessment and investigation prior to granting planning consent in order to avoid situations as at Huggin Hill and the Rose. It was through PPG16 that archaeologists for the first time gained guaranteed access and funds to carry out archaeological work. The ‘polluter pays’ concept was adopted, whereby developers, rather than government departments or publically funded museum services, would be responsible for funding archaeological works.

This change symbolically marked an end to the struggles that had been faced by the various archaeological groups of the 1970s and 1980s. By the early 1990s, the introduction of archaeology underpinned by political planning requirements directed the profession into a realm of economics, through highlighting that the MoL excavation unit clashed with trade practices law—or competition law—that promotes and maintains market competition by regulating or restricting monopolies. A separation between those providing advice and those carrying out resultant work was necessary, which is when GLAAS, acting within the wider umbrella of English Heritage (since March 31 2015, Historic England), was created. The set-up meant that the archaeological process was divided into different sections: local authorities and GLAAS would become curators (understood in the UK as local planning authority archaeology officers, development control archaeologists or county/city archaeologists who oversee archaeology under the planning regulation on both public and private land and property); private archaeology contractors (such as the redeveloped MoL, now MoLA) would tender for the work and undertake necessary fieldwork required by curators and developers so that the former can ‘sign off’ required considerations (known as planning conditions) for planning permission; and a requirement of a basic technical report would need to be submitted to the Planning Authorities and agreed by the archaeology officer. MOLA is one of the largest archaeological contractors in London, although it should be noted that there are numerous companies of varied sizes in this highly competitive urban environment, which (in a microcosm of the UK as a whole) is arguably the most competitive archaeological marketplace in the country. As a consequence, staff sizes in such organisations change regularly, with a significant use of fixed-term or subcontracted staff to meet short-term shifts in demand.

Archaeology was now part of legislation and part of the political economy. Following this, shift archaeology experienced a new age of a huge rise of funding, professionals, greater job opportunities, career development and most importantly the re-emergence of separate units—this time professionally driven contract/commercial units. In 2010, PPG 16 was replaced by Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the

Historic Environment (DCLG 2010), itself rapidly replaced in turn less than two years later by the current NPPF (DCLG 2012; discussed above).

London's Archaeology Today

The ostensibly clear and simple basis of archaeology in London—and in the UK—being managed through the frameworks of the NPPF since 2012 belies in truth a very much more complicated system of heritage management, especially in London. The unique political, social and economic pressures of this city discussed above place particular pressures on its archaeology. The fact that England does not have a state-funded national archaeological service, the archaeological structures that are seen in many of its European neighbouring countries, has also necessitated London's archaeology to progress in a unique way through the intersection of multiple different stakeholders in different partnerships. This includes local communities (and community-based archaeologists); owners and developers of historic sites (often via their paid consultants and/or archaeological contractors); the charity and amenity sector (including religious organisations); local and national planning authorities; and other governmental and non-governmental organisations, (notably in London the Port of London Authority along the river Thames). While it would be naïve to suggest that there are no tensions between these sectors, it remains a fact that the responsibilities and roles of each sector and the effort to make relationships work are now most important as we see an increasing loss of services across the country. While there is a strong focus on the regulatory functions that allow archaeology to develop, London continues to experience a challenge during the current economic and political climate of austerity whereby archaeological work of all types is constantly squeezed to do the bare minimum of work within the tightest of financial margins.

An Archaeological Archive

Having an archaeological archive is undoubtedly one of the greatest accomplishments throughout the development of London's archaeology. In the early 1990s, the Curatorial Division of the MoL hosted the site archives (both field notes, photographs and site reports and also artefacts and ecofacts) previously housed by a range of organisations. Space and resources were a continual concern, and so the collection was moved during the mid-1990s and reopened in 1998 as the London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC) in a central London warehouse, part of, and funded via the MoL (Museum of London Archaeology 2016a). Having such a rich archive situated in the heart of London—one that holds information or full archives of over 8500 sites—is a phenomenal advantage for access

purposes, whether by professionals, enthusiasts, students or other researchers. The LAARC is the largest such archaeological archive in the world, and although its value may at times be under-appreciated by heritage professionals, developers and the public alike, having it has played a powerful role in setting standards for excavation, acquisition, site reporting and also the ability to make the information more accessible through digital means. However, like so much of London's archaeology, the LAARC is also an anomaly, in that no other parts of the UK have anything close to the space and facilities that it provides for the city's archaeological archives (although many areas of Britain aspire to this, the LAARC is in general seen as an exemplar).

