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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHI</td>
<td>Association for Heritage Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Combined Sewer Outfalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCO</td>
<td>Development Consent Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLC</td>
<td>Greater London Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBMCE</td>
<td>Historic England (Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOBAC</td>
<td>House of Beauty and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>International Council on Monuments and Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLAU</td>
<td>Limits of Land Acquired or Used – the construction site’s limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>London City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAB</td>
<td>Metropolitan Asylums Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>Metropolitan Board of Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLA</td>
<td>Museum of London Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED</td>
<td>Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAWSI</td>
<td>Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTT</td>
<td>Thames Tideway Tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWUL</td>
<td>Thames Water Utilities Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The Thames Tideway Tunnel

1.1.1 London has outgrown its sewerage system. The capacities originally allowed for in the sewer network designed by Sir Joseph Bazalgette in the 1850s have been significantly exceeded. The Thames Tideway Tunnel project (scheduled for completion in 2022) will extend London’s sewerage system to cope with the demands of the city well into the 22nd century.

1.1.2 The existing network is designed to allow discharges of untreated sewage into the tidal River Thames to prevent the network flooding back into streets and people’s homes. Originally it rarely discharged, but London’s combined sewer outflows (CSO) now operate more than fifty times a year, discharging millions of m$^3$ of combined sewage into the Tideway with the result that:

- dissolved oxygen levels in the river ‘sag’ or crash, which reduces biodiversity and sometimes causes mass fish kills
- pathogenic bacteria are discharged that pose health risks to river users
- approximately 10,000 tonnes of wastewater solids and litter form slicks on the river surface or are deposited on the foreshore.

1.1.3 The sewers were built to last and are in excellent condition. They have sufficient capacity for dry weather flow but population growth and the development of land which was previously able to absorb rainwater mean many of the main sewers operate at close to maximum capacity much of the time. A decade of study has concluded that the most timely and cost-effective solution to the CSO discharge problem is a 25 kilometre storage and transfer tunnel running up to 65 metres below the river - the Thames Tideway Tunnel.

1.1.4 Starting in west London, the proposed route for the main tunnel generally follows the route of the River Thames to Limehouse, where it then continues north-east to Abbey Mills Pumping Station near Stratford. There it will be connected to the Lee Tunnel, which will transfer the sewage to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.
1.1.5 The Thames Tideway Tunnel’s use of river transport for the construction of the tunnel is set to be on a scale unprecedented in modern times. A total of 4.2 million tonnes of project materials will be conveyed by barge on the river. This will create the need for a major modernisation of the fleet of commercial boats operating on the river and the project will be a trigger for the training of a new generation of 21st century river workers - tug masters, barge hands and deck hands. The Tunnel will both reinvigorate the river as a habitat and as a workplace.

1.1.6 Tideway’s legacy objectives are bold but deliverable:

- **Environment**: Protect and enhance environment
- **Economy**: Contribute to the rejuvenation of London’s river economy
- **People**: Greater well being for all, improved health for river users
- **Place**: Improved public realm, safer communities, less crime a more cohesive society

1.1.7 For the most part the scale and engineering of one of the UK’s leading infrastructure projects will remain unseen, but will be represented and announced through the creation of four acres of new public realm, comprising landscaped permanent structures connecting the existing sewer system to the tunnel; the design of which will be informed by the Heritage Interpretation Strategy.

1.1.8 The tunnel is divided into three sections that will be constructed concurrently:

- **West** – includes 7 worksites between Acton and Falconbrook;
- **Central** – includes 9 worksites between Cremorne Wharf and Shad Thames;
- **East** – includes 8 worksites between Chamber’s Wharf and Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.
Tideway Heritage Interpretation Strategy

1.2.1 The Development Consent Order (DCO) requires a project-wide Heritage Interpretation Strategy (HIS) to be prepared in consultation with Historic England (Requirement PW11). The Interpretation Strategy examines the significance of the River Thames and sets out a framework within which interpretation can be developed and implemented. Tideway’s overall vision for the project, which is to Reconnect London with the Thames has informed the approach taken and the principles that have evolved.

1.2.2 The purpose of this document is to provide a framework, or ‘road map’ that facilitates the Projects approach to engaging people and making connections that have long term value.

1.2.3 The aim of the Interpretation Strategy is to open new perceptions and perspectives of the River so that people are inspired to encounter the Thames and its history and influence on London’s contemporary culture and ways of living. It will communicate the Thames unique cultural heritage and aspire to awaken Londoners and others to its value to the City and to the lives they live, stimulating interest, experience and exploration.

1.2.4 The Interpretation Strategy responds to the heritage knowledge and resources embedded in the River and woven into its architectural fabric and strives to engage and foster a sense of connection and cultural authenticity.
The Victorian sewer system created by Sir Joseph Bazalgette is intimately connected with the River and with Tideway. In addressing the chaos that was Victorian London’s drainage and associated disease and ill health, the sewer network shaped the development of central London through the creation of the monumental Thames Embankments and also set the tone for London’s emergence as a world city. The Interpretation Strategy explores the pioneering nature and significance of Bazalgette’s sewer system within the context of social, economic and political changes that had a profound effect on the early development of a modern metropolis.

The Interpretation Strategy is supported by a wealth of historical and cultural research. Its focus is the theme ‘River of Liberty’ and the various freedoms and protections it entails: a unifying theme emulating the Victorian legacy, correlating with Tideway’s values and a universal and timeless human value that:

- embraces and amplifies the central purpose of the Metropolitan Board of Work and Bazalgette’s vision, which was to free Londoner’s from poor health and economic harm;
- recognises London’s status has relied on river authorities who, for a millennium, have maintained free navigation of the Thames, allowing free trade and the movement of people and services;
- acknowledges the River as a force of nature, and thus a dynamic metaphor for the 17th and 18th century notions of natural laws and rights on which modern classical liberalism is based, i.e. freedom of the individual;
- has shaped the riparian heritage resources at many works site locations, which illustrate how river resources have been shaped in support of social and economic activities that have generated greatest benefits for the greatest number (utilitarianism).

The three geographic areas of the project which the Interpretation Strategy defines ‘cultural meanders’, have been analysed and characterised as the following:

West section – ‘Recreation to industry: Society in transition’

Central section – ‘Babylon to World City: Civic London’

East section – ‘The Shipping Parishes: Gateway to the World’

Within the cultural meanders each work site is described under the heading ‘Liberty Sites’.

The Interpretation Strategy is presented in five sections:

- Setting the Context: this introduces the Thames heritage, the Tideway Project, consent requirements and the Public Arts Strategy
References

- Tideway Heritage Interpretation Principles: this sets out the overarching key messages that will guide the interpretation.

- Interpretation Framework: this examines the significance of the Thames and looks in detail at the three geographical areas and the individual sites therein presenting narratives to inform the development of interpretive materials

- Guidelines for Interpretation: this presents guidelines for designers translating the principles and framework narratives into practical applications

- Delivery: Opportunities for Interpretation & Legacy: looking at the Project as a whole this section identifies additional ways to engage with audiences and the long term value of the Project.
2 Introduction – Setting the Context

2.1 The Value of the Historic Environment

2.1.1 The historic environment is an asset of enormous cultural, social economic and environmental value. It makes a real contribution to our quality of life and the quality of our places. Existing heritage assets are irreplaceable and it is important to understand, conserve and where appropriate to enhance the markers of our past.1

2.1.2 It is also a valuable tool to encourage wider involvement in our heritage and helps to ensure that everyone, both today and in the future, has the opportunity to discover their connection to those who have come before. In doing this it can help tell us where we have come from and give us a sense of who we are.

2.1.3 The historic environment is part of our everyday lives. People cherish places, and the values of the historic environment lie in defining and enhancing that connection of people to a place. It provides roots and is intrinsic to our sense of place and cultural identity. It forges connections between people and the places where they live and visit, collectively telling the story of our shared past.

2.1.4 The historic environment can provide a foundation for more engaged and active communities by offering opportunities for learning and recreation. It can be central to local identity and engender a sense of ownership in an area, as well creating physical and social wellbeing.

2.1.5 For Tideway the historic environment is a key factor in the underlying rationale for the Project and how it is delivered as well as contributing to the legacy objectives.

2.2 Understanding Thames’ Heritage

2.2.1 The River Thames’s ability to reach and influence people’s ways of life is fundamental to understanding its long-term cultural legacy and heritage value.

2.2.2 The Thames is a natural force running through the heart of the metropolis. It has a powerful presence and is a benign resource that has supported pre-human and human communities in the region for c 500,000 years. It is a conduit for cultural contact between London and the rest of the world. At times it has served to promote common purpose; at others it has been appropriated to specific or proprietal interests. It is associated with cultural practices that have wide-ranging consequences for different groups or individuals, connecting Londoners to distant shores and distant times.

1 The Governments Statement on the Historic Environment for England. 2010
River regimes have driven patterns of past human settlement and resource utilisation from the earliest times and have been principle factor in the development of London as a World City. The changing hydrology and topography of the Thames (including confluences with its major tributaries) and repeated attempts to manage it, is a dominant influence on all assets along the route of the Tideway.

Interpreting the Thames, its different character reaches and specific riverside places, begins by understanding and defining how, why, and to what extent it has cultural and heritage value. Equally important is the ability to define heritage qualities that people value as relevant and pertinent to the lives they live.

At the core of the Interpretation Strategy is the Heritage Baseline analysis (Appendix E) that provides knowledge resources to assist implementation of the key interpretive messages, particularly for designers responsible for developing the permanent public realm.

This baseline analysis treats the Thames as a single multi-faceted heritage entity. It describes contextualized characterisations of the urban river environment, examining in turn the River itself, the three riparian character areas corresponding with the Tideway project contract sections and each of the 24 individual work sites.

The central theme, 'River of Liberty', presents the River as an allegory of Liberty, highlighting a heritage of contested and determined notions of freedom and opportunity, that continues to inform public discourse and influence the character and cultures of London.

### Development Consent Order Schedule 3 Requirements

**Heritage Interpretation PW11**

Consent for the development of the Thames Tideway Tunnel was granted through the The Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014. The Development Consent Order (DCO) is the prime driver of the project’s engineering and design vision. The DCO requirements are delivered by the Design Principles which together are the mechanism as to how this vision will be achieved.

The consent is subject to the provisions of the Order and the requirements set out in Schedule 3. Project Wide Requirement PW11 of Schedule 3 requires the preparation of a Project Heritage Interpretation Strategy. The requirement states:

a. A project-wide Heritage Interpretation Strategy shall be developed in consultation with the HBMCE within 12 months of the start of construction, in accordance with the OAWSI and Design Principle HRTG.07.
b. The Strategy shall be implemented at site level through the landscaping details to be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authorities, or pursuant to a specific heritage interpretation requirement.

c. The authorised development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authorities in consultation with the HBMCE.

d. The Design Principles (HRTG 07) and the OAWSI referred to above provide clarification on the objectives and scope of the Heritage Interpretation Strategy and are set out in full in Appendix A

2.3.3 The Heritage Interpretation Strategy must therefore provide a framework for Tideway to engage with audiences across a range of subject areas and media. But the key focus is the application of interpretation to the design of the new public realm. The design and content of interpretation proposals for each site will form part of the overall landscape treatments developed pursuant to DCO Schedule 3 Requirements. These will be subject to the approval of the relevant local authority, in consultation with HBMCE and other relevant stakeholders.

Historic environment and design

2.3.4 The Interpretation Strategy is to be delivered principally through DCO site specific requirements related to landscape design, as noted above. However, it is also likely to have a bearing on the design of permanent structures adjacent to listed buildings or within conservation areas and the requirement to mitigate the impact on these historic assets. The scope of this is set out in Appendix B which highlights those works that are essential to comply with PW11, as well as requirements related to permanent structures that affect the setting of listed buildings or the character of conservation areas.

2.3.5 The Interpretation Strategy will assist designers prepare proposals that meet the requirement to protect and enhance the setting of historic assets in these sensitive heritage locations. The creation of new architecture and public realm should inspire future users of these new spaces to explore further cultural dimensions of the urban river environment.

Purpose of Interpretation

2.3.6 Interpretation enriches lives through engaging emotions, enhancing experiences and deepening understanding of places, people, events and objects from the past and present. It brings places, objects and ideas to life, by creating thought provoking and memorable experiences that connect people with our cultural heritage.

2.3.7 Revealing hidden stories and meanings deepens people’s understanding and expands their horizons. In particular it enables communities to better understand their heritage, and to express their own ideas and feelings about
values inherent in the local culture. Appendices C and D set out relevant policy and guidance related to Heritage Interpretation.

### 2.4 Tideway Vision and Values

2.4.1 The Tideway vision and values are critical to the development and implementation of the Interpretation Strategy. The vision is articulated as follows:

*Our challenge is to build a new sewer for London, to prevent the frequent pollution of the river Thames.*

*Our vision is not just to clean up the Thames but to promote a change in the relationship between London (and Londoners) and their river.*

*This is what we call... RECONNECTING LONDON WITH THE THAMES*

2.4.2 This vision will be achieved in accordance with Tideway values:

*Treating people, and their cultures, with respect, empathy and integrity.*

2.4.3 This vision of re-connecting London with the Thames is central to the Interpretation Strategy aims and to the principal theme and site specific narratives that present the River as a cultural entity. Equally important are the values by which Tideway operates and its intent to engender a Project culture of opportunity and respect for diversity. This intent, to influence the potential for people to overcome constraints that might otherwise limit life opportunities, is also encapsulated by the overarching ‘Liberty’ theme.

### 2.5 Public Art Strategy: Art on the Tideway: turning to face the River

2.5.1 Tideway is committed to a legacy of high quality open space. This is captured in both the project Legacy Commitments and the DCO. Through the DCO (Design Principle HRTG.07) Tideway has made a commitment to provide interpretive material, along with supporting information, in the form of integrated landscape and artistic installations. These public realm designs will draw on the specific history and geography of the site, with reference to archaeological and other sources of information, and will contribute to project wide narratives and themes.

2.5.2 A Public Art Strategy (PAS) has been developed to provide the mechanism to deliver the heritage interpretation via commissions integrated with the landscape design. The approach to the PAS is informed by the overarching project vision to reconnect London, and Londoners, back with the River Thames. Early 19th century Londoners turned their backs on the Thames, as
industry grew along with the associated pollution. Today we are turning back to face the river.

2.5.3 The ambition is as follows:

*Art on the Tideway will reposition the tidal River Thames as a new cultural venue. A bold world-class art programme created with local communities and stakeholders will celebrate the achievements of the Thames Tideway Tunnel through the presentation of site responsive artworks and projects. Exploring heritage and looking to the future, artists will animate new public spaces and create neighbourhood interventions to surprise, delight and inspire diverse audiences.*

2.5.4 Key objectives of the public art programme are to:

a. Create unique artworks that express the transformational importance of the Thames Tideway Tunnel for London and its relationship with the river;

b. Enhance the high quality public spaces and experience of the river for Londoners and visitors.

2.5.5 The design aspiration for the new areas of public realm, hard and soft landscaping is to create the highest quality, following on from the example set by Bazalgette for the Embankment with decorative motifs on the river wall, lion heads and sturgeon lamps.

2.5.6 The Public Art Strategy complements the Interpretation Strategy and Tideway intends to co-ordinate and align both to achieve important benefits and synergies:

a. The Interpretation Strategy provides a wide ranging narrative framework for the artistic and design proposals fixed to the cultural value of the River.

b. Integrated landscape design and public art offers a medium for communicating heritage narratives that rely on a sense of discovery or imaginative engagement.

c. Establish a reputation for world-class artworks and projects as part of the DNA of the project, engaging, inspiring and educating diverse audiences locally, nationally and internationally;

d. Collaborate with communities from the outset to create a new sense of place through a multi-stranded programme with active participation at the core:

e. Enhance the high quality public spaces and experience of the river for Londoners and visitors at all project stages from design and construction to long-term legacy;

f. Place artists and designers at the heart of the programme, creating an ambitious commissioning programme with a range of artists from those of international standing to those at the beginning of their careers;

g. Stimulate a new sense of pride in and new perception of the tidal River Thames and the wealth of opportunities that it provides;
h. Demonstrate and make visible the innovative engineering and environmental achievements of the Thames Tideway Tunnel.

2.5.7 Involving artists and integrating permanent artworks has been embedded in the project from the outset. The creative response to the heritage interpretation will inform the design of the soft and hard landscape, structures and artworks. This iterative and collaborative approach with the design teams will uncover the stories and narratives of the sites, translating them into built fabric. This aims to capture a unique series of responses to context but also to create a collection of subtle interventions and high quality public spaces.
3 Tideway Heritage Interpretation Principles

‘The Public Health is the foundation on which respose the happiness of the people and the power of the country’ Benjamin Disraeli 1875

3.1 Principles

3.1.1 In delivering the Heritage Interpretation Strategy Tideway will be guided by the following principles:

a. The historic environment of the River Thames is important: people value their historic environment; it enhances the quality of life and economic wellbeing;

b. The 19th century infrastructure created by the Metropolitan Board of Works & Sir Joseph Bazalgette are important historic assets: innovative engineering, public health benefits, new public realm, integrated city wide planning and administration;

c. The historic environment is a tool to delivering a lasting legacy for Tideway: new public realm informed by the historic environment; public art inspired by the heritage of the sites;

d. At the heart of the project is People: benefitting from an improved environment, health, economy and public realm; engaging with the heritage of the River Thames;

e. Achievement through collaboration: within the project team, with artists, local authorities and local communities.

3.1.2 Increasing population and urbanisation has led to the sewer system being overloaded with the result that there are regular pollution events as a result of the CSOs spilling untreated storm sewage into the Thames. Sewage discharges have a significant impact on the ecology of the river as well as posing risks to recreational river users and introducing aesthetic pollution from the ‘flushable’ items that enter the River and can remain there for up to three months. All these contribute to a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of the population and the City as a whole.

3.1.3 The Thames Tideway Tunnel aims to address this and its implementation will ensure that the ecology of the Thames estuary in London continues to improve. There are other benefits expected to result from the project. These include employment and regeneration benefits, reputational issues, the protection of habitats and species, and the reduction in sewer flooding risks

3.1.4 At the heart of the project are People – benefitting from an improved environment, health, economy and public realm. This is embodied in Tideway’s vision of Reconnecting London and Londoners with the River, with the overarching theme of the Interpretation Strategy of River of Liberty and the Public Art Strategy: Turning to Face the River. Together these recognise and
celebrate lives played out, in both a real and allegoric sense, against the backdrop of the river, while creating the opportunity for new stories to evolve.

3.1.5 The principles set out above have influenced the development of the key messages within the Interpretation Strategy. There are many stories that could be told about the Thames and its riparian environment but the approach taken has been informed by historic narratives that explore aspects of the relationship between people, culture and the natural elemental quality of the River.

3.2 Purpose

3.2.1 The purpose of the Interpretation Strategy is to provide a framework that facilitates the engagement of audiences and makes connections that have long term value. It will be used to inform the design of the new public realm and integrated art works to create a clearly defined identity that can flow across the Project sites. It will inform Project communications and contribute to education and engagement activities.

3.3 Aim

3.3.1 The aim of the Interpretation Strategy is to open new perceptions and perspectives of the River so that people are inspired to encounter the Thames and experience its history and influence on London's contemporary culture and ways of living.

3.4 Objectives

3.4.1 The Interpretation Strategy will:

a. Communicate the River Thames’ unique cultural heritage and awaken Londoners, and others, to its value to the city and to the lives they live, stimulating interest, experience and exploration;

b. Respond to heritage knowledge and resources embedded in the River and woven into its architectural fabric, that engage and foster a sense of connection and cultural authenticity;

c. Celebrate the achievements of the 19th century engineers responsible for the sewage infrastructure and explore its contribution to London as a World City;

d. Encourage the creation of inspirational designs and memorable local places of sustainable and lasting cultural value;

e. Sustain heritage authenticity by promoting the retention of extant features of interest wherever possible.

3.5 Audience

3.5.1 The Interpretation Strategy will, by its nature and application, have diverse audiences:
a. Stakeholders – the Strategy is Tideway’s statement of intent and purpose in respect of its obligations under the DCO. It will be utilized by Local Authorities in determining applications for permanent works;

b. Contractors – the application and development of the narratives within the Interpretation Strategy to inform the landscape design and art installations;

c. Local Communities – engagement to build relationships and understanding; involvement in the development of artistic works and a local sense of ownership of the new public realm

d. Functional users – walkers, cyclists, tourists who interact with the construction work and the new public realm

e. Specialists – heritage, art, ecology, engineering specialists who interact with the construction and the new public realm;

f. Education – schools and colleges with whom Tideway work to develop educational resources

3.5.2 As a consequence of this diversity it is recognised that different sections of the Interpretation Strategy will appeal to different audiences and the Strategy will signpost these where relevant.

3.5.3 The commissioned artists and designers have a key role in further defining local community audience groups, tailored to the specific site context. The cultural manifesto set out below encourages recognition of a heritage of culture diversity and the wide range of differing personal heritages held within the London populace.

3.6 A Cultural Manifesto for the Thames

3.6.1 The Interpretation Strategy will be delivered in accordance with a number of aspirations which together form a manifesto outlining how the cultural value of the River is recognised, in a manner that is both aspirational and accessible.

The manifesto is a high level perspective on the cultural values of the River Thames which has informed the development of the Interpretive framework and which should be taken into consideration in the development and delivery of the interpretive narratives set out in Section 4:

a. Cultural attributes: The approach to delivery will explore cultural attributes that provide a platform on which to build and embed Interpretations that are integrated and relevant to the river setting, are meaningful to Londoners and re-connect people with the River.

b. Meanings and values: The approach to delivery is to be grounded in the popular cultural dimension of the lived experiences of former communities, to be made available to contemporary and future Londoners through heritage interpretation.

c. Changing cultures: The approach to delivery will consider meanings and values represented by the River’s heritage that are open in nature
and leave scope for responses particular to individual personal stories, whatever their specific nature.

d. Richness and complexity: The approach to delivery will explore the inherent richness and complexity of the River heritage, and its capacity for multiple readings and plurality of meanings.

e. Global heritage: The approach to delivery will present heritage interpretations in a contemporary setting with an awareness of emerging economic, social, political and environmental shifts that have a global dimension and are relevant to London’s evolving World City status.

f. Iconic river: The approach to delivery will articulate the under-represented cultural role of the River, exploring its potential as a physical, psychological and allegorical cultural entity.

g. Celebrating Bazalgette: Tideway will emulate Bazalgette’s achievements, through new representations at locations along the Embankments, but also more widely along the River, which reflect contemporary values; to re-contextualize the mid-19th century architectural statement and its inherent cultural symbolism, whilst recognising the design benchmarks set by local heritage character.

**Manifesto point (a): Cultural Attributes**

3.6.2 The starting point for developing the content of the Strategy and its implementation is an appreciation of the cultural and urban context in which the Tideway occurs, i.e. how is culture defined and expressed and what heritage content currently exists. It is recognised that:

a. Rivers, especially major urban rivers such as the Thames, are a set of dynamic processes partly shaped by human, i.e. cultural, actions, partly by natural forces, but are essentially intertwined as to be inseparable;

b. The geography and history of the Thames provides an opportunity to explore a national story with a global reach that spans two thousand years. At the same time the Project has a specific purpose to up-grade Bazalgette’s sewer, one of the most influential engineering enterprises undertaken by the Victorians, in a period of rapid technical advance and new approaches to urban planning, that continues to influence the evolving metropolis;

c. These contrasting scales of understanding demonstrate the cultural richness and importance of the Thames as a powerful natural force that has fashioned a World City: an iconic river within a city of rich cultural diversity and remarkable heritage.