The LAARC faces a number of challenges, which include a lack of space, a relatively small team of staff and issues with what to keep and what to throw away. Despite this, it has created strong relationships with various archaeological societies and has a good volunteer programme, which both encourage public involvement in archaeology and contribute towards the analysis and understanding of artefacts. Volunteer tasks range from as basic as re-boxing artefacts to more in-depth analysis of sites and reports, also in some cases the conservation of materials, based on the volunteer's skill set. LAARC often has placements with universities, mostly—but not exclusively—London-based higher education organisations such as University College London and Birkbeck College. There has been a steady flow of masters and doctoral dissertations and theses stemming from such work, which often in turn lead to formal publications, especially short reports in the specialist journal *London Archaeologist* (London Archaeologist 2016).

Roles, Partnerships and Communities

What is interesting about London is not necessarily the formal organisations discussed above, but rather the relationships that have formed over a hugely significant period for London's archaeological profession. The success stories of London's archaeology lie, as much as anything, in the ability of successive generations of individuals and groups to invent, reinvent and persevere in their identities and relationships through periods where their existence would seem anachronistic. However, as time continues and established confidence fluctuates, we see that all our established groups continue to offer key pieces to the puzzle of the archaeological process. While the many county, archaeological or historical societies seem of little interest to younger generations, they nevertheless serve as engines for communication and networking.

Although there are legislative frameworks that require local authorities to work with commercial archaeologists, and although much of the archaeological sectors are fragmented, the archaeological community in London works because these networks exist, providing a foundation for a solid community. The city has also successfully, and repeatedly, developed innovative archaeology programmes that

have been set up to seal ‘gaps’ observed in the archaeology of the city. Many of these programmes include individuals from different sectors, linked to organisations and institutions that provide it with strengthened legitimacy. A recent, nationally influential example is that of the Thames Discovery Programme (TDP). Launched via funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund in 2008, the TDP built on initiatives pioneered by the Museum of London’s Thames Archaeological Survey of 1993–1999 that undertook the first systematic survey of the Thames riverfront, identifying thousands of sites and first highlighting to the public and profession alike both the extent, and the fragility, of this elongated archaeological ‘site’. The TDP communicates an understanding and informed enjoyment of the historic Thames River—which includes significant archaeological sites of all periods (including major prehistoric foreshore and intertidal sites)—to the widest possible audience through a programme of education, outreach and, crucially, public involvement and training in active research on riverside sites. A cornerstone of this work was the creation of Foreshore Recording and Observation Groups (FROGs). This is a network of over 400 volunteers who have been fully trained by the TDP in foreshore recording techniques and health and safety and have been certificated by the TDP to record the archaeology of the foreshore, assist the TDP with training sessions for new members, participate in outreach events and monitor the archaeology of the key sites of archaeological interest, found on the Thames foreshore. The FROGs provide a self-sustaining network of volunteer groups, each with their own identity but operating within the wider TDP network, akin to the types of self-sustaining groups that first developed amongst the natural environment community in the 1980s and 1990s in many towns and cities and that prosper to this day. Through such a network the TDP brings together the public with the existing archaeological community of London to generate additional ‘value’ (be this in terms of data; management; understanding or enjoyment) from archaeology for all partners. Such has been the success of the TDP that major components of its structure and ethos are now being introduced nationally via the TDP offshoot project CITiZAN (Coastal and Intertidal Zone Archaeological Network) (Museum of London Archaeology 2016b).

Archaeology is about recording information and about the analysis of that information to generate new knowledge, information and even improving skills in practice. It is fundamental—with that in mind—to both communicate that new information and ensure that it is used to advance the practice. Because London is fortunate through its historical circumstances to have a museum solely dedicated to the city, an incredible archive, dedicated local societies and bodies that work alongside development-led archaeology, it is in a prime position to get added value out of contracts and to make sure that archaeologists can maximise the benefits they can for society at large. Examples such as the TDP show this process in action.