**Manifesto point (b) : Meanings and value**
3.6.3 The Interpretation Strategy distinguishes ‘culture’ as comprising two interconnected elements:

a. Tradition of high, institutional, canonical culture, comprising expressions of aesthetic ideals through the visual and performing arts;

b. Common experience of life as lived.

3.6.4 These definitions are not mutually exclusive. For example architecture is not simply a particular set of aesthetic or artistic representations; it also determines the physical environment in which people conduct their lives. Conversely, the Thames has influenced creative communities that have fashioned ways of living that constitute forms of artistic practice.

**Manifesto point (c): Changing ‘Cultures’**

3.6.5 Contemporary Londoners’ relationships to the River are constantly changing; to a degree that precise characterisation is likely to be counter-productive. This, in part, is a reflection of the considerable diversity of culture and the wide range of differing personal heritages within the London populace which can give rise to conflicting perceptions of the heritage of the River.

3.6.6 While the River might be perceived through the lens of constantly shifting patterns of cultural orthodoxy and social/political discourse, for millennia it has also been a special place beyond conventional authority. An important aspect of the River, is its ability to support and accommodate various forms of spiritual practice, counterculture and alternative ways of living:

a. ‘Gifts to the Gods’ is a term that might explain the number and range of prehistoric votive objects and human skulls deliberately deposited in the river and adjacent wet places, most notably during the Bronze and Iron Ages. Rules governed the discarding and disposal of artefacts and human remains may have had cosmological or metaphysical associations. However, a noticeable concentration of votive items occurs along the west section of the river. Physiologically riverine rather than estuarine, this section contains numerous traditional river crossing locations. The deposition of votive items
may be related to social contacts between communities otherwise separated by the River;

b. Seventeenth century “frost fairs” were a providential response to the occasional freezing of the river. These spontaneous events took on a carnival nature and were regarded as having prophetic meanings that might influence social or political concerns prevalent among Londoners;

c. Throughout the 18th/19th century the socially displaced eked out a marginal economic existence: a liminal society with an unique folk identity, including supernatural belief systems, e.g. Queen Rat\(^2\). The character of this urban subculture was captured by journalist Henry Meyhew, in his role of ‘Special Correspondent to the Metropolis’ whilst working on the *Morning Chronicle* in the 1840s. Subsequently published in 1865 as *London Labour and London’s Poor*, Meyhew’s first hand descriptions of the ‘moral, intellectual, material and physical’ condition of the ‘industrial poor’ included interviews with ‘toshers’, ‘mudlarks’ ‘cess pool and sewermen’ and others whose existence was defined by the river and its sewers;

d. The 1970-1980’s post-industrial riverside inspired ad hoc creative communities and groups, for example:

i. A community of independent artist established studios at various semi-derelict waterfront warehouses in the 1970s, such as Butler’s Wharf, which adjoins the Shad Thames Pumping Station. Derek Jarman, film director, stage designer, diarist, artist, gardener, author and queer activist, was a prominent member of this community who possessed a deep creative connection with the Thames;

ii. House of Beauty and Culture (HOBAC), a craft collective at the heart of the London club scene in the late 1980s, scoured the banks of the River Thames in search of old bones, bottle tops and clay pipes used to create fashion accessories and handmade clothing in a post-punk DIY design aesthetic;

iii. During the summer of 1999, U.S. artist Mark Dion and a team of volunteers drawn from local groups combed the foreshore of the Thames at low tide along two stretches of beach at Millbank and

---

\(^2\) According to Westwood and Simpso’s’s *The Lore of the Land*, toshers “made their living by searching inside sewers and along the Thames banks for ‘tosh’, i.e. scrap metal, coins, lost jewellery, and anything else sellable. It was dangerous, secretive work, done at night, for unauthorised entry of sewers was made illegal in 1840; toshers formed communities of their own, with strange beliefs and stories relating to their work”

The Queen Rat was a luck-bringer in the form of a sewer rat. She would take human form and seduce toshers in and around the sewers. If the toshers satisfied her, they would discover treasure and valuables. If not death, often by drowning, would be their fate.
Bankside, near the Tate Britain and Tate Modern. Dion's practice incorporates aspects of archaeology, ecology and detection and the *Tate Thames Dig* focused on a natural, historical constant; looking for fragments of individual and ephemeral histories. The finds from both sites were meticulously cleaned and classified in 'archaeologists' tents' on the Tate Gallery's lawn at Millbank during the summer of 1999.

iv. Dion's projects focus primarily on current issues surrounding the representation of nature and on the history of the natural sciences. By re-enacting the processes of scientific research, Dion questions the premises upon which these activities are based. By reworking orthodox procedures of collecting, identifying and classifying, Dion's work suggests a more poetic and open-ended approach to interpretation.

e. Flowing water plays a significant role in Hinduism and range of contemporary and heirloom objects associated with Hindu spiritual practices, such as statuettes of deities, inscribed plaques and clay lamps used during festivals such as Diwali, are regularly found on the Thames foreshore;

3.6.7 Given this rich diversity of culture within and across the Thames it is important that the Strategy does not promote too narrow a range of meaning and values.

**Manifesto point (d): Richness and Complexity**

3.6.8 The Strategy involves a ‘conversation’ about London’s riparian heritage, cultures and ‘ways of life’, initiated through landscape design, art and public engagement activities. The tone of this conversation should be inspirational and reflective, rather than commemorative. Site-specific responses to Interpretation Strategy themes and narratives will be developed in conversations with Community Liaison Working Groups, local authorities or collaborative partners such as schools and community groups.

**Manifesto point (e): Global heritage**

3.6.9 Tideway is a major project that will play a significant role in the operation of a world city. All global metropolis face common 21st century challenges and increasingly identify common trans-national values and interests. This inevitably raises questions as to the validity, purpose and influence of a heritage rooted in social, economic and political context that can appear increasingly less relevant to the experience of future Londoners, especially as
it’s status is still intimately linked to 19th century nationalism and an imperial past\(^3\) that has left a mixed legacy in its wake\(^4\).

3.6.10 To ignore the nature of this mixed legacy would fail to recognise that, for many, London’s heritage includes connections and close personal associations. locally rooted in different perceptions of the origins of the world’s first modern metropolis. This belonging applies equally to a wide range of ethnicities, including the descendants of diaspora communities that have converged on London since the 15th century. Some originated within the British Isles, often the result of rural economic depopulations, most notably the Irish Famine. Others arrived from Europe seeking sanctuary, such as the French Huguenots escaping religious persecution, the Jews escaping pogroms in Russia and Eastern Europe, as well as many political dissidents. Some have a heritage in British merchant shipping, such as the Bengali and Chinese sailors engaged by the East India Company, who expatriated to form London’s first south east Asian communities in the ‘shipping parishes’ of East London. Later West Indian communities, who arrived in the mid-20th century, have a direct connection with London through its position at the hub of Britain’s colonial exploitation of enslaved Africans. In consequence there is a common locally rooted London heritage, with residual metropole-colonial relationships and links between a diverse diaspora and various countries of origin.

**Manifesto point (f): Iconic River**

3.6.11 For many the Thames is viewed as an icon simply due to its geographical relationship to London as a World City. But this limited view does not fully value how the ‘urban’ river and its cultures offer a special quality to the city.

---

\(^3\) Arthur Maxwell’s *Discovering London* (1935) exemplifies London’s former imperial identity:

The capital of the greatest empire this world has ever known, beside which the empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome dwindle into insignificance, London occupies a position unique in the annals of history. Towards this city the peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations turn with an affection unequalled even by the love of the Jews for old Jerusalem. To colonists in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, Kenya Colony, and the numerous British territories and protectorates around the globe, the thought of London brings a softening of the heart and a moistening of the eyes when one thinks of home. . . . What London says and does to-day is said and done to-morrow -- or the day after -- in Melbourne, Wellington, Calcutta, Quebec, and Cape Town. Almost as potent is the influence of London upon foreign lands. Though not resulting from family affection, it is none the less real. The power of Britain, its success in arms, its immense riches, its colossal trade, have made the voice of London the voice of a prophet in the affairs of men. There is no project of any importance in any sphere of life concerning which Paris, Berlin, Rome, Madrid, and even New York, are not anxious to learn the opinion and attitude of London. (18-19)

\(^4\) [https://www.artangel.org.uk/a-room-for-london/a-london-address/#caryl-phillips](https://www.artangel.org.uk/a-room-for-london/a-london-address/#caryl-phillips)
The River uniquely expresses, sometimes in abstract and often engaging ways, values that are universal, yet possess qualities specific to London and are widely accessible.

The River's timeless connection with sea and land, and the constant changing quality of tide and light, creates a strong physical and psychological presence. Despite significant changes to the river over the past 100 years, these qualities are still perhaps best captured by Polish-British novelist Joseph Conrad in the opening chapter of Heart of Darkness published in 1899:

"....The sea-reach of the Thames stretched before us like the beginning of an interminable waterway. In the offing the sea and the sky were welded together without a joint, and in the luminous space the tanned sails of the barges drifting up with the tide seemed to stand still in red clusters of canvas sharply peaked, with gleams of varnished sprits. A haze rested on the low shores that ran out to sea in vanishing flatness. The air was dark above Gravesend, and farther back still seemed condensed into a mournful gloom, brooding motionless over the biggest, and the greatest, town on earth...."

Forthwith a change came over the waters, and the serenity became less brilliant but more profound. The old river in its broad reach rested unruffled at the decline of day, after ages of good service done to the race that peopled its banks, spread out in the tranquil dignity of a waterway leading to the uttermost ends of the earth. We looked at the venerable stream not in the vivid flush of a short day that comes and departs forever, but in the august light of abiding memories.
Manifesto point (g): Celebrating Bazalgette

3.6.14 The public health campaigns of the 1840s, initiated by the investigation of the *Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Classes of Britain* (1842) by Edwin Chadwick, demonstrated the correlation between unsanitary conditions, defective drainage and overcrowded housing with disease and low expectations of life. The recommendations of that report, although embedded in the first Public Health Act 1848 failed to be implemented for more than a decade and only then when the polluted state of the River Thames threatened the Establishment in an event known as The Great Stink.

3.6.15 In 1858 the pollution of the River Thames had reached such levels that the noxious gases prevented Parliament from operating and had an impact on London as whole. This elevated what had been seen as a local problem to one with a political context that could affect the national and international perception of London and its government at a time of rampant colonial aggression. London was perceived as the potentially rotten heart of the body politic, a view enhanced by the putrid state of the capital's river. The Empire without; decay and rottenness within. If London was fatally afflicted the rest of the country would certainly perish. This resulted in unifying opinion in the defence of distinctly metropolitan values and to save the river was to consolidate the new urban-industrial order.

3.6.16 The responsibility for resolving the sewage crisis was given to the Metropolitan Board of Works. This was set up in 1855 with the responsibility to provide the infrastructure to cope with London's rapid growth. It replaced the previously established Metropolitan Commission of Sewers and was the first organisation with city wide responsibilities. Although not an elected body – its members were nominated by the vestries which up until that time were the principal local authorities, it became the principal instrument of London wide government, until the establishment of the London County Council in 1899.

3.6.17 While the grandeur of the Thames Embankments, bridges, pumping stations and underground chambers, sewers and outfalls are now seen as public manifestations of the power and collective responsibility of the State they are products of a time when private investment was responsible for the country's infrastructure. Yet they are all representations of a health movement aimed at the benefit of the public good not private interest which is a magnificent tribute to those responsible.

3.6.18 The city wide structural form of the drainage infrastructure demonstrates an integrated planning approach rarely seen – then or since. The public health campaign and subsequent legislation controlling the provision of water and the removal of waste represents a critical phase in urban environmental and social history - the quiet revolution of the 19th century.

3.6.19 The Metropolitan Board of Works' achievements include:

- Sewage system for London that wiped out cholera in the city;
b. Embankments and architectural landmarks that reflect London’s cultural aspirations at a particular moment of global imperialism;

c. Laying out several main thoroughfares that improved links between the rival cities of London and Westminster to form the modern metropolis;

d. Re-built or improved many of the city's landmark bridges;

e. Established a nascent pan-London representative administration.

Bazalgette’s cultural legacy

3.6.20 The Embankments and the architecture of the pumping stations continue to evoke Sir Joseph Bazalgette’s vision of Britain as a world leader in industry, engineering, design and culture.

3.6.21 This vision was also pivotal to transforming the cityscape and to a great degree this contribution to urban design has lasted the test of time and continues to be a valued cultural legacy.

3.6.22 For the last 150 year Bazalgette’s principal cultural legacy, the Thames Embankments, have aggrandized the riverfront, as a 19th century monumental representation of London’s status as a capital city. Drawing inspiration from the nation’s historic maritime role, it references a time and place very different to London today, that can still have negative connotations for some Londoners. The Strategy offers an important opportunity to create spaces that reflect the changing context.
### Interpretation Framework

*The really important thing….is narrative. We travel along the thread of narrative like high wire artistes: that is our life. Angela Carter (1992)*

#### 4.1 Methodology

4.1.1 To develop the Interpretation Strategy it has been necessary to gain a deeper understanding of local narratives and how they interrelate, at various levels, according to the heritage interest across the length of River corresponding to the c.25 km of the main tunnel route. Appendix E sets out the compiled information.

4.1.2 Baseline analysis involved re-examination of information presented in the DCO Environmental Statement to identify narrative ‘threads’ that correlated with Tideway’s Vision and Values and with the tenets of the cultural manifesto. Records of historic events, associations and heritage assets have contributed to short narrative descriptions highlighting significant heritage interests within a standardised framework.

4.1.3 This analysis largely relies on widely available historical or archaeological data and insights revealed by examining the interconnected qualities of individual site narratives. It is important to also acknowledge the wider availability of sources that have not been examined. For instance fictional and other contemporary accounts of the past offer further scope to connect with former communities and people. The Strategy leaves this scope open to further exploration, but will deliver meaningful representations that are sufficiently flexible to accommodate different narratives and accrue additional meanings.

4.1.4 In addition Appendix F.1 details site specific heritage assets that are located in the vicinity of each of the 24 work sites. These provide an additional heritage resource, that may assist artists and designers prepare interpretation proposals and embed heritage design in a local context.

4.1.5 Appendix F.2 collates information regarding public realm proposals for each of the Tideway worksites, which will influence opportunities and constraints for site specific heritage interpretation.

4.1.6 Analysis reveals contrasting modes of cultural interaction with the river environment over time where urbanism has been a dominant aspect since the Roman city was founded. Urban London has expanded exponentially over the past 1000 years, a factor that has widespread implications for the River and ways in which it may be understood and interpreted (see The London Evolution Animation:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NB5Oz9b84jM&feature=player_embedded)

4.1.7 This growth reflects the continuing evolution of London’s multiple urban functions: as a capital city, seat of governance, commercial and creative
centre, port and industrial production and distribution hub, whilst also meeting
the wider residential and amenity interests of Londoners.

4.1.8 Intra-site narratives patterns highlight events that occurred during a
particularly dynamic period of growth. Drawing on its late medieval roots,
urban London is rapidly and repeatedly transformed throughout the 16th -21st
centuries. The Interpretation Strategy framework focusses on London and its
role in a distinctive British contribution to ideas and concepts from which
modernism and globalisation emerges.

Limitations

4.1.9 The heritage value of the River is no less significant for the c.14,000 years of
human interaction prior to urbanism. The nature of pre-urban London heritage
largely rests on archaeological data, which, due to its nature, requires forms of
analysis and representation best served through various forms of
documentation, including academic and popular publications.

4.1.10 The DCO, through site specific archaeological Schedule 3 Requirements, will
secure the delivery of archaeological interpretative reports and publications
and will make the archaeological archive, including all portable finds, available
within the Museum of London collections. The Heritage Interpretation Strategy
acknowledges and promotes this arrangement for integrating the results of site
specific archaeological investigations and disseminating new understandings
of the River.

4.1.11 However, archaeological understandings of pre-urban London, unless they are
corroborated by other sources, are, by their nature, open to extensive revision
as new discoveries are made. There is a risk that interpretations expressed
within the landscape design will quickly become dated. In general these pre-
urban archaeological understandings, in themselves, are not anticipated as
dominant components of the heritage narratives that will inform the landscape
and permanent structure design. Instead they will primarily contribute to the
Strategy through other interpretative outputs (see Section 6).

4.2 Framework Structure

4.2.1 The River, as a physical and cultural entity that connects interlocking local
narratives is, of itself, a very powerful heritage representation. It requires
relatively simple treatment to reveal a depth of meanings, as implicit in the
19th/20th century radical Liberal politician and trade unionist John Burns’
description of the Thames as ‘liquid history’.

4.2.2 In order to give structure to the multi layered meanings a tripartite analysis for
the Interpretation Strategy framework is adopted to collate and present cultural
heritage data and inform its use for interpretation and dissemination:

a. Overarching interpretive theme: Liberty

b. Thematic interpretive grouping based on geography: Cultural Meander
The aim is that design of landscape, art or other interpretive material will keep at its core the overarching theme but will focus on specific site narratives within the context of the relevant cultural meander.

**Principal theme: ‘River of Liberty’**

The unifying overarching interpretative theme – ‘Liberty’ - conveys a high level of cultural authenticity, that communicates the:

- Richness of individual site heritage narratives;
- Distinctiveness and diversity of river heritage at contract section level;
- A project-wide narrative that is credible and cohesive.

It presents a *public history* based on narratives grounded in different accounts of the past viewed from many socio-economic positions and is capable of generating enlightening, original and innovative ideas that challenge common heritage perceptions;

Liberty demonstrates a River heritage that has universal cultural qualities, relevant to contemporary Londoners but open to examination in a global context. It utilises the physical and psychological qualities of the River, and the riparian sites, and provides subject matter that inspires creativity through the medium of public art and landscape design.

Specifically the River's relationship to different notions of 'Liberty' are central to understanding historic patterns of cultural mobility in a contested city and illuminates London’s legacy as a place of difference, diversity and encounter, where urban culture and values have and continue to be critically examined and challenged.

‘Liberty’ and the various freedoms and protections it entails has multiple heritage perspectives, encompassing narratives particular to groups who held advantages and benefits and, conversely, to those whose rights were denied, restricted or compromised. It is a concept that has evolved and in so doing continues to shape and influence the contested dimension to London’s development.

By placing concepts of ‘Liberty’ at the centre of the Heritage Interpretation Strategy, it opens to contemporary examination fundamental issues relevant to London’s future and its position within a radically changing world.

The Heritage Interpretation Strategy adopts evolved definitions of ‘Liberty’ first set out in Isaiah Berlin's (1958) *Two Concepts of Liberty*:

- Negative liberty - Absence of external constraints on individuals or groups, i.e. freedom of will or immunity from external compulsion;
- Positive liberty –Alleviation of constraints that limit the achievement of individuals and groups of people, i.e. self-mastery, self-realisation or collective control over common life.
By exploring these two aspects of ‘Liberty’ through the history and geography of the Thames, the Strategy:

a. Provides a cultural and historic perspective on an essential aspect of the human condition that is continuously negotiated in many different ways, opening opportunities for discourse that explore London’s social and cultural context at a personal, local, regional, national and global level;

b. Recognises that London’s status has relied on river authorities who, for a millennium, have maintained free navigation of the Thames, allowing free trade and the movement of people and services;

c. Embraces and amplifies the central purpose of the Metropolitan Board of Work and Bazalgette’s vision, to harness the River for the collective benefit of Londoner’s by controlling health risks and associated social and economic harm;

d. Links directly to the Tideway ‘Vision and Values’, as improved water quality and greater access to river amenity removes a constraint that otherwise inhibits opportunities for people to enjoy the River and the contribution it can make to realising human potential.

River as allegory

The London Mayor’s 2012 Cultural Strategy Cultural Metropolis 2014 Achievements and next steps recognises and promotes the River as an art venue. The Tideway Heritage Interpretation Strategy has further ambitions, to
conceptualise the River through artistic practices that explore hidden and allegorical meanings.

4.2.13 There is a rich artistic heritage of applying allegorical meanings to the Thames. Two historic examples highlight ways in which the River has been taken to illustrate contrasting perceptions of power:

a. At the beginning of the 18th century poet Matthew Prior regards the Thames as characteristic of the idealised qualities of a monarch. In "Carmen Seculare" he states:

   But her own king she likens to his Thames;
   Serene yet strong, majestic yet sedate,
   Swift without violence, without terror great.

b. George Simonds' 1901 Victoria Embankment memorial to Bazalgette's notes 'he put the river in chains' (FLVMINI VINCVLAS POSVIT), and refers to far different 19th century perceptions of the Thames, as a threat to be physically subjugated.

4.2.14 Taking 'Liberty' as a central theme provides an allegory of the Thames relevant to 21st century Londoners, that still addresses aspects of power that inspired Prior and Simonds, but establishes a clear, succinct and nuanced cultural value relevant to the challenges facing a diverse modern city.

4.2.15 The constant flow of the tidal River is a force of nature that can be seen as a dynamic metaphor for notions of natural laws and rights, emerging in the 17th and 18th century, on which modern classical liberalism is based, i.e. protecting the personal freedom of the individual – Berlin's 'negative' liberty.

4.2.16 This metaphor also encompasses the various interventions to control and exploit the natural force of the River for common purpose. The liminal nature of the riparian land is a product of long-term and incremental acts of encroachment. This has cumulatively affected the force and course of the River, without restraining its dynamic character. Historic activities driving encroachment often provided services related to wider social, political and economic interests, often interests that were held in common, such as public health and flood protection, e.g. the Metropolitan Board of Works and Bazalgette's sewer. Typically these activities, in consequence if not by intent, served the 'greatest benefit for the greatest number'.

4.2.17 This aspect of the riparian land introduces narratives embracing, to varying degrees, Berlin's 'positive' liberty aspirations, inherent in 19th/20th century ideas of Liberty, such as utilitarianism. This is a counterpoint to classical (negative) liberalism and poses a question as to the limitations that might be necessary to balance the consequences that, if unrestrained, individual free will, could create inequality for others.

4.2.18 The continuing tension in the dynamic physical relationship between river and riparian land neatly captures, in an allegoric manner, both the polarity and the mutability in these contrasting philosophical perceptions of 'Liberty'.
Furthermore historic perspectives on the environmental condition of the River can be viewed as a reflection on the degree to which contrasting notions of liberty achieved a fair and equitable society, as illustrated by the events leading up to the ‘Great Stink’.

This allegorical exploration of the River is further examined in section 4.9 Reflections and underlies and unifies the site specific narratives which draw on individual historical associations reflecting differing notions of Liberty.

**Cultural Meanders and their Liberty Sites**

A noticeable feature of the local site narratives is the degree to which they interlock, both spatially and temporally. Inter-site narrative correlations reveal sub-regional cultural narratives that account for apparent differences in the riverside heritage character of the west, central and east project sections, i.e. the cultural meanders:

a. West – Recreation to Industry: Society in Transition;
b. Central – ‘Babylon’ to World City: Civic London;
c. East – The ‘Shipping Parishes’: Gateway to the World.

Within each cultural meander the individual work site narratives evidence ‘Liberty’ associations that connect site specific historic events, associations and heritage features with various ideas expressed in current public discourse on issues of ‘Liberty’. Apart from Beckton Sewage Treatment Works, all sites offer specific historic narratives that contribute to the ‘Liberty’ theme. As Beckton makes a negligible contribution to the Tideway public realm legacy it is intended that modest public art proposals will meet interpretation requirements, by reference to either the generic ‘Liberty’ theme or to aspects of the east Cultural Meander, rather than any site specific aspect.

For all other riparian sites ‘Liberty’ can be examined from various perspectives particular to the location (see Appendix E Site Narratives). Together these cover issues of constitutional democracy, local governance, state security, charity and philanthropy, free trade, scientific and medical knowledge, the relationship between exploration, research and commerce, urban transport infrastructure, access to urban space, the availability of post-war social housing and provision of a 20th century state welfare system and urban adaption to climate change. They also refer to issues that affect individual and groups at a personal level, such as gender equality, sexuality, slavery, religious tolerance, ethics of animal exploitation and the interests of minority groups, especially immigrants.
4.3 West – Recreation to Industry: Society in Transition

4.3.1 From the 11th to 17th centuries established landholding families and institutions retained riverside estates close to the city. As well as providing a source of agricultural income, rural estates were expressions of vested authority and functioned as formalised pleasure grounds or recreational space. They provided a rural setting for social and political discourse close to, but beyond, the capital and its various ruling institutions.

4.3.2 Reflecting their proximity to London, Tideway locations at Hammersmith, Barn Elms, Putney and Chelsea provide contrasting heritage perspectives on evolving ideas of democracy, governance and the balance of power between Crown and State over the period of the 16th-19th centuries. These associations reveal nuanced understandings of ‘Liberty’, featuring the suppression of individuals or non-ruling groups and severe judicial punishment, which are less apparent in more widely circulated or authorized narratives.

4.3.3 By the late 18th century much of the west riverside was a designed and idealised pastoral riverscape, surrounded by extensive areas of market gardens, a situation that was on the cusp of major change:
a. Initial social changes are reflected in the adaption of private pleasure grounds at Barnes, Chelsea and Vauxhall to commercial public attractions or sports venues catering for the recreational interests of the growing urban middle class from the neighbouring city. The riverine character of the west section of the Thames lent itself to recreational and sporting uses. The first University Boat Race was held in 1829 and, other than when interrupted by war, the event has been held annually since 1856;

b. Horticulture skills of Huguenot immigrants had a significant impact on sustainable urban expansion at this time. Immigrant communities supported themselves by improving riverside land for the commercial production of fresh vegetable products, metabolising urban waste in the process, contributing a net benefit to the health and well-being of the wider urban population;

c. Modernity arrives with the transformational force of coal-powered steam technology in the 1840-60s. River access to the Port of London attracted substantial value and the historic riverside estates were sold as land values inflated. Traditional landowners took residence in the new fashionable squares in districts such as Mayfair and Belgravia, but communities associated with the city market gardens were displaced.

4.3.4 In a matter of decades industrialisation saw the emergence of urban manufacturing and chemical industries, with residential estates for factory workers in close proximity. Other than pockets of riverside around Chelsea, Fulham and Putney, the former urban arcadia was largely restricted to stretches of riverside, which still survive upstream of Brentford and Barnes, e.g. Syon House, Ham House, Kew Palace and Gardens, Richmond and Twickenham riverside, etc.

4.3.5 Large scale industrial transformation during the mid-19th century and early 20th century produced economic and social change that remade modern society.
along this western section of the Thames. This close juxtaposition of urban industry and residential estates had a bearing on social conditions. As economic development progressed, so too did processes of social improvement. This is reflected in site narratives at Carnwath Road Riverside and King George’s Park. These provide a local illustration of socially progressive national policies that followed the first and second World Wars: replacing Poor Law support and late 19th century paternalistic philanthropy with a state sponsored housing, welfare and health system, with concomitant changes in urban planning.

(c) John Gay/ English Heritage NMR/Mary Evans Picture Library

4.3.6 Economic, environmental and social challenges, latterly due to economic restructuring brought about by late 20th century global neo-liberalism, continue to influence the changing character of the western riverside.

4.4 WEST – Liberty Sites

Acton Storm Tanks

4.4.1 Contemporary with the construction of Acton Storm Tanks in 1905 many manufacturing enterprises based in central London expanded and relocated to the outskirts. The Napiers Motor Works adjoined the Storm Tanks site until closure shortly after the Second World War. The company was one of a number of vehicle manufactures, such as CAV and Lucas (automobile components) and Du Cros (cars), to establish factories at Acton, which was described in the 1920's as "Motor Town". In 1932 the motor industry employed 5,400 people, some 80% of the workers in the district. By 1956 The Times considered Acton to be one of the two largest concentrations of industry south of Birmingham.

4.4.2 Early in World War I, Napier was contracted to build aero engines from other companies' designs: initially a V12 Royal Aircraft Factory model and then
Sunbeam Arabs. Both proved to be unreliable so, in 1916, Napier decided to self-finance their own design, the 12-cylinder Napier Lion.

4.4.3 Recognising the value of publicity gained from racing, Napier designed engines to power cars, motor boats and later aeroplanes that had a considerable influence on technological advancement.

4.4.4 The Lion was used in the 1920s World Land Speed Record set by Malcolm Campbell's Napier-Campbell Blue Bird and Campbell-Napier-Railton Blue Bird and in Henry Segrave's Golden Arrow.

4.4.5 Campbell, dubbed ‘the speed king’, was at the forefront of efforts to test the limits of technology, as well as his own physical endurance, under extreme situations. He was the most prominent of the British drivers engaged in a constant rivalry with the United States during the inter-war period. In 1935, Sir Malcolm was the first to reach the 300 miles per hour mark in his celebrated Bluebird at Bonneville Flats, Utah. From here he chose to move to speedboat racing, and in 1939 set a new world record of 141 miles per hour. His son, Donald Campbell, carried on the family tradition by holding both land speed and water speed records.

4.4.6 This narrative offers opportunities to explore human endurance and creativity when tested to extreme.

**Hammersmith Pumping Station**

4.4.7 Hammersmith Pumping Station occupies part of the former riverside estate of Brandenburg House. Buried with the inscription 'Caroline of Brunswick, the injured Queen of England', George IV’s estranged wife died aged 53, at Brandenburg House on 7 August 1821, having recently returned to Britain after a period of exile in Europe. Despite being the Consort, she was physically refused entry to George IV’s Coronation ceremony when she appeared uninvited earlier that year on 29th of April. Following her death Brandenburg House was demolished in 1823, on the instruction of George IV.

4.4.8 This last stage in a Royal estrangement that defined all twenty six years of marriage, was played out very publicly in Caroline’s final years, and was widely reported in the Regency forerunners to the tabloid press. Caroline received popular support, as the public regarded her as having been mistreated by her highly unpopular husband and recognised the hypocrisy of a political establishment determined to discredit her. Her experiences highlight inequalities, even for the most privileged of women in 18th century London society, but also the role of a free press in bringing public opinion to bear on

---
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issues of the day, especially the role of the monarch and democratic representation.

4.4.9 Because of the subjugation of her role as Consort, Caroline was adopted as a political figurehead for the Reform Movement, which campaigned for restrictions on the authority of the monarch and a strengthening of an elected Parliament as the principle instrument of democratic government. The campaign culminated in Reform Acts passed between 1832 and 1928 that progressively delivered universal suffrage.

4.4.10 This narrative offers opportunities to explore how differing forms of authority affect social expectations of women in ways that might determine their personal status and achievement.

Barn Elms

4.4.11 Sir Francis Walsingham, a resident of Barn Elms Manor, whose former estate included the work site, provides a historic perspective on religious intolerance and its effect on the relationship between civil liberties, state security and the intelligence services.

4.4.12 Throughout Elizabeth I’s reign England faced external and internal threats centred on an internecine religious rivalry played out between the major Royal houses of Europe. Sir Francis Walsingham, who retired to Barn Elms Manor, had been responsible for providing intelligence essential to the security of the State and the personal protection of the Tudor monarch.

4.4.13 It was Walsingham’s spy system that discovered, among other matters, the Babington Plot of 1586 to murder Elizabeth and her ministers, to organize a general Roman Catholic rising in England and to liberate Mary Queen of Scots. It included, in its general purpose of destroying the government, a large number of English Roman Catholic families and was supported by Philip II of Spain.

4.4.14 Babington’s encrypted correspondence with Mary was intercepted and decoded by Walsingham’s spies. The co-conspirator Ballard was tortured to reveal evidence damning Mary. Mary was charged with plotting to kill Elizabeth, for which she was found guilty and executed. With the failure of the plot to assassinate Elizabeth, Phillip of Spain’s military support for a Catholic uprising never materialised.

4.4.15 This narrative offers opportunities to explore the responsibility of the State, and the role of its security services, to protect the right to life in a manner compatible with wider rights and freedoms, including the right to challenge authority and dominant ideologies.

6 Also refer to Appendix E BAREL Site Narrative.
Putney Embankment Foreshore

4.4.16 The Tideway work site adjoins St Mary’s Church, the venue of the Putney Debates held during the English Civil War that sought to advance a constitutional settlement incorporating basic human rights. Opposition and violent repression of radical political and constitutional ideas discussed at Putney impelled advocates, within the military and society beyond, to seek opportunities to advance ideals of representational government outside strict British hegemonic control. Ideas discussed at Putney followed advocates into exile and ultimately contributed to the emergence of independence and republican movements within the British American colonies.

4.4.17 For several weeks in late 1647, after the defeat of King Charles I in the first hostilities of the Civil War, representatives of the New Model Army and the constitutional Levellers met at Putney to debate the future of England. There was much to discuss: who should be allowed to vote, civil liberties and religious freedom.

4.4.18 Whilst it was important to reach a constitutional agreement with the King, the Debates were also held in the midst of growing unrest between Parliament

---
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and the New Model Army. In 1647 the Council of the Army, under Henry Ireton, put forward a draft document, the 'Heads of Proposals', based largely on old constitutional principles. A more radical manifesto, the 'Agreement of the People', came from extremists in the army, known as the Agitators, political allies of the Levellers, who sought:

a. Annual Parliaments;
b. Freedom of conscience;
c. Equality before the Law.

4.4.19 Even though the Leveller’s sharply differentiated themselves from the utopian programme advocated by “the diggers”, Ireton, Oliver Cromwell’s son-in-law, nevertheless claimed their “doctrine of natural rights would lead to communism”. In the absence of an agreement Cromwell terminated the debates at Putney, ordering the Agitators back to their regiments.

4.4.20 Whilst the debates were inconclusive, the ideas aired in Putney had a considerable influence on centuries of political thought. A quote from Colonel Rainsborough, the highest ranking officer to support the ordinary soldiers, sums up the principles and ideals that remain an inspiration: “I think that the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live, as the greatest he”.

4.4.21 Rainsborough’s funeral in 1648 became the occasion for a large Leveller demonstration, but without their chief supporter in the Army they were marginalized and their power depleted. Increasing repression of Levellers included the execution of Agitators who led local mutinies in London and Oxfordshire during 1649. As a consequence many Levellers, such as John Lilburn and Rainsborough’s brother, William, fled to America. In the colonies their ideas would gain popularity and later found expression in the American revolutionary war and the constitution of the newly formed United States of America.

4.4.22 This narrative offers opportunities to explore ways in which cultural context influences popular movements advocating social change, to generate varied forms of political engagement.

Dormay Street

4.4.23 The site is the location of the first factory developed by Sir Henry Wellcome, who founded both a pharmaceutical company and a philanthropic trust that have been at the forefront of global scientific research to free humanity from disease.

8 Also refer to Appendix E DRMST Site Narrative.
Henry Wellcome left America to start a pharmaceutical business in Britain with fellow American Silas Burroughs. Wellcome’s unyielding commitment to improving human health through research, his passion for culture and the arts, and support for philanthropy led to the creation of the Wellcome Trust in 1936.

Today, the Wellcome Trust is an independent global charitable foundation dedicated to improving health. It is a champion of science, funding research and influencing health policy across the globe, as well as contributing to debates on issues of ethics, education and policy.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore the interactions between global philanthropic interests, medical research and the availability of pharmaceutical therapies within the developed and developing world.

King George’s Park

The emergence of public social policies covering housing, welfare, health and well-being formed part of a 20th century modernist vision of urbanism. The history of the Park illustrates this significant shift in the responsibility for social wellbeing of the urban workforce and illustrates the post-First World War political commitment to resolving London’s housing challenge.

9 Also refer to Appendix E KNGGP Site Narrative.
Originally King George’s Park was a private ‘miniature park’ established by the Watney milling and brewing family, to which tenants of the mill estate would be allowed occasional access.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, Lloyd George’s Coalition Government passed the 1919 Housing Act, committing the state to building ‘homes for heroes’. This post-War effort to re-build society on equitable terms, and address the underlying need to supply good quality social housing, had a transformative effect on the character of London and the lives of its working poor.

Wandsworth Borough Council embarked on an ambitious programme of social housing, including the 1920s Watney Housing development. As part of the scheme the Watney’s family private park was re-modelled by Stephen Percival (Percy) Cane, a prominent London landscape and garden designer, as a public park for the new Council tenants. The park, which was built with the assistance of veteran labour, was named King George Park in honour of George V who opened the park in 1923.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore different models of housing provision and methods of urban planning, with reference to changing social and environmental expectations, including the provision of green spaces.

**Carnwath Road Riverside**

Wharves at Carnwath Road were originally developed for the late 19th/early 20th century Metropolitan Asylums Board (MAB) ambulance service, including a river facility used to transport infectious patients to isolation hospitals near Dartford. The Board can justly claim to have provided the nation's first state hospitals, and laid the foundations of what in 1948 became the National Health Service.

The MAB Mechanical Transport Department at Carnwath Road undertook a variety of work, including the building of ambulance bodies and the repair and maintenance of the fleet of vehicles. This eventually became part of the London Council ambulance service and a forerunner of today’s medical emergency service.

Between 1867 and 1930, MAB played a substantial and increasing role in the care of London's sick poor, alleviating the spread of ill health among the urban population. During that period, institutional medical care for the poor was transformed to include around forty general and specialist MAB establishments, many purpose-built, staffed by trained personnel. The institutions set up by the MAB came to be accessible by all the capital's inhabitants, not just the poor.

10 Also refer to Appendix E CARRR Site Narrative.
| 4.4.35 | This narrative offers opportunities to explore the origins of the UK post-War system of universal health care and its support of diverse urban communities, offering both health care and career prospects. |
4.5 Central – ‘Babylon’ to World City: Civic London

4.5.36 Benjamin Disraeli describes London as the ‘modern Babylon’ in his 1847 novel *Tancred, or The New Crusade*. This reflected contemporary perceptions of the metropolis as being riven by self-interest, inequality and decadence, but also a place attracting a myriad people, languages and cultures.

4.5.37 To a degree Disraeli’s characterization of the 19th century populace of London was a consequence of London’s adoption, from the late 17th century, of notions of free speech, freedom of conscious and a free press. These freedoms were measured by modern terms but by the mid-19th century London had assimilated a significant influx of religious refugees and political dissidents escaping persecution in neighbouring European states. London’s historic role as a destination of sanctuary persisted throughout the 17th-20th centuries, latterly extending beyond the European sphere to support refugees originating from Commonwealth countries and former colonial interests e.g. the expulsion of Ugandan Asians in 1972.

4.5.38 Nineteenth century London, as described by Disraeli, was evidently struggling to achieve a credible system of governance. Demand for labour to support growth in the new industrial economy was also a major driver in population movement that tested London’s urban capacity at a time when investment in infrastructure was piecemeal at best.

4.5.39 The consequential environmental deterioration of the Thames, resulting in the ‘Great Stink’ of 1858, proved to be the political catalyst that produced the first pan-London civic entity since the medieval Corporation of London. The Metropolitan Board of Works was empowered to represent and act on behalf of the citizens of London, a role that was to challenge the interests of both the Corporation and the Crown. This pivotal political development, embodied in Bazalgette’s Thames Embankments, set London on course towards an open and politically engaged plural society.

---
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The Metropolitan Board of Works principal *raison d’être* was the construction of a metropolitan sewer system, through invested powers as the pan-London component of a 2-tier metropolitan administration. Given construction of The Embankments involved a major shift toward localism in London’s regional governance, it is informative that the architecture projects such a strong sense of 19th century state hegemony.

4.5.40
The Metropolitan Board of Works (MBW) perhaps most closely fits a ‘Development Corporation’ governance model, rather than a truly representational form of local government. But it remains a model of state-led investment in public institutions and infrastructure; with supporting democratic processes governing urban planning.

In due course the evident need for greater democratic accountability directly led to the elected London County Council. Whilst the MBW was constituted in such a way that its longevity was inevitably limited, it transformed London’s built environment. The MBW had a major influence on London’s status as a World City, contributing a historic and architectural legacy that contrasts with the variable market-driven urban design outcomes that characterise London’s current urban planning practices.

This Victorian approach to what is now termed ‘nationally significant infrastructure’ also provides an informative historic perspective on changes in the governance, procurement and investment in urban infrastructure, as illustrated by the Tideway project itself. The Victorian MBW scheme, a response to an environmental crisis caused by over-exploitation of natural resources, was promoted solely by the UK national government and was funded from a tax on fossil fuel (i.e. coal levy).

In contrast the Tideway scheme illustrates how national government now plans and responds to recognised national and trans-national environmental interests, through novel and unique legislative and regulatory framework models that, by removing risks to investors, enable the private sector to develop nationally significant infrastructure.
4.6 CENTRAL – Liberty Sites

Falconbrook Pumping Station\textsuperscript{12}

4.6.1 The Tideway pumping stations constitute an important architectural group charting industrial design by municipal authorities through the late 19th and first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Falconbrook illustrates how changing concepts of industrial design affects the urban built environment, influencing the public social sphere and the quality of life for local people.

4.6.2 The current Falconbrook Pumping Station, a modernist industrial design of the early 1960s, is the latest of three pumping stations to be built at the site:

a. The first pumping station was built near the corner of York and Creek Roads by the MBW in 1878–9;

b. A larger scale replacement pumping station built in 1905–7 was designed by the LCC’s Engineer’s Department and built by its Works Department;

c. The current Falconbrook Pumping Station, sited slightly north-east of its predecessor, was designed by the London County Council’s architects and engineers, built by A. Waddington & Son, with equipment supplied by Vickers Armstrong.

\textsuperscript{12} Also refer to Appendix E FALPS Site Narrative.
Subsequently the local authority has attempted to integrate the industrial function of the 1961–3 pumping station with community facilities, including York Gardens, created in 1972 as part of a social housing project, and the York Gardens Library and Community Centre, opened in 1982 to a Wandsworth Borough Council’s Director of Development design.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore, with reference to new and mid-20th century drainage infrastructure, how urban design practice can deliver exemplar public realm in an urban industrial setting, to provide benefits to local communities.

**Kirtling Street Pumping Station and Heathwall Pumping Station**

Both sites are located within the extensive area of lowlying land that was improved as a result of the endeavours of 17th century Huguenot immigrant market gardeners, who settled in London to escape religious persecution following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. The arrival in London of Flemish Protestants and French Huguenot refugees from the mid-17th century contributed to the social and economic development of host communities. Semi-rural villages surrounding London, such as Wandsworth and Battersea, were preferred settlement locations, as food and housing were cheaper and trade less exposed to City of London guild control.

The Huguenot’s founded various charitable and education institutions that gave the immigrant community a degree of self-reliance within the new host country. One of their notable achievements was in the field of horticulture, advancing scientific approaches through the development of intensive market gardens and osier beds at places like Nine Elms and Battersea, which were a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city.

The market gardens had a significant impact on sustainable urban expansion. Riverside garden locations were preferred in order to bulk ship urban organic waste and effluent used as a fertiliser and to create hotbeds, which extended both the range of vegetable grown and the length of the season. Not only were immigrant communities able to sustain themselves economically. By improving
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14 1598. King Henri IV. Edict of Nantes - The immediate aim was to obtain peace after decades of internal conflict, but its declared long term objective was to procure religious harmony throughout the kingdom. The edict established civil equality between Catholics and Protestants as well as the conditions necessary for the peaceful coexistence of the two; however, the edict set limits to protestant worship.
riverside land, providing fresh vegetable products for commercial sale and by
metabolised urban waste, they had a beneficial effect on the health and well-
being of the wider urban population. Their investment in land improvement
also had ramifications for London’s subsequent expansion of its industrial
base.

4.6.9 This narrative examines the social integration of immigrant communities, and
their contribution to the wider urban community, through culturally specific
institutions concerned with education, employment and welfare;

4.6.10 This narrative also offers opportunities to explore how urban communities
have traditionally accessed horticultural resources and the potential role of
horticulture within models of sustainable urbanism.

Cremorne Wharf Depot\[^{15}\]

4.6.11 Formerly part of the grounds of Viscount Cremorne's 18th century Ashburnham
House, the site illustrates how tenurial rights influence free access to River
amenity. During its later history the former private Ashburnham House estate
was made available to the general population as commercialised recreational
amenity. Notably, colonial trade connections within the City played an
important role in commodifying the recreational and social aspirations of 19th
century London’s growing urban middle class.

4.6.12 On the death of the 1st Viscount in 1813 the estate passed to his widow, Lady
Cremorne (née Philadelphia Hannah Freame) the grand-daughter of William
Penn, founder of Pennsylvania. In 1845 the site was acquired by Thomas
Bartlett Simpson, owner of the North & South American Coffee House in
Threadneedle Street.

4.6.13 Simpson sublet to James Ellis, a confectioner, who re-opened the house and
grounds as Cremorne Gardens. Laid out as typical London pleasure gardens
of the era, a range of entertainments and attractions were offered, including
concerts, restaurants, fireworks, balloon ascents, dancing and walks in the
landscaped grounds. Simpson later took over the management himself and
within a few years Cremorne Gardens was established as a popular feature of
London’s summer season and a mecca for Londoners of all classes, alongside
similar pleasure gardens at Vauxhall and Ranelagh. Cremorne Gardens could
be easily reached by steamer from the City to Cremorne Pier, adding to its
appeal to people looking for reasonably priced leisure.

4.6.14 Closure of the gardens in 1877 ended a brief period of public access, as
industrial and commercial real estate established a persistent dominance on

\[^{15}\] Also refer to Appendix E CREWD Site Narrative.
the Thames, other than where public amenity was secured and subsequently protected along The Thames Embankments.

4.6.15 This narrative offers opportunities to explore how new fashions in amenity and recreation broke down social constraints and realised communal value in the River, i.e. as an early illustration of how people can be connected with the Thames.

The Thames Embankments

4.6.16 The Thames Embankments are the great civic legacy of the Metropolitan Board of Works’ (MBW) ambition to beautify the river for the benefit of London’s citizens. However it was immediately embroiled in challenges to the public interest, issued on behalf of the Crown, which it successfully countered.