Concluding Discussion: Why It Works, or Does It?

In London, more than perhaps in any other part of the UK, developers, owners and occupiers have—at least some of the time—fully identified and valued the wider benefits of paying for archaeology beyond simply being a ‘cost’ of doing business. There is social, and even economic, cachet and ‘added value’ in London archaeology to an extent rarely seen anywhere else in Britain and even in the world. This is particularly the case in terms of leaving elements of significant archaeological sites ‘in situ’ as part of redevelopments: these include the Guildhall Roman amphitheatre, the Fleet Street Ossuary, Billingsgate Roman Bathhouse and the Temple of Mithras (Fig. 2.4). Such inclusions come at a price, yes, but are also seen as a benefit by both community and local government—as one of the things that makes London distinctive, a valued, high-profile place for organisations to have their offices, within which heritage is directly seen as contributing to the quality of life of employees. Historically, there have been incentives given under some circumstances to the developers, or the future occupiers, of new buildings that incorporate historic (especially archaeological) features. However, such incentives are negotiated on a case-by-case basis rather than being a standing incentive provided by government. Such incentives are usually part of the broader, highly confidential financial arrangements associated with such redevelopments, and as such are rarely if ever on public record. More generally, the inclusion of historic/archaeological features within modern buildings in London is part of the wider phenomenon (shared with other mega-cities around the world) of having high-profile ‘prestige’ offices that incorporate a prominent location along with distinctive architectural designs (often by well-known architects) and ‘unique selling points’ such as the inclusion of archaeological remains, the provision of roof gardens, the presence of cafes and other facilities like gyms on site, and the prominent placement of major works of art (often by famous artists) around or within the building, and other attractions to organisations to be based within a building as both a mark of their success and an aid to staff retention. In various publications coming out of the Greater London Authority, it is recognised that ‘our culture...is central to promoting London as a place to visit, work and study and to attracting foreign investment and multinational companies’ (GLA 2014, p. 11).

The wider socio-economic benefits of archaeological sites to London should be framed in more negative lights as well, however; not all is as rosy as the picture above might suggest. Leaving aside the constant fight for sufficient time and funding to undertake archaeological work in advance of development that remains a concern to this day, there are politically driven medium-long-term planning issues that continue to seriously impact upon London’s archaeology. There has been, for example, a continued loss of or degradation to the setting of heritage assets in London under the current administration’s—arguably uncontrolled—programme of introduction of tall buildings (including its impact on the Tower of London World Heritage Site) (UNESCO 2016). There has been within this also the loss of much public realm streetscape. This includes some areas of historical significance itself,



Fig. 2.4 London's Roman Amphitheatre in situ under the Guildhall in Central London. Photograph taken by Valeria E.M. Bellazzi, 2016

including more 'intangible' elements of heritage such as historic street patterns, names; and tangible elements such as street furniture like public realm art, statuary and facilities like public toilets; and thus the ability to appreciate freely historic locales. Outside of the historic City of London, there has also been the loss of significant proportions of outer London greenbelt.

Such changes on the one hand, and losses on the other, if projected forward, raise serious concerns about what London looks like, for example, fifty years from now in 2065 under such a model of uncontrolled ongoing development—of a sprawling megacity with endless outer suburbs and a giant inner core of tall buildings of the like seen in parts of the Near and Far East and the Americas, but not—yet—in Europe. Add in here the anticipated pressures of ongoing growth in population, but a demographic imbalance within that (with a super-rich core surrounded by miles of middle- and lower-class suburbs serving that super-rich centre); the concluding question of this chapter has to be not what lessons others can learn from London in how to deal with archaeology, but rather, what lessons London can learn from other big historic cities facing similar challenges?