John Thwaites, the chair of the Metropolitan Board of Works, made note that the Thames Embankments were an important step in making London recognised as an exemplary imperial city, and that The Embankments were the greatest public work to be taken in London. They were intended to reflect a Victorian view of modernity at a time of sweeping social, economic, political and administrative change.

4.6.17 Imperial power was symbolised by The Embankments' grandeur and in the way they controlled nature, i.e. the tidal river. The new monumental Thames frontage physically linked the two opposing areas of historic authority i.e. the cities of London and Westminster. It contributed to the architectural setting of various buildings central to state and national identity, including the Palace of Westminster, Lambeth Palace and the Royal Hospital at Chelsea. The new St
Thomas’ Hospital buildings, constructed on land reclaimed during construction of Albert Embankment, included a nurse and midwife training school funded by public subscription raised in recognition of Florence Nightingale’s service in Crimea.

4.6.19 The Embankments opened the River to London’s citizens. The 52 acres of reclaimed riverside provided public parks, tree lined highways and a pedestrian promenade surfaced with York paving stone and decorative gaslight posts. New steamboat piers and landing stairs were designed for river access. The Embankments were more than simply a structure to contain the main sewer and other buried utilities. They more widely embraced the need to improve health and the social conditions of the expanding urban populations by creating a new urban park that connected Londoner’s to the amenity of the River. Similar motives lay behind contemporary major urban parks created in other emerging metropolitan global cities, such as New York’s Central Park, created by Fredrick Law Olmsted in 1865 and the program of new boulevards, parks and public works in Paris, during Georges-Eugène Haussmann's renovation of Paris through the 1850-70s;

4.6.20 As well as constructing The Embankments and the main drainage system, the MBW instigated a wide range of urban infrastructure modernisations that improved the operation of the River and London more widely. This was concurrent with social and economic transformations associated with industrialisation, and helped prepare the metropolis for the onset of modernity. Improvements in transport infrastructure included the creation of new thoroughfares and an underground line that reduced traffic congestion. Also privately-operated bridges spanning the Thames eventually came within MBW jurisdiction, allowing the removal of tolls, a programme for re-building (Putney Bridge, Battersea Bridge, Waterloo Bridge and Hammersmith Bridge) and works to strengthen others.

4.6.21 Each of the four separate Embankment worksites provide a specific narrative that allows consideration of different aspects of the MBW’s cultural legacy:

- Chelsea and Albert Embankments serve as a formal architectural embellishment to the riverside dominated by major architectural expressions of civic pride in the provision of care to the vulnerable and infirm, at the Royal Hospital and at St Thomas’ Hospital;
- Victoria Embankment faced challenges during planning and construction that reveal the significance of the Metropolitan Board of Works as an early form of regional governance that pioneered large scale urban regeneration;
- Blackfriars faced equally challenging circumstances, but these concerned construction engineering innovations required to negotiate London’s historic topography in order to solve the problem arising from the pollution of its natural tributaries.
Chelsea Embankment Foreshore\textsuperscript{16}

4.6.22 This site forms the river frontage to the Royal Hospital, which for over 300 years has been responsible for the care of former military veterans who fought on behalf of the State and the nation. Whilst ‘Liberty’ is often been cited as moral justification for the use of armed force, this can be contested and contributes to perceptions of ‘Liberty’ that continue to be challenged in political discourse, as is evident following recent western military interventions in the Middle East. However, the Hospital continues to perform its historic function of ensuring former veterans are themselves free from poverty and maintain independent lives throughout retirement.

\begin{center}
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Progress of the Thames Embankment at Chelsea 1873 (c) Museum of London

4.6.23 Until the 17\textsuperscript{th} century the state made no specific provision for old and injured soldiers. Care for the poor and sick was provided by religious charitable foundations (see \textsuperscript{6.6.82 Bekesbourne Street}). In 1681, responding to the need to look after these soldiers, King Charles II issued a Royal Warrant authorising the building of the Royal Hospital Chelsea to care for those ‘broken by age or

\textsuperscript{16} Also refer to Appendix E CHEEF Site Narrative.
war. The provision of a hostel rather than the payment of pensions was inspired by Les Invalides in Paris, where Charles had spent time in exile during the Protectorate. Sir Christopher Wren was commissioned to design and erect the building and Sir Stephen Fox was commissioned to secure the funds necessary to progress the build. It now provides both a retirement and nursing home for some 300 former British soldiers of the British Army, admitting female veterans in 2009.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore the obligations of the nation and the government to the armed forces, and the role of the Hospital, which, for the last 300 years, has been a particularly visible and ceremonial demonstration of the armed forces covenant.

Albert Embankment Foreshore

At Albert Embankment the MBW waived its insistence that land reclaimed during construction of The Embankments should solely be for the recreational benefit of Londoners. Instead, it secured an alternative public benefit by providing a new location for St Thomas’ Hospital. Apart from administering to the urban poor, the Hospital played a significant role in establishing nursing as a profession. In so doing, traditional attitudes toward female career roles were challenged and beneficial perinatal and maternity outcomes further improved the lives of women.

At nearly a mile long the Albert Embankment recovered part of the construction cost by selling 8.5 acres of reclaimed land to St Thomas’ Hospital. Originally a medieval monastic charitable foundation, St Thomas’ left its historic Southwark site in 1862, when it was compulsorily purchased to make way for the construction of the Charing Cross Railway viaduct from London Bridge Station. The new hospital buildings on the present site near Lambeth Palace were completed in 1871.

It was at St Thomas’ that Florence Nightingale founded the first professional school of nursing. The school was funded by subscription raised in recognition of Nightingale’s service in Crimea. One of the first institutions to teach nursing and midwifery as a formal profession, the training school was dedicated to communicating the philosophy and practice of its founder and patron, including Nightingale’s strongly argued position on the removal of restrictions on women from having careers. The improvement in nursing care had a transformative effect on patient outcomes.

The Hospital itself is of major architectural interest, as the grandest and most lavish of the English pavilion-plan hospitals. A bold and ambitious architectural
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set-piece, in the manner of a series of Venetian palazzi, the Hospital exploits to the full its riverside setting opposite Westminster Palace.

**4.6.29** It is of outstanding historic interest in the continuity of London's oldest hospital foundation, as an early and influential British pavilion-plan hospital built at an important watershed in C19 healthcare reform, and as the premises of Florence Nightingale's seminal nursing school.

**4.6.30** This narrative offers opportunities to examine trends in welfare and social reforms with reference to opportunities for women in the workplace.

**Victoria Embankment Foreshore**

**4.6.31** The MBW represents the first significant attempt at localism in the governance of the Capital, establishing a regional authority for 'inner' London in 1855. The MBW's effectiveness in giving voice to the civic interests of Londoners was tested early by powerful and long-established vested interests. This was illustrated by the outcome of disputes with the Crown that spanned a decade during the construction of the Victoria Embankment.

**4.6.32** The MBW's jurisdiction over the riverside was initially challenged by the Crown in 1862, who claimed there would be a loss of amenity to the river frontage adjoining its properties along The Strand that run down to the riverside, e.g. Somerset House. This claim was not sustained, but in 1870 the Crown again sought to assert rights to develop part of the reclaimed land following construction of the Embankment, which had been achieved entirely at taxpayer expense. This claim was eventually resolved in 1872 following a strong public response expressed through Parliament and press media campaigns, which supported the MBW insistence that the Embankment should be protected for the recreational benefit of Londoners.

**4.6.33** The Victoria Embankment is a physical link imposed by the Metropolitan Board of Works connecting districts subject to different historic authorities i.e. the cities of London and Westminster. The Embankment survives as a legacy of civic aspirations that prioritised public interests along the River. Blackfriars Road Bridge, itself a civic legacy of the historic Bridge House Estate charity, is the point where Bazalgette's Victoria Embankment ends and the City River frontage begins. Downstream of the bridge the River frontage takes on a different quality, one that is more changeable, reflecting the vitality of commerce and the market driven ambitions of the City of London and its historic commercial institutions, such as the guilds, livery companies and charities.

---
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This narrative offers opportunities to explore how evolving democratic institutions responsible for London’s governance have influenced the experiences of diverse urban communities.

**Blackfriars Embankment Foreshore**

Engineering and design innovation played a major role in transforming London’s urban sanitation system and protecting the health of Londoners. In particular it has been spectacularly successful in curbing infectious epidemics such as cholera, which in the mid-19th century was responsible for the death of 40,000 Londoners.

Blackfriars is located at the mouth of the River Fleet, a tributary that had a notorious reputation for its impact on public health. As one of the more significant of London’s ‘lost rivers’, the Fleet had been used as a sewer since the late medieval period, becoming progressively culverted. In the 17th century Sir Christopher Wren attempted a failed scheme to improve the lower Fleet, creating a canal modelled on Venice’s Grand Canal, broadening its Thames’ mouth and constructing four new decorative bridges, at Bridewell, Fleet Street, Fleet Lane, and Holborn. This did little to alleviate the sanitation problem and eventually the Fleet became choked with mud and was no longer navigable. Pollution remained a significant public health problem to the Victorian population.

Located at the eastern end of Victoria Embankment, Blackfriars is the point where Bazalgette’s Northern Low Level sewer intercepts the River Fleet, which rose from springs on Hampstead Heath. Significant engineering challenges were overcome to successfully intercept the flow of the Fleet.

Bazalgette’s sewer design explored the engineering possibilities of various geometric forms. His use of an elliptical arch tunnel profile was a widely copied innovation that optimised flow, achieved self-cleaning and provided load bearing structural support that prevented settlement of the overlying city. Similarly engineering design and fluid modelling have played a significant part in the Tideway tunnel, notably the vortex drop shafts that connect the CSOs to the Tunnel.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore how form and function can be understood through science, technology, engineering and mathematics; to bring about planned topographic transformations and the creation of infrastructure, that contributes to the management and experience of London’s urban environment.

---

19 Also refer to Appendix E BLABF *Site Narrative*. 
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[Heritage Interpretation Strategy 51]

[Document Ref [Subject property] Uncontrolled when printed]
Shad Thames Pumping Station

Shad Thames illustrates how transitioning economic situations might generate social and economic opportunities, widening access to urban space and providing a catalyst to entrepreneurial and creative activities.

Formerly part of the land held by the Cluniac Abbey of Bermondsey, which had been reclaimed by the construction of extensive medieval flood defence systems. The estate was surrendered to Henry VIII in 1537 and subsequently sold to raise revenue for the Crown. The availability of new land assets proved to be a catalyst for investment and commercial development of the Bermondsey riverside in the late 17th century. New riverside wharves and warehouses were constructed and intertidal areas reclaimed, transforming the relatively under-utilized riverside pasture fringing the historic city, generating economic value that sustained expanding local urban communities over the subsequent three centuries.

By the middle of the 20th century the commercial riverside was in decline and the extensive riverside warehouses developed during the 19th century became redundant. A creative community of independent artists established studios at various semi-derelict Southwark waterfront warehouses in the 1970s, in particular at Butler’s Wharf, which adjoins the Shad Thames Pumping Station.

Derek Jarman, film director, stage designer, diarist, artist, gardener, author, queer activist, AIDS campaigner and provocateur was a prominent member of this Thames artistic community. He possessed a deep creative connection with the River. Using Super 8 film he documented the avant-garde warehouse art scene (Studio Bankside (1971)) and the 1976 Valentine’s Day Ball performance of the Sex Pistols in his Butler’s Wharf studio. The post-industrial riverside featured as a location for many scenes in his 1977 apocalyptic cult feature film ‘Jubilee’ in which the occultist John Dee transports Queen Elizabeth I forward in time to the shattered Britain of the 1970s, a film highlighting post-Punk social change.

Jarman’s political and creative activities challenged prejudicial attitudes affecting the queer community and AIDS sufferers, with significant and lasting effect.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore the influence of urban transitions on prevailing attitudes to individuality, equality, opportunity and changing perceptions of lifestyle norms.

20 Also refer to Appendix E SHTPS Site Narrative.
4.7 East – The ‘Shipping Parishes’: Gateway to the World\textsuperscript{21}

4.7.1 A pattern of medieval estuarine settlements and extensive surrounding areas of reclaimed medieval grazing marsh (principally systems for the water management of estuarine wetlands surrounding the urban core), were transformed throughout the 16\textsuperscript{th}, 17\textsuperscript{th}, 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries, to be replaced by a dock economy that was to have a fundamental influence on the physical, economic, ethnic and social structure of the area.

4.7.2 This period of transformation has significant ‘Liberty’ implications, especially with regards to the management of environmental resources, but most significantly it relied on the restriction and exploitation of human capital.

4.7.3 London’s international maritime trading presence originated in the early medieval period. Bede writing in the 730s referred to Saxon London as “a mart of many nations”. The maritime character of the Thames became increasingly dominant following Henry VIII’s appropriation and disposal of monastic riverside estates and the founding of Royal naval facilities at Deptford, Woolwich, Erith and Chatham. Soon after, commercial maritime trade is inextricably linked to the concept of ‘British Empire’. Initiated under Elizabeth I this doctrine of aggressive global expansion of sovereignty, accompanied by colonisation and enslavement, was pursued over the subsequent three centuries.

4.7.4 This had important consequences for the 16\textsuperscript{th}, 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} century communities downstream of the City of London, at places such as Wapping, Ratcliff, Poplar, Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptford and Greenwich. Within these rapidly expanding maritime communities there resided traditional notions of ‘Liberty’ based on customary laws of the sea, codified at various times between the 12\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries (e.g. the \textit{Rôles d’Oléron} and the \textit{Wisby Sea Law}). These private laws, pertaining to intra-territory sea trade and governing relations within the international seafaring community, include relatively progressive concepts of social democracy, which are largely absent from wider contemporary society until the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century. Consequently, values of independence and cultural co-existence were familiar within these communities.

\textsuperscript{21} Also refer to Appendix D East Cultural Meander.
In stark contrast, the trade in commodities from the 16th century, such as tobacco, sugar and coffee, positioned London’s port communities at the apex of a triangular trade structure, involving subjugation of indigenous people, appropriation of lands and property, mass forced slavery of Africans and transportation. Other forms of imperial trade linked to London, such as the British East India Company’s forced import of opium to China resulting in the Opium Wars of 1840s & 1860s, also stand alongside slavery as examples of colonial exploitation.

Behind the growth of London as a centre of finance and commerce from the 1700s onwards lay one of the great crimes of humanity. Thus any objective examination of issues of ‘Liberty’ in relation to the Thames requires an open acknowledgement that the River formed a key element of the maritime infrastructure of a political and economic system that oppressed and abused human capital on a massive scale, to serve imperial ambitions, the interests of the state and, to varying and unequal degrees, the wealth and commercial interests of its citizens.

This extremely conflicted moral duality, of nascent forms of local social democracy juxtaposed with extreme and violent racial exploitation, resonates globally and continues to be a factor that influences perspectives on London’s heritage. Although the fourth largest slave trading post, London’s association with African slavery is not an openly explicit feature of the historic environment, even less so the indentured servitude of south east Asian people involved in 17th century and later merchant shipping. But their imprint is not entirely invisible and can be detected through a legacy of buildings and archaeological remains across London. Apart from the 19th century docks, surviving riverside evidence includes the remnants of former sugar, coffee and tobacco industries and trading institutions; associated secondary industries, including sugar-reliant food processing; and a range of local supply craft industries. In addition the substantial flow of capital associated with the triangulation trade ultimately accounted for the wealth of institutions and
individuals that had, and to a degree continue, to have a significant effect on London’s historic built environment.

From the 17th century the rapidly changing Thames express Britain’s expanding colonial interests, as illustrated by the construction of shipyards by the East India Company and others. Thames-side wharves and warehouses, served by a maze of narrow streets, lined with tightly packed rows of workers’ houses, were interspersed with larger and grander houses for merchants and dock officials.

Increasing demand for port capacity throughout the 19th century was met by the construction of enclosed docks on either side of the Thames. These included West India Docks (1802), East India Docks (1803, originating from the Brunswick Dock of 1790), London Docks (1799-1815), Surrey Commercial Docks (1807, originating from the Howland Great Wet Dock of 1696), St Katharine Docks (1828), Royal Victoria Dock (1855), Millwall Dock (1868), Royal Albert Dock (1880), and Tilbury Docks (1886).

By the early 19th century the Port of London dock economy was the hub of the British Empire, supported by diaspora drawn from across the British Isles and the Empire. This has had a fundamental influence on the physical, ethnic, cultural and socio-economic character of the area. Historic factors related to colonial exploitation of south east Asia by London’s trading companies, most notably the East India Company, underlie issues of identity, cultural
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acceptance and belonging that are still largely overlooked in common perceptions of the origins of East London’s Bengali population.

4.7.11 The physical consequences of dock development including the construction of massive warehouses, known as ‘London’s Larder’, which Joseph Conrad alludes to in an evocative description in his autobiographical *The Mirror of the Sea* (1906):

> Wharves, landing places, dock-gates, waterside stairs, follow each other continuously right up to London Bridge, and the hum of men’s work fills the river with a menacing, muttering note as of a breathless, ever-driving gale. The waterway, so fair above and wide below, flows oppressed by bricks and mortar and stone, by blackened timber and grimed glass and rusty iron, covered with black barges, whipped up by paddles and screws, overburdened with craft, overhung with chains, overshadowed by walls making a steep gorge for its bed, filled with the haze of smoke and dust.

Whilst the Second World War saw a period of intense use, by the 1960s the inability of these parts of the Port of London to compete with the expanding container ports downstream rapidly became evident leading to the erosion of social and economic traditions by the 1970s. Industrial decline had a significant effect on traditional social norms due to the loss of economic opportunity. However, it also created short-term situations that encouraged new and creative communities and groups.
4.8    EAST – Liberty Sites

Chambers Wharf

4.8.1 Chamber’s Wharf is located on the north margin of the Bermondsey eyot, to the east of the mouth of the Neckinger. The original flood defence, initiated by the medieval Abbey of St Saviour Bermondsey, crosses the site, along the line of Bermondsey Wall Road.

4.8.2 Following dissolution, the Abbey estate was acquired c.1541 by Sir Thomas Pope, founder of Trinity College Oxford and a close associate of both Thomas More and Thomas Cromwell. Pope’s personal wealth benefited from his position as treasurer of the institution set up to manage the monastic property annexed by the Crown.

4.8.3 Commercial development of the Bermondsey riverside intensified as the Port of London rapidly expanded. Throughout the 17th and 18th century Bermondsey’s economy was closely connected with Britain’s expanding mercantile and colonial interests.

4.8.4 Manufactured goods shipped from London were exchanged for West African slaves, who, transported across the Atlantic, worked in colonial plantations. Commodities, such as sugar, were shipped back to Britain for processing and trading.

4.8.5 Seventeenth century and later sugarhouses in Bermondsey and Southwark refined imported cane sugar into various consumer products. Refining relied on a local supply chain of equipment/materials and an extensive consumer market. Tideway’s archaeological site investigation revealed successive phases of 17th century timber wharf revetments and industrial waste, including ceramic sugar cone moulds, part of the sugar industry supply chain.

4.8.6 Improved manufacturing processes greatly increased the capacity of London’s 19th century sugar refineries, supporting the local development of large scale food processors serving domestic and export markets. The Peek Freans Biscuit Factory was originally established at nearby Mill Lane, before relocating to a site south of Jamaica Road. The surrounding area of Bermondsey was known as ‘Biscuit Town’, a colloquialism reflecting a connection with generations of local families.

4.8.7 To meet the needs of the expanding industrial and commercial base, new riverside wharves and warehouses were built on reclaimed intertidal land,

23 Also refer to Appendix E CHAWF Site Narrative.
culminating at Chambers Wharf with the creation of the early 20th century concrete deck.

4.8.8 This narrative offers opportunities to explore the cultural context that determines patterns of commodification and exploitation in human capital.

**Earl Pumping Station**

4.8.9 Earl Pumping Station is located close to Greenland Dock, formerly known as the Howland Great Wet Dock. It is one of the earliest enclosed docks within the historic Port of London. Built 1695-99 and later renamed Greenland Dock, it was expanded at the beginning of the 20th century. Originally used to refit East India Company merchant ships, from the early 18th century the dock was the berth and processing plant for the London's Arctic whaling fleet, which operated off the Atlantic coast of Norway and Greenland.

4.8.10 Whaling was an important economic activity between the 16th-19th centuries. Initially operating under a charter of Elizabeth I, the Port of London whaling fleet played a leading role in the commercial exploitation in cetacean resources. It became commercially unviable in the early 19th century due to overexploitation and a decline in the market for whale oil following the development of chemical and petro-chemical alternatives.

4.8.11 This narrative offers opportunities to explore the ecological and cultural impact of industrial exploitation of marine fauna.

**King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore**

4.8.12 The site has close historical links with mercantile and dock communities that, for a period of 400 years, have been associated with the contrasting impact of former British maritime power and trading empire on different ethnic, social and economic groups, both locally and internationally. The Park serves a community forged from intersecting diaspora, which has a radical tradition of philanthropy and for challenging political extremism and racism.

4.8.13 The Park adjoins the historic mercantile settlements at Ratcliffe and Shadwell involved in 16th century and later global exploration. The role of 16th century ‘merchant adventurers’ had positive consequences in terms of knowledge and developments in science and navigation, but also advanced less positive
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25 Also refer to Appendix E KEMPF Site Narrative.
‘Liberty’ outcomes by initiating colonization\textsuperscript{26} and, by consequence, the triangular slave trade (see Chambers Wharf above).

4.8.14 Throughout the 17\textsuperscript{th}, 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries the area accommodated an expansion of docks by the East India Company, the West India Company and other mercantile trading interests, creating an entry hub drawing migrant people and expatriate seamen into the area.

4.8.15 The East India Company had a particularly vital role in the establishment of the Bengal and Chinese diaspora resident in London and UK. The Company held a virtual monopoly over Indian trade and the majority of Indians and Chinese arriving in Britain in the early 18\textsuperscript{th} century were in indentured service to the Company. Most worked on ships, but house-servants, working for families returning from India (where they had worked for the Company), added to their number.

4.8.16 Sailors, whether passing through or stranded, tended to rely on riverside lodging places. From 1795, hostels and seamen’s homes catering for Bengali merchant seamen were set up in Shoreditch, Shadwell and Wapping. Separate Chinese groups established a presence in Limehouse. Initially intended as temporary bases rather than the start of a permanent community, by 1856 various Christian missionary societies set up foundations, such as ‘The Strangers Home for Seaman from Asia, Africa and South Sea Islands’, which sought to implement legislative provisions for repatriation. The arrival of 19\textsuperscript{th} century Jewish and Irish populations added to the intersecting and sometimes conflicted diaspora groups, to create a continuous riverside mercantile settlement extending from Wapping to Blackwall.

4.8.17 Charles Dickens’ ‘The Uncommercial Traveller’ (1860) describes the 19\textsuperscript{th} century qualities of this maritime community, around the time it suffered 4,000 deaths in the 1866 cholera epidemic:

\begin{quote}
The borders of Ratcliff and Stepney, eastward of London, and giving on the impure river, were the scene of this uncompromising dance of death, upon a drizzling November day. A squalid maze of streets, courts, and alleys of miserable houses let out in single rooms. A wilderness of dirt, rags, and hunger. A mud-desert, chiefly inhabited by a tribe from whom employment has departed, or to whom it comes but fitfully and rarely. They are not skilled mechanics in any wise. They are but labourers,–dock-labourers, water-side
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{26} Coincidentally, the adjoining St Paul’s Church has a close genealogical association with Thomas Jefferson, a principal author of the 1776 American Declaration of Independence, which rejected 18\textsuperscript{th} century British colonial government and brought to an end the ‘First’ British Empire based on permanent settlements in the Americas. Jefferson’s great grandfather had settled in Virginia, the first English colony in the world. Jefferson’s maternal grandfather, Isham Randolph, a ship’s captain and agent for the Virginia Colony tobacco trade, was married at St Paul’s. His daughter, Jane Randolph, Jefferson’s mother, was born in Shadwell and christened at St Paul’s in 1718.
In response to this epidemic, Dr Nathaniel Heckford and his wife Sarah established, in 1868, the UK’s first hospital for infants in a sailmaker’s loft, which Dicken’s describes:

*I found the children’s hospital established in an old sail-loft or storehouse, of the roughest nature, and on the simplest means. There were trap-doors in the floors, where goods had been hoisted up and down; heavy feet and heavy weights had started every knot in the well-trodden planking: inconvenient bulks and beams and awkward staircases perplexed my passage through the wards. But I found it airy, sweet, and clean. In its seven and thirty beds I saw but little beauty; for starvation in the second or third generation takes a pinched look: but I saw the sufferings both of infancy and childhood tenderly assuaged; I heard the little patients answering to pet playful names, the light touch of a delicate lady laid bare the wasted sticks of arms for me to pity; and the claw-like little hands, as she did so, twined themselves lovingly around her wedding-ring.*

The creation of the Park in 1922 required clearance of many of Shadwell’s streets, many dating to the 17th century. By this time the Children’s hospital had relocated to Shadwell. There remained, however, a culturally diverse population whose response to racist discrimination gained an increasingly radical and socially progressive outlook.

The Battle of Cable Street took place nearby on Sunday 4 October 1936. It was a clash between the Metropolitan Police, overseeing a march by members of the British Union of Fascists, led by Oswald Mosley. Various anti-fascist demonstrators, including local Jewish, socialist, anarchist and communist groups, organised counter-protesters to block Oswald’s Fascists, successfully blocking their progress into the community.

From at least the 1930s local people of Bengali heritage have contributed to this legacy of confronting race-based political exponents. In more recent times they have led, organised and participated in demonstrations against racist extremism and related violence during the 1990s, i.e. the racist attack on student Quddus Ali, on 8 September 1993, and the election of the BNP councillor Derek Beackon in Millwall Ward on 16 September 1993.

This narrative offers opportunities to examine a historic maritime community prone to poverty and disadvantage, and how the experience of London’s diaspora communities has contributed to metropolitan race relationships.
Bekesbourne Street

Located at the western end of Ratcliff where it meets Lower Shadwell, Bekesbourne Street forms the eastern boundary to the property of the Royal Foundation of St Katherine.

Founded in 1147 by Queen Matilda, the wife of King Stephen, the Foundation has benefited from the Royal patronage of the female monarch for over 850 years, administering religious and charitable services to the poor of East London. The role of the Queen had particular resonance during the Second World War when the dockyard communities of East London suffered sustained bombing raids during the Blitz.

The duties of the Foundation lay in celebrating Mass and in serving the poor infirm in the medieval Hospital. At the beginning of the 18th century the Foundation also provided charity schools for both boys and girls.

Having survived both the 16th century Reformation and the 17th century puritan Protectorate, the Church and Hospital was demolished in 1825 to make way for an extension to St Katherine’s Dock, which was opened in 1828. With the death of Queen Caroline, George IV’s estranged wife, the Foundation was without a Queen Patron at this crucial time.

The Foundation’s move to a new site in Regents Park coincided with a rapid deterioration in living conditions across the East End, which suffered a cholera epidemic in 1866. Whilst several attempts were made by the local clergy to obtain the benefit of St. Katharine’s endowments, the Foundation in Regents Park remained “a kind of aristocratic Almshouse”.

It was not until 1914 that St. Katharine’s funds were put to more appropriate use. The Foundation’s two functions, of worship and charitable works, were separated and funds transferred to the Royal College of St. Katharine, set up by Queen Alexandra, the widow of Edward VII, to undertake welfare work in Poplar. After the Second World War the future of the Foundation was once more reconsidered. Under the patronage of Queen Mary, the widow of George V, it was reconstituted in 1948 as the Royal Foundation of St. Katharine. On returning to its traditional home area, its two functions of worship and service to the community were re-united.

The new Foundation moved to the blitzed site of St James Ratcliff. The surviving Vicarage became the Master’s House. In 1952 a new Royal Chapel was built in a plain modern style, incorporating carved wooden stalls and Jacobean pulpit from the previous Foundation church. New accommodation was also built for conferences and retreats, forming a villa shaped complex. In 2002 renovation and extension of the retreat and conference facilities was
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undertaken and the Chapel re-ordered in memory of Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother, for 49 years Patron and friend of the Foundation.

4.8.30 The Chapel of 1951, a simple brick-faced portal frame monument to post-war austerity, is important in the history of English architecture, housing, as it does, exceptional fittings preserved from earlier sites, alongside more radical furnishings of its time. Eight hundred and fifty years after its foundation St Katherine’s now provides conference and accommodation facilities more suited to contemporary ecclesiastical needs and continues to minister to the changing facets of life in East London and beyond.

4.8.31 This narrative offers opportunities to explore the role of religious and charitable institutions in the provision of education and social welfare services.

Deptford Church Street

4.8.32 Deptford High Street has an association with Mary Lacy, whose 18th century memoirs describe her life as a mariner and naval shipwright whilst disguised as a man under the adopted name William Chandler.

4.8.33 After securing a Navy pension Mary settled in Deptford and began a new career as a housing developer. The buildings at 104-108 and 116-118

28 Also refer to Appendix E DEPCS Site Narrative.
Deptford High Street (known locally as ‘Slade’s Place’) are typical of the domestic architecture of 18th century Deptford, but are notable as having been built by Mary Lacy, who by this time had adopted the surname of her partner Elizabeth Slade.

Mary Lacy's biography highlights a personal experience of gender non-conformity associated with female restrictions to ‘male’ workplace roles, at a time when contemporary activists, such as Mary Wollstonecraft, were campaigning for female education and gender equality. Wollstonecraft’s philosophical arguments (e.g. her 1792 Vindication of the Rights of Woman) remain an inspiration for modern campaigners.

Lacy’s story is re-emerging as a valued aspect of Deptford maritime heritage. This can be seen as more than a simple novelty in the context of emerging political challenges to prevailing gender conventions.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore gender fluidity, gender equality and the implications for gender disparity in education and opportunity, in the UK and/or globally.

Greenwich Pumping Station

The site adjoins London's first railway, the line of the London & Greenwich railway, connecting London Bridge (opened in 1836) to Greenwich (opened in 1838), which catered for short-distance intra-urban travel. The revolutionary impact of 19th century rail systems connecting towns and cities was to transform urban development and the ability to rapidly transport people, goods and services over significant distances. This transformative effect stimulated economic and social opportunities available to Victorian and later society.

It comprises a series of nineteen brick railway viaducts linked by road bridges between London Bridge railway station, Deptford Creek and Greenwich Station, which together make a single structure 3.45 miles (5.55 km) in length. The structure consists of 851 semi-circular arches and 27 skew arches or road bridges. It is the longest run of arches in Britain, one of the oldest railway viaducts in the world and the earliest example of an elevated railway line.

This narrative offers opportunities to explore how connectivity between urban centres and other places supports social, economic and cultural mobility.

29 Also refer to Appendix E GREPS Site Narrative.
Abbey Mills Pumping Station

The history of Abbey Mills illustrates the importance of water resources to the well-being and sustenance of London’s populations. It also provides an historic perspective on the urban planning challenges required to meet the consequences of large scale environmental and climate change.

Water is essential for human survival and well-being and important to many economic activities. Effective management of water resources has far reaching ‘Liberty’ implications. Clean water is essential to life and is a utility that provides economic benefits. Conversely it can spread disease and flooding and is a perennial threat to urban centres, like London, located on tidal rivers. Throughout its history London has negotiated significant changes due to both climate driven sea-level rise and the constant challenge of achieving urban drainage capacity within a rapidly expanding metropolis.

Progressive post-glacial inundation had a significant impact on the morphology of the lower Lea Valley, including the Abbey Mills site. During the medieval period local water resources were an important source of energy, supporting local agricultural and industrial communities. Flood defences were necessary to protect against loss of life and land resources. For the past 150 years urban sanitation and measures to protect the Thames’ water quality has dominated activities at Abbey Mills.

Key features include:

a. Holocene alluvial deposits sequences of c 4m depth demonstrate the scale of sea level rise that has affected the lower Lea Valley over the last 12,000 years;

b. The natural tidal drainage system of the River Lea was adapted to power early watermills, with five recorded in the Lower Lee in the 11th century Domesday Book. Prone to flooding, the estate of the Abbey of Stratford Langthorne founded in 1135, was reclaimed to create economically productive medieval grazing marsh. The Abbey, in tandem with its operation of tidal mills at Three Mills, constructed leats, earthen embankments and ditches to protect its economic interest in both water and riverine land resources. Successive improvements and maintenance of flood protection measures have continued to the present day, including canalisation of the River Lea;

c. The Abbey Mills pumping station complex, including Building A (known as the ‘cathedral of sewage’), was designed as a key element in London’s interceptor drainage system, raising sewage to the level of the elevated Northern Outfall Sewer and protecting London from flooding during storm and tidal surges.

30 Also refer to Appendix E ABMPS Site Narrative.
This narrative examines the implications of climate change for the management and provision of urban water resources.

**Reflections**

4.9.1 After exploring the three *cultural meanders* and each of the Liberty sites it is worth re-considering the River’s metaphorical capacity to illuminate ‘Liberty’, as a contributing force that shapes and influences London’s heritage and contemporary society:

a. A contested relationship exists between the River, as a natural force, and persistent cultural efforts to manage, protect and extend riparian land. Long-term, incremental encroachment, intended to control and harness the nature and power of the River, brought about a profound physical transformation of the River and its tributaries, including the ‘lost rivers’. By creating additional riparian land, various forms of urban amenity, as illustrated in the culturally eclectic site narratives, have contributed to incremental and no less profound long-term cultural transformations.

b. This allegoric exploration of the polarity/mutability of contrasting philosophical perceptions of ‘Liberty’, as outlined above has specific implications for ways in which the heritage of the Thames might be depicted and the deeper cultural characteristics of London understood:

i. For 2,000 years the River has been firmly controlled to protect the exercise of free movement, especially in relation to trade and wealth generation. There can be no doubt that this utilisation of the natural force of the River has contributed profound and widespread social and economic benefits. But there have also been times when the River held a central role in servicing economic and urban expansion, with scant regard to wider implications. Disregard for impacts on common interests gave rise to extreme situations resulting in long term environmental harm and practices that were contrary to basic principles of humanity;

ii. Efforts to advance wider interests have often relied on the organisational ability of subsidiary groups to access and improve marginal riparian land resources and effect change through investment in personal resources, through common enterprise and self-improvement; gaining economic opportunities for social mobility and/or effecting cultural change. Immigrants and other marginalised groups have been a significant factor in these situations. Yet limited tenurial property rights ensured any long-term economic advantages tend to have been re-appropriated;

iii. Changing attitudes to race, class and gender have influenced the relationships between individuals/ groups and the River. Whilst giving rise to very different
experiences, gender, class and race discrimination expose individuals to disadvantages that give rise to inequality; posing moral and philosophical questions that have contributed to historic and contemporary discourse on Liberty. Issues related to gender are present equally across all three cultural meanders. Class and race have a greater degree of visibility, but not exclusivity, within specific locales.

iv. Class, particularly those narratives focussed on political representation and social welfare provisions for the working poor, is a more visible characteristic of the west cultural meander ‘Recreation to Industry: Society in Transition’. Race and associated forms of institutional discrimination strongly dominate historic narratives characterising the east cultural meander ‘The ‘Shipping Parishes’: Gateway to the World’.

c. Historic narratives related to water management and ecological issues also reflect spatial characteristics. These forms of narratives feature more prominently in the more easterly parts of the estuarine ‘The ‘Shipping Parishes’: Gateway to the World’ cultural meander, where environmental factors are more prescient relative to the culturally dominated historic urban core;

d. Across all three cultural meanders it is the Thames Embankments, developed under the auspices of the MBW, through the engineering vision of Sir Joseph Bazalgette, that stand out as an exceptional monument to civic society. Although, the architectural representation includes symbolic projections of 19th century values, it remains the legacy of a unique and genuinely altruistic endeavour, which continues, 150 years on, to secure London’s citizens’ common interest in the amenity value of the River. These interests are enhanced by the fact that the Embankments stand on the River in equal prominence to architectural representations of national civic institutions of state, democracy, religion and commerce.

e. Finally, specific site narratives give a local perspective on London’s historic contribution to science and technology, health and well-being and culture. Seen in a 21st century global context, these topics, which underpin various notions of Liberty, secured the UK’s 4th place ranking in the 2016 Good Country Index (http://goodcountry.org/). This index of 160 countries is based on various measures intended to identify what each contributes to, or takes away from, the common good of humanity relative to its size.
5 Guidelines for Interpretation

5.1 Introduction

5.1 Developing interpretation materials in any form requires consideration of four key principles which will influence the form and nature of the output:

a. Who is the audience?

b. What is the message that is being conveyed and how does it relate to the audience?

c. What is the interpretation trying to achieve and why?

d. Media – where, what and how?

5.2 As described above in section 3.5 the Tideway audience is diverse yet the interpretive materials developed should offer each group experiences of the River rooted in its long-term cultural legacy while focused on values that are relevant today. The interpretation should respond to the influence of the River on ways of living manifest in the cultural and heritage significance of the Thames such that the ‘users’ of the interpretive materials will be motivated to respond.

5.3 The following sections set out guidelines on how the heritage interpretation can be delivered. It is recognised that the interpretation of the Thames’ heritage faces the challenge of creating a clear unified identity across a wide geographic and historic area. During construction this identity will be aligned with the Tideway works and communications strategy and while Tideway is committed to leaving a legacy of high quality improved public realm, following completion of construction, how this is to be perceived and understood requires consideration.

5.4 Visitors to any of the areas of new public realm need to be able to navigate the space and understand its context and relationship to other sites and the stories being told. Achieving a uniform voice and identity that is consistent across all sites will be a particular project design challenge. Unique identifiers need to be both integrated into the landscape design as well as into other forms of engagement that make reference to the heritage of the Thames. This should be initiated at the early stages of design development to embed the identity; to stimulate awareness, interest and association; so that in the longer term the vision of reconnecting with the river will be achieved.

5.2 Landscape Design

5.2.1 In accordance with PW11 (b): The Strategy “…shall be implemented at site level through the landscaping details to be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authorities, or pursuant to a specific heritage interpretation requirement.” There is, therefore a significant relationship between interpretation with the public realm design and proposals for each site.
Design is thus critical to achieving the Interpretation Strategy aim and objectives. Heritage interpretation should be an embedded element that adds a quality of authenticity to storytelling articulated through design. It should be integrated from the outset of the design development and not appear as an add on. However it should not be over-literal or too concerned with an ‘accurate’ reflection of the ‘past’. Whilst rooted in the historic cultural narratives, representations incorporated in the design should be capable of multiple readings and a plurality of meanings.

Individual site conditions and designations will influence how this is articulated:

a. The physical extent, location and nature of the permanent (above ground) works;

b. The Project's Public Art Strategy;

c. The planning designation of the site which affects the scope for design development and change, i.e. whether indicative or illustrative design (see Appendix G:2);

d. The contractual process of design development and allocation of responsibilities across multiple parties.

Appendix F2 summarises the proposed future landuse at each of the 24 work sites which has significant implications for the form and nature of Heritage Interpretation designs that can be accommodated. Therefore design schemes for each site will develop interpretation proposals commensurate with the extent of public access as appropriate to the local urban context.

It should be noted that sites where public access is most limited are the operational sites, which in many instances include the significant historic architecture of the pumping stations. The site narratives described in section 4 are still pertinent to interpretation design at these locations but designs should be a simple expression of the functional requirements that respect the context and enhance the wider surroundings.

5.3 Design Principles

5.3.1 The DCO contains reference to “Design Principles” with which the designs for the permanent above ground structures and landscaping “shall accord”. As such they constitute the key requirements and constraints for the architecture and landscape proposals. The Design Principles document contains a number of project-wide (generic) design principles in addition to site-specific principles. This reflects the correct balance that must be achieved across the project between London-wide and site-specific considerations. Appendix G

31 These generic principles are deemed to apply to all works, unless dis-applied in the site-specific sections.
summarises the generic and site specific design principles that apply to each of the work sites, with reference to the DCO approved Design Principles (Doc Ref: APP206.01).

5.3.2 In developing an integrated heritage/landscape proposal designers shall respect and contribute positively to each site’s individual context and surroundings. As such it should avoid creating unacceptable visual clutter.

5.3.3 Designers should ensure that spaces that would be handed over to others could be maintained to a good standard in the long-term, having due regard to planning policy and best practice.

5.3.4 Within the Generic Design Principles are a number of Heritage Design Principles (HRTG.01 - HRTG.08) which set out conservation practices that will apply wherever there are interventions to the fabric of listed buildings/structures and conservation areas. These should be taken into consideration when developing interpretive responses particularly in respect of materiality.

Application of Narratives to Design

a. Design, layout and form of new public realm should be cognisant of historic site landuses, building forms, axes and grain, both on the site and adjacent to it.

b. Materials should be used to make reference to the history and narrative of the site, while respecting the surrounding townscape character.

c. Furniture, fencing or railings, while keeping in character with the surrounding townscape could be used as a vehicle to express the site narrative.

d. Lighting could be used to accent narrative aspects of the landscape design.

e. Planting could be used to express the site narrative, however long term maintenance may limit the application of this.

f. Signage/Signature to be integrated within the landscape design.

g. Integration of public art.

5.4 Design Process and Management

5.4.1 Tideway has awarded three Main Works Contracts (MWCs) to three joint ventures to complete the design of, gain consent for and then construct the Thames Tideway Tunnel Project. In addition, TWUL have instructed their framework contractor Eight2O to undertake works at Shad Thames Pumping Station, Bekesbourne Street and Beckton Sewage Treatment Works. These organisations will be responsible for completing the design and discharging the DCO requirements as regards interpretive material on Tideway’s and TWUL’s behalf.
To ensure compliance with the DCO, the Design Principles and the Heritage Interpretation Strategy, a project internal design submission process requires prior Tideway Project Manager acceptance of all design and technical submissions the MWCs issue for Consent Granting Body (CGB) approval.

This design process is without prejudice to the Contractor's additional Environmental Management responsibilities. It shall also integrate Tideway's separate arrangements for the selection of artists and the procurement of art works, which is detailed in the Project Public Arts Strategy.

The design submission process identifies the following gates under which submissions shall be made to Tideway for acceptance. These Gates are loosely based on the RIBA Stages of Work 2013. Appendix H illustrates this process in more detail:

- Gate 1: Preparation
- Gate 2: Concept Design
- Gate 3: Developed Design
- Gate 4: Detailed Design
- Gate 5: For Construction and Manufacture
- Gate 6: Testing, Commissioning, Operation and Maintenance.

This process requires ongoing engagement with “Others” (primarily local authorities but also pan-London stakeholders such as Historic England) and evidence of that engagement at each gate submission. There are more extensive design submissions required for “illustrative” worksites and elements, than there are “indicative” ones.

Design evaluation

Designers will be required to submit a statement of how the integrated landscape and public art proposals respond to the Heritage Interpretation Strategy. The evaluation criteria and template is set out in Appendix I.

This evaluation will be taken into consideration during Tideway’s assurance of DCO Schedule 3 submissions at the relevant design Gate.

Public Art

Tideway’s commitment to a collaborative heritage interpretation and design process includes the appointment of artists to work alongside Contractor design teams. Together they will develop site specific design proposals, within a common conceptual approach, that integrates landscape and figurative elements in response to heritage themes and narratives. It is important that the story-telling aspect of the overall design composition is clear and understandable. Refer to Section 2.5 Public Art Strategy

Careful consideration will need to be given to the scope and scale of artistic and landscape representations at individual sites. Nuanced, subtle and
ephemeral design responses, rather than ‘iconic’ statement pieces, are likely to be more powerfully resonant of the spirit of the River and of the narratives and themes set out in this Strategy.

5.5.3 For each site a conceptual design approach should be defined that balances:

a. the artistic practice of the artist/designer/landscape architect;

b. the physical, psychological and allegorical (River of Liberty) qualities of the River;

c. the specific site and cultural meander narratives described in section 6;

d. the relationship of tunnel infrastructure with its changing local context; and

e. the materiality and methods of production of the landscaped public realm.

5.5.4 The Interpretive Artwork commissions are to be developed in the framework of the progressive design assurance process described above based on submission “Gates” as the design develops, along with the overall architecture and landscape design proposals for each site. The individual stages for Interpretive Artwork commissions are set out below:

a. Brief Development for each site

b. Artist Selection

c. Design Development up to Gate 4

d. Gate 4: Detailed Design (Architecture and Landscape Packages: A&L)

e. Consents

f. Gate 5 Submission (for Construction)

g. Fabrication and Installation

h. Gate 6: Testing, Commissioning, Operation and Maintenance

5.5.5 Refer to Appendix H for detail of each of these stage. Further collaboration includes working with local authorities to realise landscape masterplans for Deptford Church Street and King Edward Memorial Park that integrate Tideway worksite landscape proposals. The Living Wandle Project interfaces with work at Kings George’s Park and thus consideration should be given to synergies across the projects.

5.6 Communications / Story telling

5.6.1 To ensure that the project’s delivery creates a lasting legacy, part of which will be judged by the overall reputation of the Project once it is delivered, it will be necessary to engage with communities at all levels throughout the process. A key part of this process will be to communicate pro-actively with those affected by construction activity in a way that is appropriate to their circumstances and lifestyle, using language that is accessible.

5.6.2 However another role of communications is to build a broad public awareness of the scale and complexity of the engineering challenge involved in delivering
the project and to put this in the context of Sir Joseph Bazalgette’s achievements in masterminding the city’s modern day sewerage network.

5.6.3 A challenge to this is the nature of the project, i.e. an underground sewer which people generally only engage with indirectly but expect to function without question. The Heritage Interpretation Strategy provides a rich source of narrative to help connect with people and bring to life the overall value of the project and the individual work sites. This could manifest itself in a range of ways:

a. Media events – printed and digital media: film, TV, radio, You Tube
b. Social media – Facebook, Instagram, etc.
c. Performance – e.g. street theatre, music
d. Community consultation / engagement workshops
e. Hoarding design
f. Exhibitions
g. Thames Festival

5.6.4 Through communication and storytelling of the themes set out in the Interpretation Strategy Tideway could also help people see the value the historic environment as an important community resource as well as gaining an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of our historic environment.