References

- Aitchison, K. (2009). Feature editorial. *British Archaeology*, (Issue 107).
- Aitchison, K. (2012). *Breaking New Ground*. Landward Research Publication. Kindle Edition.
- Biddle, M. (1984). London on the Strand. *Popular Archaeology*, (July), 23–7.
- Biddle, M., Hudson, D. & Heighway, C. (1973). *The Future of London's Past: a survey of the archaeological implications of planning and development in the nation's capital*. Rescue publication No. 4.
- Bird, J., Graham, A. H., Sheldon, H., & Townend, P. (1978). *Southwark excavations 1972–74*. London: London and Middlesex Society & Surrey Archaeological Society.
- Cowie, R., & Whytehead, R. (1989). Lundenwic: the archaeological evidence for middle Saxon London. *Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Department of Environment. (1990). *Archaeology and planning, PPG 16*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Communities and Local Government. (2010). *Planning for the historic environment, PPS 5*. London: HMSO.
- Department for Communities and Local Government. (2012). *National Planning Policy Framework*. London: HMSO. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf
- Flatman, J., & Perring, D. (2012). The national planning policy framework and archaeology: a discussion. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 22, 4–38. Retrieved from <http://www.pia-journal.co.uk/issue/view/24>
- Flatman, J. (2012). The Past, present and future of rescue archaeology in England. *Post-Classical Archaeologies*, 2279–98.
- Greater London Authority (GLA). (2014). *Cultural Metropolis*. London: GLA. Retrieved from: https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/cultural_metropolis_2014.pdf
- Historic England. (2016). Greater London archaeology advisory service. Retrieved from: <https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service>
- London Archaeologist. (2016). Journal, *London Archaeologist*. Retrieved From: <http://www.londonarchaeologist.org.uk>
- London Consensus: <http://data.london.gov.uk/census/data/>. Accessed December 12, 2014.
- Lyon, J. (2007). The Temple of Mithras: changing heritage values in the City of London 1954–2006. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 9(1), 5–37.
- Marsden, P. (1980). *Roman London*. London: Thames & Hudson Ltd.
- Marsden, P. (1996). The beginnings of archaeology in the city of London. In J. Bird et al. (Eds.), *1978 Southwark Excavations 1972–74*. London: London and Middlesex Society & Surrey Archaeological Society.
- Merrifield, R. (1965). *The Roman City of London*. Tonbridge: Benn.
- Museum of London Archaeology. (2014). Oral history project celebrates Roman Temple of Mithras. *Past Horizons*. September 23, 2014. Retrieved from: <http://www.pasthorizonspr.com/index.php/archives/23/2014/oral-history-project-celebrates-roman-temple-of-mithras>
- Museum of London Archaeology. (2016a). Museum of London Archaeological Archive Retrieved from: <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/collections-research/laarc/>
- Museum of London Archaeology. MOLA. (2016b). CITiZAN (Coastal and Intertidal Zone Archaeological Network). Retrieved from: <http://www.mola.org.uk/projects/research-and-community/citizan>
- New York City Department of Planning, ‘The Newest New Yorkers – 2000 Edition’: http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/census/nyy_exec_sum.shtml. Accessed January 14, 2015.
- Orton, C. (1989). A tale of two sites. *London Archaeologist*, 6(3), 59–65.
- RESCUE. (2016). RESCUE—the British archaeological trust. Retrieved from: <http://rescue-archaeology.org.uk/>
- SAVE Britain’s Heritage. (2016). Retrieved From: <http://www.savebritainsheritage.org/>

- Sheldon, H., & Clark, J. (2008). *Londinium and beyond: essays on Roman London and its hinterland for Harvey Sheldon*. York: Council of British Archaeology.
- Shepherd, J. (1998). *The temple of Mithras, London: excavations by W F Grimes and A Williams at the Walbrook*. London: English Heritage.
- Sheppard, F. (1991). *The treasury of London's Past, an historical account of the p and its predecessors, the Guildhall Museum and the London Museum*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Sidell, J. (2012). Paris London: 150 years of site preservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites*, 14(1–4), 372–383.
- UNESCO. (2016). World Heritage List—Tower of London. Retrieved from: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/488>
- Walbrook Discovery. (2016). Walbrook Discovery Programme. Retrieved from: <https://walbrookdiscovery.wordpress.com/>

Urban Archaeology, Municipal Government and Local
Planning

Preserving Heritage within the Commonwealth of
Nations and the United States

Baughner, S.; Appler, D.R.; Moss, W. (Eds.)

2017, VIII, 345 p. 85 illus., 73 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-55488-4