5.6.5 An example of this approach can be seen in the naming of the Tunnel Boring Machines (TBMs). It is traditional to name these after women and Tideway propose to use material within the Heritage Interpretation Strategy narratives to identify historic female figures who have contributed to their local area thereby highlighting individuals that may previously have been overlooked and thus not familiar to the local communities that will decide on the final names.

5.6.6 The Interpretation Strategy will help inform the Communications Strategy for Tideway and act as a catalyst for wider associated engagement.

5.7 Implementation and Operation

5.7.1 The responsibility for the implementation of the Heritage Interpretation Strategy overall lies with Tideway. This will be discharged/ delivered through the following:

a. Employment of artists to develop works of art for individual worksites informed by the Interpretation Strategy.

b. Interface with and management of the MWCs contracts to ensure compliance with DCO requirements particularly in respect of the landscape design and integration of art. Approval of the detailed landscape designs.

c. Liaison with Thames Water Utilities Ltd in respect of works at:
   i. Shad Thames Pumping Station
   ii. Bekesbourne Street
iii. Beckton Sewage Treatment Works

d. Funding of a Community Archaeologist with the Thames Discovery Programme.

e. Development of Educational resources.

f. Contributions to Tideway’s communications where Heritage Interpretation can add value in establishing and developing relationships.

5.7.2 Oversight of the implementation and initial operation of the Heritage Interpretation Strategy and its outputs will be the responsibility of Tideway’s Archaeology and Heritage Lead. In terms of the permanent above ground works, including landscape, Thames Water Utilities Ltd will be the future owner and maintainer of the new public realm, including artworks.
6 Delivery - Opportunities for Interpretation & Legacy

6.1 Heritage and the public realm

6.1.1 The aim of the Interpretation Strategy is to communicate an understanding and perspectives of the River so that people are inspired to encounter the Thames and experience its history and influence on London’s contemporary culture and ways of living. This will be achieved through the processes for landscape design and public art set out above which will make a significant Legacy contribution. The works that form part of the new public realm will be physical manifestations of the Interpretation Strategy, however there are further opportunities to engage with audiences which will augment the landscape and art installations.

6.2 Thames Discovery Programme

6.2.1 Tideway supports the work of the Museum of London Thames Discovery Programme (TDP), an award winning community archaeology project that aims to communicate an understanding and enjoyment of the historic Thames to the widest possible audience. The two organisations will work together using TDP to increase the impact of Tideway’s public outreach to leave a lasting legacy. This will be achieved through the appointment of a Senior Community Archaeologist (Tideway Heritage Interpretation) to deliver a programme of engagement with school age children and young people and local communities that will be specifically developed around the Interpretation Strategy and the ‘River of Liberty’ theme.

6.2.2 Development and delivery of educational content to the widest possible audience will be achieved across four key initiatives:

a. A schools programme for key stage 2 and 3 school children, which has particular reference to the sites and themes outlined in the Interpretation Strategy. This includes classroom and foreshore sessions and will be supported by online resources.

b. The development and delivery of the Tadpoles (foreshore training) programme (8-17 yr olds)

c. Supporting the Foreshore Recording and Observation Group (FROG)

d. An extensive programme of community outreach events.

6.2.3 TDP will engage with schools in Tideway’s target boroughs through visits to the foreshore and relevant historic buildings, following these up with classroom sessions. The schools programme is planned to be launched in 2017, comprising half day sessions, incorporating a field visit and classroom session.

6.2.4 TDP FROG membership has so far been limited to over 18’s. The Tideway-sponsored Community Archaeologist will create a new junior strand to the
project, ‘Tadpoles’, actively engaging young people aged from 8 to 17 in recording their heritage via new separate training programmes, one each aimed at Key Stages 2 and 3. Once trained, they would be able to attend regular fieldwork and monitoring sessions, and then, on their 18th birthday, would graduate to full FROG status. This programme would fill a gap in the provision of archaeological experience as the Young Archaeologist Club (YAC) only deals with young people up to the age of 16.

6.2.5 Tideway/TDP community engagement will offer greater support to existing TDP volunteer networks through talks, walks and skills sessions. The Tideway-sponsored Community Archaeologist will offer new opportunities for skills development to TDP Foreshore Recording and Observation Group (FROG) volunteers, introducing an additional quarterly workshop and an additional quarterly lecture.

6.2.6 The partnership also provides for the option of additional Tideway sponsored one-day family events delivered from the MOLA Time Truck, a unique new community archaeology and education trailer. The Time Truck display would feature the outputs of the schools education sessions with all the participating schools in an area notified of the day and invited to attend. This offers an opportunity to engage parents (and grandparents) alongside their children, reaching a group of key Tideway stakeholders.

6.2.7 The Tideway-sponsored Community Archaeologist will also facilitate CPD opportunities for Tideway stakeholders and contractors, ranging from lectures, through workshops to archaeological fieldwork, as required by Tideway.

6.3 Education

6.3.1 Heritage related education improves life opportunities, consistent with the ‘Liberty’ theme, and contributes to Tideway Legacy and DCO commitments:

a. The Tideway Legacy commitment to People (Thames Tideway Tunnel Legacy Doc Ref 100-PX-CMN-000000-000008) includes:
   i. providing teaching and learning resources;
   ii. a volunteer STEM ambassador programme.

b. The Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (OAWSI) Section 11.3 Heritage Interpretation and Outreach Opportunities states the project commitment to activities such as presentations, school activities, media coverage, web-based initiatives, as well as the permanent heritage interpretation at relevant sites.

6.3.2 The Interpretation Strategy will contribute to Tideway education commitments by providing access to various heritage learning resources, including digital material accessed via Tunnelworks (http://www.tunnelworks.co.uk). The content of the Tideway Tunnelworks portal includes specific heritage focussed classroom based resources for teachers, Londoners and anyone interested in the Thames.
Additional information about new discoveries and the stories of the Thames will be incorporated on Tunnelworks throughout the Tideway construction programme. This new content will be curated and reinterpreted through the Tideway/TDP education programme. This growing educational resource, with links to the full TDP archive, will share knowledge with the widest audience possible.

Current arrangements under development by Tideway and their education consultants EBC include, but are not limited to:

a. The development of Key Stage 2 curriculum teaching resources focussed on the social and economic context of local historic buildings;

b. The development of Key Stage 3 curriculum teaching resources focussed on the cultural impact of historic population movements, specifically the long term effect of 17th century Huguenot communities (Sir Joseph Bazalgette was of Huguenot descent) on the economic, social and urban development of London;

c. The development of Contractor input to the Tideway STEM ambassador programme.

**Crossness Pumping Station**

In accordance with Design Principal HRTG.07, to take into account local interpretation strategies, Tideway is also supporting the Crossness Engines Trust plans to complete landscaping and the installation of an exhibition exploring the history of the Pumping Station. The Trust’s education objective of opening the historic buildings to visitors complements the Tideway Interpretation proposals.

It can offer a valuable contribution to the Tideway Heritage Interpretation Strategy by specifically examining the history of the Metropolitan Board of Works Main Sewer scheme. The Interpretation Strategy has taken this into account and avoids duplication of the narrative themes developed by the Trust for their exhibition, so that it complements, rather than conflicts with those identified for Tideway sites.

Tideway is providing exhibition materials that will assist the Trust explain the importance of the site, the role of the Metropolitan Board of Works, the history of urban sanitation, its impact on disease and the life of Sir Joseph Bazalgette.

**Tideway Website**

An Arts & Heritage section of the extant Tideway website would facilitate the wider dissemination of the Interpretation Strategy and its outputs. It could provide the stories behind the artworks and landscape design and provide the detailed site narratives and results of archaeological investigations. It could provide a platform for audio / visual stories of the individual sites, told by local people, specialists, artists, river users etc. It could provide a platform for Tideway Artist in Residence, new poetry (Tideway Poet Laureate), theatre or
music specifically curated for the Project and informed by the Interpretation Strategy.

6.6 Mobile Web application

6.6.1 A mobile app could be developed to tell the stories of the Thames. This would be done in partnership with other organisations such as the Port of London Authority and Museum of London. The app would be aimed at visitors to individual (former work) sites seeking information about the art or landscape or history of the site who could access site specific information through use of tools such as QR codes. It would also be developed to be relevant to river users who interact with the new public realm and river walls in a different way to other users.

6.7 Exhibitions

6.7.1 The Strategy recognises that, should appropriate partner organisations approach Tideway, there may be additional opportunities to place heritage interpretation displays within gallery or museum settings and other venues.

6.7.2 Tideway will consider future collaboration should opportunities arise.

6.8 Publications

Archaeological Research and Technical Reports

6.8.1 Various technical reports will be produced that will contribute to a Tideway legacy that advances knowledge and understanding.

Interim fieldwork (mitigation) report

6.8.2 On completion of archaeological fieldwork, the Employer’s Archaeological Contractor (EAC) will prepare an interim worksite fieldwork report. This will outline the findings of the excavation and archaeological works at each work site. The main purpose of this report will be to demonstrate the fieldwork complies with the SSAWSI and to highlight how key findings would be dealt with during post-exavcation assessment.

Post excavation assessment report

6.8.3 Tideway will review arrangements for the preparation of a post excavation assessment once all mitigation works have been completed across an individual section of the tunnel route (West, Central & East). It is envisaged that site specific or project wide post-exavcation reports will be prepared to assess the archaeological finds and propose a suitable strategy for undertaking analysis and publication.
Publication and dissemination

6.8.4 Post-excavation assessment reports will be produced to the scope agreed with HBMCE and consent granting bodies. It will quantify and describe the archaeological finds or materials, to allow further analysis, publication, outreach and dissemination to be scoped. The report will include an up-dated project design, which refers to the OAWSI Archaeological Research Framework and provide a detailed methodology and programme of tasks for completing the final stage of the DCO archaeological requirement.

Publication and dissemination

6.8.5 The scope of publication, outreach and dissemination, including popular forms of publication, will be regularly reviewed in light of opportunities to share new knowledge that arise during analysis.

6.8.6 Publication and dissemination of the archaeological mitigation works will contribute to discharge of the heritage interpretation with regards to:
   a. number of archaeological publications;
   b. archaeological publication impact rating;
   c. teaching and educational experiences;
   d. input to heritage-led design (interpretation).

Communications

6.9 Tideway will include an account of progress of our Heritage Interpretation work, including schools/community engagement, in our Legacy and Sustainability Report, published annually in the autumn.

6.9.2 Specific archaeological discoveries or heritage interpretation milestones will be reported to the media (including social media) and public as posts on the Tideway website, in community newsletters and/or at face-to-face Community Liaison Working Groups, as appropriate.
6.9.3 Interpretation Strategy themes and narrative will be promoted through internal communications:

a. promoting cultural diversity within the Tideway workforce and celebrating the contribution of different cultures to London’s heritage as part of the Encompass Inclusivity Programme event calendar;

b. raising awareness of the heritage associated with individual worksite through ‘Tributary’, the Tideway internal newspaper;
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Appendix A DCO Commitments and Schedule 3 Requirements

A.1 Interpretation Strategy (DCO Schedule 3 PW11)
A.1.1 A project-wide Heritage Interpretation Strategy shall be developed in consultation with the HBMCE within 12 months of the start of construction, in accordance with the OAWSI and design principle HRTG.07.
A.1.2 The Strategy shall be implemented at site level through the landscaping details to be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authorities, or pursuant to a site specific heritage interpretation requirement.
A.1.3 The authorised development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authorities in consultation with the HBMCE.

A.2 Design Principal (HRTG.07)
A.2.1 A project-wide Interpretation Strategy shall be developed to celebrate the pioneering nature and significance of Bazalgette’s sewerage system, and the engineering achievements of the project as a sensitive development of London’s historic sewer system. This shall take account of any existing local interpretation strategies. The design of interpretative materials at the site level shall be sensitively integrated into the design of the new facilities and surrounding area and avoid creating unacceptable visual clutter.

A.3 OAWSI 11.3 Heritage Interpretation and Outreach Opportunities
A.3.1 Para 11.3.1 states ‘Bazalgette’s sewage system is of at least national significance and has shaped the development of central London from the mid-19th century. Its characteristic structures provided a thematic link to the Thames embankments in central London, where none existed previously. The monumental and more homogeneous character that it provided to the Thames helped to augment the existing grandeur of central London, providing it with a cutting edge sewer system and underground railway and setting the tone of the city as a world trade hub. The Thames Tideway Tunnel structures are designed to adapt and augment Bazalgette’s system, thus preserving its significance and providing it with a new lease of life’.
A.3.2 Para 11.3.2 states ‘As such the Thames Tideway Tunnel project has the scope to incorporate permanent heritage interpretation across Thames Tideway Tunnel sites, celebrating the pioneering nature and significance of Bazalgette’s sewage system, and the engineering achievements of the Thames Tideway Tunnel as a sensitive development of London’s historic sewer system’.
A.3.3 Para 11.3.3 states ‘A project such as the Thames Tideway Tunnel also has the scope to generate considerable historical information and provide an opportunity for communicating such finds to the wider public. Interpretation of
historical archaeological information will be informed by the reported fieldwork results and the updated priorities framework developed from them (see Appendix B, i.e. Research Framework). Appropriate outreach and engagement opportunities will be identified throughout the construction and operational phases of the project and could include activities such as presentations, school activities, media coverage, web-based initiatives and permanent heritage interpretation at relevant sites.’

A.3.4 Para 11.3.4 states ‘Proposals for heritage interpretation, both in relation to Bazalgette’s sewage system and archaeological material and finds from all periods, within the design of Thames Tideway Tunnel sites, will be detailed within an Interpretation Strategy, as per the project Design Principles, and requirements detailed in Schedule 3 of the Development Consent Order. The Interpretation Strategy will also detail how outreach and engagement opportunities will be identified and delivered’.

A.4 DCO Site Specific Requirements

A.4.1 The project wide Interpretation Strategy is to be delivered through site specific requirements that are to be approved by the Local Authorities, either in response the submission and approval of:

a. permanent structure and landscape design proposals that accord with Design Principals, including HRTG.07, which stipulates that design of interpretative materials at the site level shall be sensitively integrated into the design of the new facilities and surrounding area and avoid creating unacceptable visual clutter.

b. or, at sites where there is no appropriate design requirement specified in the DCO: relevant details applicable to each site from the project wide heritage Strategy required by PW11. (i.e. schedule 3 requirements CREWD14, SHTP8, CHAWF13, EARPS12 BEKST9, ABMPS8 & BESTW6.)

A.5 WI GEN 7300. Employer’s architecture and landscape works specifications – Introduction

A.5.1 Para 0.2.2 states ‘The Contractor shall complete the design in accordance with the requirements of the Employer’s Interpretation Strategy as defined under Project heritage design principle HRTG.07. The Employer shall, following the completion of archaeological work at each site, provide proposals for interpretative material at any or all of the sites. These proposals may include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. signage: freestanding or fixed to structures

b. artwork and sculpture: freestanding or fixed to structures

c. modifications to the Contractor’s design, for example carved stone walling surfaces
A.5.2 Para 0.2.3 states 'The Employer shall provide designs for the interpretive material. The additional cost of providing the interpretative material shall be borne by the Employer. The Contractor shall allow for all costs, co-ordination and programme implications associated with:

a. design co-ordination with interpretive material providers

b. incorporating the installation of interpretive material

c. adapting the design of the works to incorporate interpretive material.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite</th>
<th>Listed building</th>
<th>Conservation area</th>
<th>DCO Schedule 3 - Site specific requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acton Storm Tank</td>
<td>ACTST</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTST5 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>HAMPS</td>
<td>Fulham Reach CA</td>
<td>HAMPS8 Detailed design for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms</td>
<td>BAREL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BAREL5 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment</td>
<td>PUTEF</td>
<td>Putney Bridge and walls</td>
<td>PUTEF2 Detailed design for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormay Street</td>
<td>DRMST</td>
<td>Wandsworth Town CA</td>
<td>DRMST2 Detailed design approval for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George's Park</td>
<td>KNGGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>KNGGP6 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnwath Road</td>
<td>CARRR</td>
<td>Sands End CA</td>
<td>CARRR1 Detailed design for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CARRR5 Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CARRR12 Detail design for riverwall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite</th>
<th>Listed building</th>
<th>Conservation area</th>
<th>DCO Schedule 3 - Site specific requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falconbrook</td>
<td>FALPS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Wharf</td>
<td>Lots Road Pumping Station</td>
<td>Thames Conservation Area</td>
<td>CREWD2 Detailed design for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design approval for permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design for signature ventilation column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Details of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment</td>
<td>CHEEF2 Location of permanent works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design of river wall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protective works to heritage assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration works to heritage assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEEF17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtling Street</td>
<td>KRTST4 Site restoration (excluding the designated Safeguarded wharf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathwall</td>
<td>HEAPS7</td>
<td>Heathwall Pumping Station Landscaping (excluding the designated Safeguarded wharf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment</td>
<td>ALBEF2 River wall and terraces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design of river wall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Details of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protective works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALBEF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>VCTEF2 Location of permanent works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite</th>
<th>Listed building</th>
<th>Conservation area</th>
<th>DCO Schedule 3 - Site specific requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embankment</strong></td>
<td>Lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF5 Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catenary lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF6 Detailed design of river wall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sphinx and camel benches</td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF7 Details of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF8 Protective works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF9 Restoration works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF10 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures (moorings and piers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VCTEF15</strong> Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VCTEF21 Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blackfriars Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge</td>
<td>Whitefriars CA Temple CA</td>
<td>BLABF2 Location of permanent works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLABF</strong></td>
<td>River wall and sturgeon lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF3 Location of permanent works (moorings and piers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF4 Detailed design of river wall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF5 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF6 Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF10 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures (moorings and piers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF11 Details of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF12 Protective works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF13 Restoration works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BLABF14</strong> Landscape works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLABF23 Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shad Thames</strong></td>
<td>Tower Bridge CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHTPS8 Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHTPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CHAWF12</strong> Heritage Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chambers Wharf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EARPS12</strong> Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DEPCS2</strong> Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deptford Church Street</strong></td>
<td>St Paul's CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEPCS3 Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite</th>
<th>Listed building</th>
<th>Conservation area</th>
<th>DCO Schedule 3 - Site specific requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DEPCS4 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Pumping Station</td>
<td>Greenwich Pumping Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS2 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS3 Details of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS4 Detail of works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS5 Protective works to listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS6 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
<td>Wapping Wall CA (inc King Edwards Memorial Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMPF2 Location of permanent works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMPF3 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMPF4 Detailed design for signature ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMPF5 Detailed design of river wall and foreshore structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEMPF6 Landscaping works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEMPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekesbourne Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BEKST9 Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEKST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Mills* Pumping Station</td>
<td>Three Mills CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABMPS2 Detailed design of permanent above-ground structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ABMPS8 Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABMPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becton Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BESTW6 Heritage interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESTW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Works at this site is part of the TWUL Eight2O contract.*
C.1 Scope

C.1.1 Policies and guidance that contribute to the Strategy cover the following topics:

a. Historic Environment;
Culture and Public Art;
Heritage Interpretation;
Design.

C.2 Historic Environment

Government Policy for the Historic Environment 2010

C.2.1 The Government’s Statement on the Historic Environment for England 2010 sets a clear agenda that guides the Tideway Heritage Interpretation Strategy. This Strategy embraces the Government ‘Vision’ for the historic environment as:

...... an asset of enormous cultural, social, economic and environmental value. It makes a very real contribution to our quality of life and the quality of our places. We recognise that while some of today’s achievements may become tomorrow’s heritage our existing heritage assets are also simply irreplaceable. We realise the importance of understanding, conserving, and where appropriate, enhancing the markers of our past. We believe in encouraging a wider involvement in our heritage, in order to ensure that every one, both today and in the future, has an opportunity to discover their connection to those who have come before.

C.2.2 The Interpretation Strategy also recognises the Government Statement that the historic environment is a vital cultural asset, that:

........needs to be appropriately protected, supported and explored for the benefit of this and future generations. In common with other cultural artefacts many of the buildings, landscapes and archaeological sites that make up the historic environment can be highly valued in and of themselves. They may simply have outstanding aesthetic appeal; they may represent important works by leading architects, designers or artists; they may embody significant innovations in design or technology or represent important primary evidence of a phase of our history. But they all help to tell us where we have come from and give us a sense of who we are.

C.2.3 Finally the Interpretation Strategy supports the Government’s desire to realise social values inherent in the cultural heritage:
By supplying a focus for civic activity and offering opportunities for learning and recreation the historic environment can also be the foundation for more engaged and active communities. At its most basic, in providing distinctive local features and a tangible link to the past, the historic environment is often central to local identity in both urban and rural areas. Local environments which offer a range of attractive and accessible public spaces, including local heritage, also encourage people of all backgrounds to enjoy them, creating places where people come together and mix. Taking this one step further, by encouraging people not just to enjoy, but also to involve themselves in the management of historic places and make active use of them for their own benefit, we can help to create a sense of ownership in the locality and so help to strengthen local communities. There are benefits for the individual too. Studies have shown that active involvement in cultural activities can offer a physical or emotional benefit to those taking part. The historic environment can also be used to enrich formal and informal education and life-long learning, and for children in particular, OFSTED research has shown that learning outside the classroom offers real educational benefit.

C.3 Culture and Public Art

The Culture White Paper 2016

C.3.1 The Culture White Paper sets the context in which the Interpretation Strategy has been developed. The key objectives of the White Paper align with Tideway’s values and its aim to engage with London and Londoners to reconnect them with the River through the medium of art, design and heritage.

C.3.2 Key objectives of the White Paper

a. Everyone should enjoy the opportunities culture offers, no matter where they start in life

The riches of our culture should benefit communities across the country

The power of culture can increase our international standing

Culture no longer simply means being familiar with a select list of works of art and architecture, but the accumulated influence of creativity, the arts, museums, galleries, libraries, archives and heritage upon all our lives. When we talk about our ‘cultural sectors’, we are referring to an extraordinary network of individuals and organisations, that together preserve, reflect and promote who we are as a nation, in all our rich diversity. There will always be an aesthetic aspect to culture in its many forms; and the government will

always champion cultural excellence. But each community has its own culture – its own history, museums and traditions. In this global, interconnected economy, what is local and unique has a special value and should be supported and encouraged. We should no more dictate a community’s culture than we should tell people what to create or how to create it. The role of government is to enable great culture and creativity to flourish – and to ensure that everyone can have access to it.

The cultural sectors are already an immensely important part of our economy and society. We know that investment in culture not only has immense economic value; it also has a wide range of benefits that touch all our lives every day. We can see the difference that culture has on children’s education, and we are beginning to understand better the profound relationship between culture, health and wellbeing.

Everyone should have the chance to experience culture, participate in it, create it, and see their lives transformed by it.

The value of culture

Culture brings many benefits. In this white paper, we are concerned with three areas in particular:

– the intrinsic value: the enriching value of culture in and of itself;
– the social value: improving educational attainment and helping people to be healthier; and – the economic value: the contribution culture makes to economic growth and job-creation.

The intrinsic value of culture. Culture creates inspiration, enriches lives and improves our outlook on life. Evidence suggests that culture has an intrinsic value through the positive impact on personal wellbeing. Data shows that engaging with culture (visiting, attending and participation) significantly increases overall life satisfaction.

The social value of culture. Culture has important social benefits in terms of health, education and community cohesion. There is considerable evidence of the beneficial effects of the arts on both physical and mental health. This includes improvements such as positive physiological and psychological changes in clinical outcomes; decreasing the amount of time spent in hospital; and improving mental health.

The economic value of culture. In 2014, the economic contribution of museums, galleries, libraries and the arts was £5.4 billion, representing 0.3 per cent of the total UK economy. This is up 59 per cent (in nominal terms) since 2010 – a massive increase compared to total economic growth of 16 per cent (nominal terms) over the same period. Heritage tourism accounts for 2% of GDP, contributing £26 billion per year. The number of people employed in the cultural and creative sectors has been increasing since 2011 and now stands at 321,000.
Cultural Metropolis 2014 Achievements and next steps

C.3.3 A review and update to the London Mayor’s 2012 Cultural Strategy was recently published as *Cultural Metropolis 2014 Achievements and next steps*, which has informed the Tideway Heritage Interpretation Strategy. It includes useful advice regarding infrastructure, environment and the public realm. Specifically it highlights cultural projects inspired by the city’s heritage, using its architecture and historic sites as the basis for artistic expression. It also identifies the River Thames as a key focus for future cultural initiatives.

C.3.4 *Cultural Metropolis* includes the Mayor’s commitments to support the Thames Festival, an annual event, and to commission new cultural projects centred on the River. It highlights the Thomas Heatherwick *Garden Bridge* and separate proposals to construct a floating public lido on the Thames and to install a contemporary and energy-efficient lighting scheme on a cluster of London bridges to enhance the river at night.

C.3.5 Through public art projects, the Mayor is also committed to integrating contemporary art into the cityscape.

C.3.6 Alongside these initiatives, Tideway has a significant role in improving access to heritage through the creation of public art that enhances the cultural value of the River Thames and its public realm.

C.4 Heritage Interpretation

Association for Heritage Interpretation (AHI)

C.4.1 The Strategy recognizes the purpose of heritage interpretation, as defined by the Association for Heritage Interpretation (AHI), to be:

*Interpretation enriches lives through engaging emotions, enhancing experiences and deepening understanding of places, people, events and objects from the past and present. It brings places, objects and ideas to life, by creating thought-provoking and memorable experiences that connect people with our cultural heritage.*

*Revealing hidden stories and meanings deepen people’s understanding and expands horizons. In particular it enables communities to better understand their heritage, and to express their own ideas and feelings about their home area. As a result individuals may identify with values inherent in the local culture.*

ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites 4 October 2008

C.4.2 The Strategy is consistent with the ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites 4 October 2008 (Appendix D) and will develop interpretation based on the Charter’s seven principles:
C.5 Design


Appendix D ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites 4 October 2008

D.1 Preamble

D.1.1 Since its establishment in 1965 as a worldwide organisation of heritage professionals dedicated to the study, documentation, and protection of cultural heritage sites, ICOMOS has striven to promote the conservation ethic in all its activities and to help enhance public appreciation of humanity’s material heritage in all its forms and diversity.

D.1.2 As noted in the Charter of Venice (1964) “It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis, with each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions.” Subsequent ICOMOS charters have taken up that mission, establishing professional guidelines for specific conservation challenges and encouraging effective communication about the importance of heritage conservation in every region of the world.

D.1.3 These earlier ICOMOS charters stress the importance of public communication as an essential part of the larger conservation process (variously describing it as “dissemination,” “popularization,” “presentation,” and “interpretation”). They implicitly acknowledge that every act of heritage conservation—within all the world’s cultural traditions - is by its nature a communicative act.

D.1.4 From the vast range of surviving material remains and intangible values of past communities and civilisations, the choice of what to preserve, how to preserve it, and how it is to be presented to the public are all elements of site interpretation. They represent every generation's vision of what is significant, what is important, and why material remains from the past should be passed on to generations yet to come.

D.1.5 The need for a clear rationale, standardised terminology, and accepted professional principles for Interpretation and Presentation (*See definitions) is evident. In recent years, the dramatic expansion of interpretive activities at many cultural heritage sites and the introduction of elaborate interpretive technologies and new economic strategies for the marketing and management of cultural heritage sites have created new complexities and aroused basic questions that are central to the goals of both conservation and the public appreciation of cultural heritage sites throughout the world:

a. What are the accepted and acceptable goals for the Interpretation and Presentation of cultural heritage sites?

b. What principles should help determine which technical means and methods are appropriate in particular cultural and heritage contexts?
c. What general ethical and professional considerations should help shape Interpretation and Presentation in light of its wide variety of specific forms and techniques?

D.1.6 The purpose of this Charter is therefore to define the basic principles of Interpretation and Presentation as essential components of heritage conservation efforts and as a means of enhancing public appreciation and understanding of cultural heritage sites.

D.1.7 Although the principles and objectives of this Charter may equally apply to off-site interpretation, its main focus is interpretation and presentation at, or in the immediate vicinity of, cultural heritage sites.

D.2 Definitions

D.2.1 For the purposes of the present Charter:

a. **Interpretation** refers to the full range of potential activities intended to heighten public awareness and enhance understanding of cultural heritage site. These can include print and electronic publications, public lectures, on-site and directly related off-site installations, educational programmes, community activities, and ongoing research, training, and evaluation of the interpretation process itself.

b. **Presentation** more specifically denotes the carefully planned communication of interpretive content through the arrangement of interpretive information, physical access, and interpretive infrastructure at a cultural heritage site. It can be conveyed through a variety of technical means, including, yet not requiring, such elements as informational panels, museum-type displays, formalized walking tours, lectures and guided tours, and multimedia applications and websites.

c. **Interpretive infrastructure** refers to physical installations, facilities, and areas at, or connected with a cultural heritage site that may be specifically utilised for the purposes of interpretation and presentation including those supporting interpretation via new and existing technologies.

d. **Site interpreters** refers to staff or volunteers at a cultural heritage site who are permanently or temporarily engaged in the public communication of information relating to the values and significance of the site.

e. **Cultural Heritage Site** refers to a place, locality, natural landscape, settlement area, architectural complex, archaeological site, or standing structure that is recognized and often legally protected as a place of historical and cultural significance.

D.3 Objectives

D.3.1 In recognizing that interpretation and presentation are part of the overall process of cultural heritage conservation and management, this Charter seeks to establish seven cardinal principles, upon which Interpretation and Presentation—in whatever form or medium is deemed appropriate in specific circumstances—should be based.
Principle 1: Access and Understanding

Principle 2: Information Sources

Principle 3: Attention to Setting and Context

Principle 4: Preservation of Authenticity

Principle 5: Planning for Sustainability

Principle 6: Concern for Inclusiveness

Principle 7: Importance of Research, Training, and Evaluation

D.3.2 Following from these seven principles, the objectives of this Charter are to:

a. Facilitate understanding and appreciation of cultural heritage sites and foster public awareness and engagement in the need for their protection and conservation.

b. Communicate the meaning of cultural heritage sites to a range of audiences through careful, documented recognition of significance, through accepted scientific and scholarly methods as well as from living cultural traditions.

c. Safeguard the tangible and intangible values of cultural heritage sites in their natural and cultural settings and social contexts.

d. Respect the authenticity of cultural heritage sites, by communicating the significance of their historic fabric and cultural values and protecting them from the adverse impact of intrusive interpretive infrastructure, visitor pressure, inaccurate or inappropriate interpretation.

e. Contribute to the sustainable conservation of cultural heritage sites, through promoting public understanding of, and participation in, ongoing conservation efforts, ensuring long-term maintenance of the interpretive infrastructure and regular review of its interpretive contents.

f. Encourage inclusiveness in the interpretation of cultural heritage sites, by facilitating the involvement of stakeholders and associated communities in the development and implementation of interpretive programmes.

g. Develop technical and professional guidelines for heritage interpretation and presentation, including technologies, research, and training. Such guidelines must be appropriate and sustainable in their social contexts.

D.4 Principles

Principle 1: Access and Understanding

D.4.1 Interpretation and presentation programmes should facilitate physical and intellectual access by the public to cultural heritage sites.
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D.4.2 Effective interpretation and presentation should enhance personal experience, increase public respect and understanding, and communicate the importance of the conservation of cultural heritage sites.

D.4.3 Interpretation and presentation should encourage individuals and communities to reflect on their own perceptions of a site and assist them in establishing a meaningful connection to it. The aim should be to stimulate further interest, learning, experience, and exploration.

D.4.4 Interpretation and presentation programmes should identify and assess their audiences demographically and culturally. Every effort should be made to communicate the site’s values and significance to its varied audiences.

D.4.5 The diversity of language among visitors and associated communities connected with a heritage site should be taken into account in the interpretive infrastructure.

D.4.6 Interpretation and presentation activities should also be physically accessible to the public, in all its variety.

D.4.7 In cases where physical access to a cultural heritage site is restricted due to conservation concerns, cultural sensitivities, adaptive re-use, or safety issues, interpretation and presentation should be provided off-site.

Principle 2: Information Sources

D.4.8 Interpretation and presentation should be based on evidence gathered through accepted scientific and scholarly methods as well as from living cultural traditions.

D.4.9 Interpretation should show the range of oral and written information, material remains, traditions, and meanings attributed to a site. The sources of this information should be documented, archived, and made accessible to the public.

D.4.10 Interpretation should be based on a well-researched, multidisciplinary study of the site and its surroundings. It should also acknowledge that meaningful interpretation necessarily includes reflection on alternative historical hypotheses, local traditions, and stories.

D.4.11 At cultural heritage sites where traditional storytelling or memories of historical participants provide an important source of information about the significance of the site, interpretive programmes should incorporate these oral testimonies—either indirectly, through the facilities of the interpretive infrastructure, or directly, through the active participation of members of associated communities as on-site interpreters.

D.4.12 Visual reconstructions, whether by artists, architects, or computer modellers, should be based upon detailed and systematic analysis of environmental, archaeological, architectural, and historical data, including analysis of written, oral and iconographic sources, and photography. The information sources on which such visual renderings are based should be clearly documented and
alternative reconstructions based on the same evidence, when available, should be provided for comparison.

D.4.13 Interpretation and presentation programmes and activities should also be documented and archived for future reference and reflection.

**Principle 3: Context and Setting**

D.4.14 The Interpretation and Presentation of cultural heritage sites should relate to their wider social, cultural, historical, and natural contexts and settings.

D.4.15 Interpretation should explore the significance of a site in its multi-faceted historical, political, spiritual, and artistic contexts. It should consider all aspects of the site’s cultural, social, and environmental significance and values.

D.4.16 The public interpretation of a cultural heritage site should clearly distinguish and date the successive phases and influences in its evolution. The contributions of all periods to the significance of a site should be respected.

D.4.17 Interpretation should also take into account all groups that have contributed to the historical and cultural significance of the site.

D.4.18 The surrounding landscape, natural environment, and geographical setting are integral parts of a site’s historical and cultural significance, and, as such, should be considered in its interpretation.

D.4.19 Intangible elements of a site’s heritage such as cultural and spiritual traditions, stories, music, dance, theatre, literature, visual arts, local customs and culinary heritage should be considered in its interpretation.

D.4.20 The cross-cultural significance of heritage sites, as well as the range of perspectives about them based on scholarly research, ancient records, and living traditions, should be considered in the formulation of interpretive programmes.

**Principle 4: Authenticity**

D.4.21 The Interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites must respect the basic tenets of authenticity in the spirit of the Nara Document (1994).

D.4.22 Authenticity is a concern relevant to human communities as well as material remains. The design of a heritage interpretation programme should respect the traditional social functions of the site and the cultural practices and dignity of local residents and associated communities.

D.4.23 Interpretation and presentation should contribute to the conservation of the authenticity of a cultural heritage site by communicating its significance without adversely impacting its cultural values or irreversibly altering its fabric.

D.4.24 All visible interpretive infrastructures (such as kiosks, walking paths, and information panels) must be sensitive to the character, setting and the cultural and natural significance of the site, while remaining easily identifiable.
D.4.25 On-site concerts, dramatic performances, and other interpretive programmes must be carefully planned to protect the significance and physical surroundings of the site and minimise disturbance to the local residents.

**Principle 5: Sustainability**

D.4.26 The interpretation plan for a cultural heritage site must be sensitive to its natural and cultural environment, with social, financial, and environmental sustainability among its central goals.

D.4.27 The development and implementation of interpretation and presentation programmes should be an integral part of the overall planning, budgeting, and management process of cultural heritage sites.

D.4.28 The potential effect of interpretive infrastructure and visitor numbers on the cultural value, physical characteristics, integrity, and natural environment of the site must be fully considered in heritage impact assessment studies.

D.4.29 Interpretation and presentation should serve a wide range of conservation, educational and cultural objectives. The success of an interpretive programme should not be evaluated solely on the basis of visitor attendance figures or revenue.

D.4.30 Interpretation and presentation should be an integral part of the conservation process, enhancing the public’s awareness of specific conservation problems encountered at the site and explaining the efforts being taken to protect the site’s physical integrity and authenticity.

D.4.31 Any technical or technological elements selected to become a permanent part of a site’s interpretive infrastructure should be designed and constructed in a manner that will ensure effective and regular maintenance.

D.4.32 Interpretive programmes should aim to provide equitable and sustainable economic, social, and cultural benefits to all stakeholders through education, training and employment opportunities in site interpretation programmes.

**Principle 6: Inclusiveness**

D.4.33 The Interpretation and Presentation of cultural heritage sites must be the result of meaningful collaboration between heritage professionals, host and associated communities, and other stakeholders.

D.4.34 The multidisciplinary expertise of scholars, community members, conservation experts, governmental authorities, site managers and interpreters, tourism operators, and other professionals should be integrated in the formulation of interpretation and presentation programmes.

D.4.35 The traditional rights, responsibilities, and interests of property owners and host and associated communities should be noted and respected in the planning of site interpretation and presentation programmes.
Plans for expansion or revision of interpretation and presentation programmes should be open for public comment and involvement. It is the right and responsibility of all to make their opinions and perspectives known.

Because the question of intellectual property and traditional cultural rights is especially relevant to the interpretation process and its expression in various communication media (such as on-site multimedia presentations, digital media, and printed materials), legal ownership and right to use images, texts, and other interpretive materials should be discussed, clarified, and agreed in the planning process.

**Principle 7: Research, Training, and Evaluation**

Continuing research, training, and evaluation are essential components of the interpretation of a cultural heritage site.

The interpretation of a cultural heritage site should not be considered to be completed with the completion of a specific interpretive infrastructure. Continuing research and consultation are important to furthering the understanding and appreciation of a site’s significance. Regular review should be an integral element in every heritage interpretation programme.

The interpretive programme and infrastructure should be designed and constructed in a way that facilitates ongoing content revision and/or expansion.

Interpretation and presentation programmes and their physical impact on a site should be continuously monitored and evaluated, and periodic changes made on the basis of both scientific and scholarly analysis and public feedback. Visitors and members of associated communities as well as heritage professionals should be involved in this evaluation process.

Every interpretation programme should be considered as an educational resource for people of all ages. Its design should take into account its possible uses in school curricula, informal and lifelong learning programmes, communications and information media, special activities, events, and seasonal volunteer involvement.

The training of qualified professionals in the specialised fields of heritage interpretation and presentation, such as content creation, management, technology, guiding, and education, is a crucial objective. In addition, basic academic conservation programmes should include a component on interpretation and presentation in their courses of study.

On-site training programmes and courses should be developed with the objective of updating and informing heritage and interpretation staff of all levels and associated and host communities of recent developments and innovations in the field.

International cooperation and sharing of experience are essential to developing and maintaining standards in interpretation methods and technologies. To that end, international conferences, workshops and
exchanges of professional staff as well as national and regional meetings should be encouraged. These will provide an opportunity for the regular sharing of information about the diversity of interpretive approaches and experiences in various regions and cultures.
Appendix E Baseline Analysis

Table E.2 Baseline Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Character</td>
<td>Cultural Meanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTST</td>
<td>Although small in scale, relative to the urban metropolis of the 21st century, the Roman city of Londinium initiated 2000 years of urbanisation that has had a marked and intensifying effect on the Thames. However, culturally the Thames has been a focus of activity for at least 250,000 years, in ways that are particularly evident over the 12,000 years since the end of the last glaciation (Devensian). Knowing how the post-Devensian river evolved is essential to any understanding of how the river sustained pre-urban culture and the degree to which urbanisation has modified the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPS</td>
<td>The Thames valley downstream of Teddington comprises an increasingly wide floodplain containing a tide-dominated estuary that can be subdivided into a river dominated zone and a mixed energy (river/marine) zone of tidal meanders. The transition between these zones currently occurs around Battersea. Beyond Gravesend the estuary is marine dominated. The lower reaches of various Thames tributaries rivers share characteristics with the respective zones at the point of confluence, but are otherwise river dominated. Sea level change plays a significant part in determining the extent of the different zones, as a result the transition between river dominated and mixed energy zones may have been different in the past. An equally significant factor has been the topographic template that developed in the late Devensian. The most notable aspect of this template are the Devensian modifications to earlier gravel terraces and the deposition of the Shepperton Gravels. These influence the pattern of drainage and also define an undulating surface, with contrasting locations of higher and lower ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Much of this topographic template is now buried. The riverine character of this stretch of the Thames, and its proximity to the Tudor, Stuart and Georgian London court was to further attract numerous aristocratic riverside mansions and villas built during the 16th, 17th and early 18th centuries, often on land disposed following the Dissolution of the Monasteries between 1536 and 1541. Over this period traditional riverside communities saw a reduction in customary communal rights held since the medieval period. Established landholding families and institutions retained valuable riverside estates close to the city, as both a source of agricultural income and as increasingly formalised pleasure grounds or recreational space. As a result significant stretches of the river became socially selective places by the 18th century. In addition, from the 17th century extensive areas of intensive horticulture characterised the immediate environs of the City of Westminster, e.g. Chelsea, Fulham and Battersea (see also Central section below). The more exclusive areas were often intended to represent idealised pastoral or more formalised genteel landscapes. Although rural in character, they were nevertheless subject to the social and economic factors evident within the adjoining urban areas. In some cases, especially in the vicinity of Chelsea and Vauxhall, 18th century private pleasure grounds operated as commercial public attractions or sports venues, catering for the recreational interests of the growing urban middle class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Embedded heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAREL</strong></td>
<td>Beneath alluvial silts and clays that have accumulated over the past 12,000 years as the river evolved in response to climatic and sea level changes. These form a wedge of Holoene deposits within the floodplain which is limited in depth and extent within the river dominated zone, but becomes increasingly complex within the mixed energy zone and thicknesses downstream to reach a maximum depth of c. 35m within the marine estuary. The pre-urban river operated relatively freely within the floodplain, passing through various stages of development: from an early arrangement of multiple-channels separated by gravel bars to a single wide river channel, within which gravel islands occurred. These islands are sometimes referred to as yeots. Derived from the Old or Middle English aet, islands features as a topoyn on various riverside locations that were probably still surrounded by river water in the early middle ages, such as Bermondsey, Thorney, Chelsea, and Battersea. This dynamic of an evolving river and land prone to varying degrees of wetland formation has influenced the formation of habitats, the availability of ecosystem resources and the nature of sediment accumulation within the floodplain, all factors that have a significant effect on the occurrence of past cultural activity and the survival of archaeological evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUTEF</strong></td>
<td>Between the mid-19th century and early 20th century dramatic economic and social change remade society, along modes that would come to typify modernity. Industrialisation included both large scale urban infrastructure, in particular bridges and the MBW sewer system, and entrepreneurial manufacturing and distribution businesses, mainly serving regional markets. Both had common labour and river transport requirement. As a result purpose built wharves were constructed through further encroachment and reclamation of the riverside. Planned residential estates for workers were created on adjoining greenfield sites. The dynamics of later market globalisation and major changes in urban infrastructure meant that many of the original late 19th/early 20th century riverside business did not survive into the later years of the 20th century, e.g. T&amp;W Farmiloe (Kirtling Street), Burroughs and Wellcome (Dormay Street) is a prominent exception, going on to become a global pharmaceutical business, but only after it had relocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRMST</strong></td>
<td>Prior to the foundation of Londinium the floodplain was a permanent or temporary home to successive and multiple communities whose cultural practices no less diverse than the changing riverine environment they inhabited. One of the most notable cultural feature of the pre-urban Thames is the tradition of votive deposition that occurred from the Neolithic period through to the Iron Age, with some evidence to suggest it may have continued into the Roman period. Important objects, including highly ornamented and exquisitely crafted metalwork (e.g. Battersea Shield), were cast into the water in substantial numbers. In some instances objects had been deliberately damaged before the 1840-60s. Land with river access to the Port of London attracted substantial value and the historic estates were sold, with former landowning families taking residences in the new fashionable squares in districts such as Mayfair, but displacing communities associated with the market gardens that surrounding the city. In contrast to the riverside upstream of Brentford/Kew, where vestiges of the character of the pre-industrial riverside estates survive, the TTT west section, with few exceptions, such as Chelsea Royal Hospital/Ranelagh Gardens, was transformed from rural arcadia to industrial urban riverscape in a matter of decades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **CARRR** | Cultural Meanders Site Narrative

### Heritage Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Site Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames</td>
<td>Riverside setting at the confluence of the Beverley Brook, distant to medieval settlement foci at Barnes, Putney and Mortlake. Comprising part of the manorial Barn Elms estate held by St Paul’s Cathedral from the 14th to 17th centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms</td>
<td>Barn Elms manor house and its associated watermeadows, embankments and water features, possibly fish ponds, were leased by Elizabeth I for Sir Francis Walsingham (the Queen’s Spymaster) between 1579-1590 on his retirement as her Secretary of State. The medieval manor house was replaced with a mansion in the late 17th century and further 18th century remodelling took place during the tenure of the Hoare banking family. The estate was sold to provide land required for construction and access to the original Hammersmith Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea</td>
<td>The surviving mansion became home to the Ranelagh Polo Club (named after Ranelagh Gardens -see CREWD below) between 1878 and 1939 when the grounds were remodelled to provide polo pitches, tennis courts, golf course and croquet lawns within a parkland setting, incorporating the former fish pond as ornamental features. Following a fire the mansion was demolished in 1954 and the parkland became municipal playing fields and a sports centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Bridge</td>
<td>Riverside setting within Putney Embankment CA, a historic riverside village centre with legacy of medieval, 18th, 19th and early 20th century buildings. Historic street plan is juxtaposed against regular street plan of later residential estates. Imposing late 19th/early 20th century buildings set back from the Thames overlook the Embankment and Waterman’s Green. Site of a historic ferry crossing, with a medieval church at both ferry access points. St Marys Church, adjoining the LLAU, was venue of the 1647 ‘Putney debates’ concerning a new constitution based on principles of human rights drafted during the 1642-61 English Civil War. Ferry crossing replaced in the 18th century by a timber bridge. Current bridge designed by Sir Joseph Bazalgette in 1880s which incorporates 2 sewer outfalls. Embankment to west of LLAU has been a focal point for recreational and competitive rowing since 19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Park</td>
<td>Currently low quality brownfield land at the mouth of the Wandle to the north of historic settlement and river crossing at Wandsworth. Former wetland reclaimed in 19th century to accommodate expanding industries exploiting the water resources of the Wandle. Former industries operating from the site include malt processing, but of greatest significance is the first Burroughs and Wellcome (B&amp;W) factory, which was located on Bell Lane Wharf. Founded by businessman, collector and philanthropist Sir Henry Wellcome, B&amp;W evolved to become part of a multinational pharmaceutical company (GlaxoSmithKline) and Sir Henry established a research institute (Wellcome Trust). Both are now global drivers of innovation and research in human health and culture. Riverside setting at Sands End CA. Historic embanked ‘town meadow’ until wharfage was created for Metropolitan Asylum Board ambulance service in late 19th/early 20th century, transporting urban victims of infectious disease by paddle steamers to isolation hospital ships moored at Dartford. London Council assumed responsibility for ambulance service in 1930 ceased operations at Carwath site. Mid-20th century industrial wharves, developed, in association with former local cement works, remains active industrial concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural Meanders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded heritage</th>
<th>Site Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Interpretation Strategy</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Ref: [Subject property]</td>
<td>Uncontrolled when printed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Embedded heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Character</td>
<td>Cultural Meanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>KNGGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Meanders</td>
<td>PALPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Narrative</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Metropolitan Board of Works became the principal instrument of London-wide governance from December 1855 until it was succeeded by the GLA and the London Mayor/Assembly. The Board of Works sewer system between 1871 and 1874. When it was known as the Ranelagh Ground. The formal riverside character was extended with an esplanade when Bazalgette opened the Chelsea Embankment, constructed as part of the Metropolitan Board of Works sewer system between 1871 and 1874.

This stretch of the Thames lies within the Royal Hospital CA at the former confluence of the Tideway. Geographically and historically it is intimately linked to the early urban environmental capacity of the river on which its well-being and prosperity depended. The condition of London's urban fabric rapidly became unequal to its economic and social needs. Disraeli, writing in 1847, describes the metropolis as 'a modern Babylon', teeming with a myriad people, languages and cultures. In 1858 The Great Stink demonstrated the degree to which the metropolis was already exceeding the environmental capacity of the river on which its well-being and prosperity depended. The Metropolitan Board of Works (MBW) became the principal instrument of London-wide government from December 1855 until it was succeeded by the GLA and the London Mayor/Assembly.

From 'Babylon' to World City: Civic London

This tunnel section marks the transition from the river-dominated to the mixed energy estuary zone. Geographically and historically it is intimately linked to the early urban development of the metropolis. The City of London's origins lies in the original Roman port and administrative/commercial centre, whilst the City of Westminster foundation rests on a medieval ecclesiastical centre and later a Royal court and seat of democratic government. The Thames was central to their development, with the river providing a context for displays of authority and pageantry. Closely inter-related, each adjoining city gave rise to distinct urban entities situated on free draining locations within an extensive river wetland complex. Both areas experienced early reclamation schemes and a long history of river management, with river transport, commerce, as well as improvements to navigation, defining the timing and nature of changes to the character of the river frontage until the mid-19th century. The river and its tributaries also served an additional function as the nascent sewage disposal system.

London, by the early 17th century, was gaining an increasingly global influence. As a major European capital it was to play a significant role in the influence of people across north-west Europe and beyond in the post-Reformation upheaval. Great Britain was also establishing mercantile colonies across the Americas, Africa, Australasia and the Indian sub-continent, which included both the voluntary and involuntary intra-continental and trans-continental displacement of people. During the course of the 18th and 19th centuries London became the epicentre of a world-wide trading and mercantile empire, which attracted an influx of people of ever greater diversity.

The condition of London's urban fabric rapidly became unequal to its economic and social needs. Disraeli, writing in 1847, describes the metropolis as 'a modern Babylon', teeming with a myriad people, languages and cultures. In 1858 The Great Stink demonstrated the degree to which the metropolis was already exceeding the environmental capacity of the river on which its well-being and prosperity depended. This was the social and environmental context for two separate but inter-related changes that were to have a major effect on the character of the river. The most obvious involved the state-led creation of the Metropolitan Board of Works, as an institution of local governance with a mandate to resolve London's infrastructure needs. This was the means by which the current drainage infrastructure and the Thames Embankments were created under the auspices of its Chief Engineer, Sir Joseph Bazalgette.

However, beyond the relatively compact historic urban core the implications of post-Reformation population mobility was post-Reformation urbanisation and the development of intensive market gardens and osier beds at Nine Elms. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city.

The Royal Hospital and Ranelagh Gardens have hosted the Royal Horticultural Great Spring (Chelsea Flower Show) show since 1913. Formerly historic riverside wetlands and open strip fields held by medieval Westminster Abbey that formed part of the main arable areas of the medieval parish centred on Battersea. 17th-century records of a windmill at the site reflect the prevalence of commercial agriculture at riverside lands in the immediate environs of the cities of Westminster and London.

The arrival of Flemish Protestants and French Huguenot refugees from the mid-16th century influenced the development of intensive market gardens and osier beds at Nine Elms. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city.

From the 17th century Christopher Wren's Chelsea Hospital has cared for pensioned military personnel within a highly formalised parkland setting. The adjoining Ranelagh Gardens are a legacy of Ranelagh House, built in 1688-89 by the first Earl of Ranelagh, Treasurer of Chelsea Hospital (1685–1702), which was demolished in 1805. In the mid-18th century Ranelagh Gardens were open to the public as a commercial pleasure garden, containing various attractions such as the Rotunda, a venue for music recitals. The Rotunda witnesses a performance by nine year old Mozart and helped popularised the European masquerade ball among the middle-class English public. The Rotunda and garden, the subject of a number of paintings by Canaletto, was re-designed in the 19th century by John Gibson, an apprentice to Joseph Paxton, who also was the first superintendent of Battersea Park. The gardens were a venue for Fulham Football Club in 1896-8, when it was known as the Ranelagh Ground. The formal riverside character was extended with an esplanade when Bazalgette opened the Chelsea Embankment, constructed as part of the Metropolitan Board of Works sewer system between 1871 and 1874.

The Royal Hospital and Ranelagh Gardens have been the Royal Horticultural Great Spring (Chelsea Flower Show) show since 1913. Formerly historic riverside wetlands and open strip fields held by medieval Westminster Abbey that formed part of the main arable areas of the medieval parish centred on Battersea. 17th-century records of a windmill at the site reflect the prevalence of commercial agriculture at riverside lands in the immediate environs of the cities of Westminster and London.

The arrival of Flemish Protestants and French Huguenot refugees from the mid-16th century influenced the development of intensive market gardens and osier beds at Nine Elms. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city. Battersea was a major supplier of fresh vegetables, notably asparagus (known as 'Battersea bundles'), to the nearby city.
**Heritage Character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Cultural Meanders</th>
<th>Site Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>London County Council in March 1889. From 1877</strong></td>
<td><strong>By the 18th century London’s market gardens not only provisioning the urban centre, it also assisted in the relatively safe metabolising of organic waste generated by the expanding urban population. A need for a continuous supply of organic fertiliser supported large scale ancillary river transport services removing and delivering urban waste, including animal dung and human effluent. It was also serviced by a social underclass, including night-soil men, who are vividly chronicled by social reformers such as Henry Mayhew and Charles Dickens.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shortly after the construction of the original Battersea Bridge in 1770s the stretch of the river downstream was reclaimed to create timber wet docks and wharves incorporating a new river wall, with barge beds located on the foreshore. Further industrial transformation came when, in the late 19th to early 20th century, the docks were infilled to accommodate new manufacturing enterprises.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As well as constructing the main drainage system, the MBW instigated a wide range of urban infrastructure modernisations that affected the operation of the river and London more widely. This was concurrent with social and economic transformations associated with industrialisation, and helped prepare the metropolis for the onset of modernity. Improvements in transport infrastructure included the creation of new thoroughfares that reduced congestion. Also private bridges spanning the Thames came within its jurisdiction, allowing the removal of tolls, a programme for re-building those no longer adequate (Putney Bridge, Battersea Bridge, Waterloo Bridge and Hamme rsmith Bridge) and works to strengthen others.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apart from assisting in the sustainable management of population growth, horticulture was a pioneering economic activity that led to a transformation of the riverside that extended beyond the pre-18th century urban core. Early small scale plots on marginal land gave way to extensive orchards and gardens on what had been cheap, poorly protected land vulnerable to flooding. By investing in flood defence and drainage improvements horticulture created a new supply of land that would prove equally suitable for London’s 19th century industrial development. Eventually escalating land values reached levels beyond those market garden leaseholds could sustain, leading to the economic demise of large scale local food production in London. Ironically, food processing was to form a significant aspect of the industrial enterprises that took its place.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Located within lowland meadows near the mouth of the Battersea channel, evidence of Mesolithic structures and Bronze Age structures are exposed in eroding peats and silts that infilled the channel.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>These achievements were a mark of the degree to which the MWB provided an effective voice for the civic interests of Londoners in the face of powerful vested interests. This is illustrated by the outcome of disputes with the Crown that spanned a decade during the construction of the Victoria Embankment. The MWB’s jurisdiction over the riverside was initially challenged by the Crown in 1862, who claimed there would be a loss of amenity to the river frontage adjoining its properties. This claim was not sustained, but in 1870 the Crown again sought to assert rights to develop part of the reclaimed land following construction of the Embankment, which had been achieved entirely at taxpayer expense. This claim was eventually resolved in 1872 following a strong public response in support of the MWB insistence that the Embankment should be protected for the recreational benefit of Londoners.</strong></td>
<td><strong>This economic power of industry was to lead to even greater levels of investment in the riverside, with the creation of wharves and docks and a wide range of subsidiary services, such as barge building. In many instances, what started out as family companies or start-up enterprises, were to develop into major international concerns through the ability to reach global markets via the port of London.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Located at the confluence of the Tyburn, the former river separating Thorney Island, the location of the medieval Palace and Abbey of Westminster, from the gravel ridge that forms The Strand, which was the site of the middle Saxon port and by the 16th century was dominated by aristocratic residential riverside houses, part of the Crown estate. By the early 19th century the river frontage had been extended and was occupied by numerous wharves.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bazalgette’s Victorian sewer system is exceptional in its scale, its use of steam driven pumping technology, the fact that it was retrofitted to a major urban entity and employed a range of groundbreaking technical engineering innovations. These are all standards of a remarkable achievement. It was, however, based on river management principles that had preceded it and has been responsible for the medieval reclamation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bazalgette’s Victorian sewer system is exceptional in its scale, its use of steam driven pumping technology, the fact that it was retrofitted to a major urban entity and employed a range of groundbreaking technical engineering innovations. These are all standards of a remarkable achievement. It was, however, based on river management principles that had preceded it and has been responsible for the medieval reclamation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Located at the mouth of the Fleet, which separated the City of London, site of the Roman and Medieval port, from the medieval Inns of Court and legal quarter of London.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HEAPS**

**ALBEF**

**VCETF**

**BLABF**

**Appendices**

**Heritage Interpretation Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Strategy 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Ref [Subject property]</td>
<td>Uncontrolled when printed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic reclaimed land to the north and east of the Horsleydown eyot, adjoining the mouth of the Neckinger. Horsleydown was part of the land held by the Cluniac Abbey of Bermondsey, who established St Saviour’s Dock at the mouth of the Neckinger. The Abbey surrendered their possessions to Henry VIII in 1537. Development of the Bermondsey riverside intensified in the late 17th century, with the creation of new riverside wharves and warehouses alongside earlier boatyards. This involved reclamation of the intertidal areas such as the site that later became the pumping station.

Following the dissolution of Bermondsey Abbey its estate was acquired c1541 by Sir Thomas Pope, founder of Trinity College Oxford and a close associate of both Thomas More and Thomas Cromwell. Pope’s personal wealth benefited from his time as treasurer and second officer of the institution set up to manage the property of religious houses annexed by the Crown during the dissolution.

Formerly riverside wetlands on the north margins of Bermondsey eyot, to the west of the mouth of the Neckinger. Fish weirs dating to Saxon period are recorded at this site. Bermondsey Wall represents the former riverside wetlands on the north margins of Bermondsey eyot, to the west of the mouth of the Neckinger.

Pre-industrial and industrial communities of the Thames have been engaged in shipbuilding. There are relatively few records of the Thames shipbuilding industry before the 16th century. However, it seems probable that shipyards were already established beyond the city by the 11th and 12th centuries. The establishment of Tudor naval ship yards at Deptford and Woolwich was transformative and between 1512 and 1915 Thames shipbuilding became a major industry. It reached its apogee with the construction of its largest ship, Brunel’s Great Eastern, which had a 27,000 tons displacement on its launch in 1858. In those four centuries, some 5,000 ships were launched into the Thames from the Royal Dockyards at Deptford and Woolwich, and from the many private shipyards along its banks. In contrast to ship building the role of the Thames fisheries follows a different trajectory, being diminished in importance as industrialisation of the Thames intensified. Foreshore remains of Roman and Saxon fish traps are evidence for precursors to the medieval fisheries based on Thames populations of smelt, salmon and eel. These fisheries operated on an increasingly commercial scale until the late 18th century and included the export of eels to the Dutch. In addition North Sea fishing fleets supplying the city operated from Thames ports such as Barking between the 15th and 19th centuries.

Although still within the mixed energy estuary zone, this tunnel section correlates to the length of the river subject to the strongest marine influences. It is part of the historic Pool of London and is most intimately connected to London’s strong maritime traditions. Improvements in transportation and communication, schemes that for centuries protected land alongside the tidal Thames. The construction of river walls to protect land from tidal flood, the adaptation of existing natural tributary drainage features to carry water away from the land and the creation of channels to intercept and collect surface water are all features broadly common to both the pre-industrial and industrial systems of water management employed on the Thames. This longevity and continuity of cultural practices is also associated with the other notable river traditions, such as ship-building and fishing, although each responds differently to the transformative effects of 19th century industrialisation.

The discovery of Roman, medieval and 17th century ships that had sunk at the entrance to the inlet. By the early 19th century the river frontage had been extended and was occupied by numerous wharves. Historic reclaimed land to the north and east of the Horsleydown eyot, adjoining the mouth of the Neckinger. Horsleydown was part of the land held by the Cluniac Abbey of Bermondsey, who established St Saviour’s Dock at the mouth of the Neckinger. The Abbey surrendered their possessions to Henry VIII in 1537. Development of the Bermondsey riverside intensified in the late 17th century, with the creation of new riverside wharves and warehouses alongside earlier boatyards. This involved reclamation of the intertidal areas such as the site that later became the pumping station.

Improvments in transportation and communication, schemes that for centuries protected land alongside the tidal Thames. The construction of river walls to protect land from tidal flood, the adaptation of existing natural tributary drainage features to carry water away from the land and the creation of channels to intercept and collect surface water are all features broadly common to both the pre-industrial and industrial systems of water management employed on the Thames. This longevity and continuity of cultural practices is also associated with the other notable river traditions, such as ship-building and fishing, although each responds differently to the transformative effects of 19th century industrialisation.

The ‘Shipping Parishes’ - Gateway to the World.

Downstream of the City of London the principal medieval riparian landowners were monastic institutions, including abbeys at St Mary Graces at Tower Hill, Bermondsey, Stratford Langthorne, Barking and St Peter’s of Ghent at Greenwich. These played a key role in creating flood defences and reclaiming the more vulnerable stretches of the floodplain. The value of this land as pasture formed the main economic source of wealth sustaining the monasteries, although the creation of St Saviour’s Dock may have also contributed to the income of Bermondsey Abbey.

Secular communities along the riverside, such as Erith, Woolwich, Ratcliff, Deptford, Greenwich, Rotherhithe and Bermondsey are associated with the earlier medieval associations was revealed in the 1960/70s with the discovery of Roman, medieval and 17th century ships that had sunk at the entrance to the inlet. By the early 19th century the river frontage had been extended and was occupied by numerous wharves. Historic reclaimed land to the north and east of the Horsleydown eyot, adjoining the mouth of the Neckinger. Horsleydown was part of the land held by the Cluniac Abbey of Bermondsey, who established St Saviour’s Dock at the mouth of the Neckinger. The Abbey surrendered their possessions to Henry VIII in 1537. Development of the Bermondsey riverside intensified in the late 17th century, with the creation of new riverside wharves and warehouses alongside earlier boatyards. This involved reclamation of the intertidal areas such as the site that later became the pumping station.
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### Heritage Interpretation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Heritage Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Cultural Meanders</th>
<th>Site Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as well as economic and technological advances, have reduced the commercial viability of the Thames shipbuilding and fishing traditions and even the 19th and 20th century manufacturing industries are greatly diminished. In contrast the need to continue to protect property within the evolving and expanding World City means that river management remains a prime consideration, as illustrated by the construction of the Thames Barrier, which has operated since 1982. The Tideway Tunnel is a 21st century solution that sustains the viability of the Victorian main drainage system, which itself applied principles of land improvement that medieval riparian landowners employed in commercial enterprises that contributed to the growth of urban London, through the provision of commodities, the generation of capital and by protecting land resources that gave scope for later urban expansion. The demise of historic prohibitive or commercial riparian activities, Tideway’s improvements to water quality, alongside with transformative programmes of post-industrial regeneration of the riverside, present an historic opportunity for expanding access to river resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipbuilding on the Thames took a major step forward, with the founding of the Royal Docks at Deptford and Woolwich and by the release of land suitable for shipbuilding following the dissolution of the monasteries (1536-41), both instigated by Henry VIII. They also played a significant scientific role in 16th century development of navigation and exploration. An early exponent of scientific navigations was John Dee, resident of Mortlake, who advised various merchant adventurer expeditions departing from Ratcliff. Dee was a leading occultist, geographical adviser and advocate of the concept of a British Empire. He proposed that maritime dominance, colonization of new lands, and exploitation of mineral resources, were the key to England gaining the power to withstand or challenge Spain. Brytaniæ Impenræ Limites (The Limits of the British Empire), written late in the 1570s, outlined Dee’s belief in Queen Elizabeth’s power over most of the seas and a large amount of land in the northern hemisphere, claims he presented to Queen Elizabeth and her ministers in 1580. In 1584, Queen Elizabeth granted Sir Walter Raleigh a royal charter, authorizing the colonisation and rule of any “remote, heathen and barbarous lands, countries, and territories, not actually possessed of any Christian Prince, or inhabited by Christian People.” Raleigh despatched an expedition from Blackwall, which establish the Roanoke Colony in 1587, in what is today Dare County, North Carolina. Also known as the “lost colony”, it had failed by 1590, and the first permanent English colony of Virginia was founded nearby in 1601, under the expedition led by John Ratcliffe, which also departed from Blackwall. This marked the start of an aggressive expansion of British sovereignty that was to continue over the subsequent three centuries. From the 17th century shipbuilding on the Thames increasingly reflects Britain’s expanding mercantile interests, as illustrated by the construction of shipyards by the East India Dock and others. Local ship building concerns helped establish expanded riverside communities at Bermondsey and Rotherhithe. Various local commercial interests relied on the mercantile trades, including processing of sugar, coffee and tobacco, luxury commodities linked to the Atlantic slave trade. The early rapid development of Thames-side wharves and warehouses was served by maze of narrow streets lined with tightly packed rows of workers’ houses, interspersed with larger and grander houses for merchants and dock officials. By the early 19th century the dock economy was a fundamental influence on the physical and social structure of the area, reflecting the importance of the Port of London and the British Empire. Massive warehouses were known as London’s ‘Larders’: every variety of food, estimated to amount to three-quarters of London’s imported provisions, was stored in Bermondsey Riverside. Often, the ships took a human cargo back with them on their return journey. For example in the 18th century, south German Protestants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic to work in the West Indies sugar plantations. Successive phases of reclamation of the intertidal area was associated with creation of new riverside wharves and warehouses until the early 20th century when the current dock was constructed. Former floodplain wetlands to the south east of the Rotherhithe eyot. Early post-glacial wetlands comprised a mosaic of lakes, marsh and streams and a diverse range of successional habitats. Land was reclaimed in the medieval period, partly drained by the Earl Sluice, a former channel that bisected the site and marked the historic parish and county boundary. 17th century and later impacts of urbanisation contrast to that experienced along the riverside. Encroachment began when docks were constructed to the south of Rotherhithe in late 17th century were further expanded during the 18th century. The site remained in agricultural use until the mid-19th century development of industrial housing to the north west of the Earl Sluice and a chemical works to the south east. Residential expansion, the culverting of the Earl Sluice and the replacement of the chemical works with recreational space in the late 19th/early 20th century preceded housing clearance for the construction of the Earl Pumping Station in the 1940s. The nearby Greenland Dock, formerly known as the Howland Great Wet Dock, is one of the earliest enclosed docks within the historic Port of London. Built 1695-99 and later renamed Greenland Dock, it was expanded at the beginning of the 20th century. Originally used to refit East India Company merchant ships, from the early 18th century the dock was the berth and processing plant for the London’s Arctic whaling fleet, which operated off the Atlantic coast of Norway and Greenland. Whaling was an important economic activity between the 16th-19th centuries. Initially operating under a charter of Elizabeth I, the Port of London whaling fleet played a leading role in the commercial exploitation in cetacean resources. It became commercially unviable in the early 18th century due to overexploitation and a decline in the market for whale oil following the development of chemical and petro-chemical alternatives. Deptford High Street in the early 16th century was a rural location north of the Saxon settlement established alongside a Roman road adjoining a crossing at the head of the tidal Ravensbourne (Deptford Broadway). Further north, the medieval riverside settlement at Deptford Strand on the site of a Saxon predecessor and centred on St Nicholas Church, was transformed when Henry VIII established a royal dockyard in 1513 and when further shipyards were built by the East India Company at the beginning of the 17th century. Over the next three centuries Deptford became ‘a military-industrial satellite’ settlement. Its rapid growth resulted in a population that by 1700 almost equalled Bristol. A petition to the New Churches Commission for a second church at Deptford was accepted in 1711 and the new parish of St Paul's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Embedded heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Character</td>
<td>Cultural Meanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>River</strong></td>
<td><strong>CREPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Meanders</strong></td>
<td>Fleeting persecution were housed at Hay's Wharf before taking ship for America. A need for increased port capacity was met by the construction of enclosed docks on either side of the Thames. These included West India Docks (1802), East India Docks (1803, originating from the Brunswick Dock of 1796), London Docks (1799-1815), Surrey Commercial Docks (1807, originating from the Howland Great Wet Dock of 1699), St Katharine Docks (1828), Royal Victoria Dock (1855), Millwall Dock (1868), Royal Albert Dock (1880), and Tilbury Docks (1886). The London Docks are a typical example of an enclosed dock and were built to the design of the architects and engineers Daniel Asher Alexander and John Rennie. There are over 30 acres of grassed and landscaped gardens, consisting of Western and Eastern docks linked by the short Tobacco Dock. The Western Dock was connected to the Thames by Hermitage Basin to the south west and Wapping Basin to the south. The Eastern Dock connected to the Thames via the Shadwell Basin to the east. Apart from the expanding port, land that had previously been market garden or historic grazing marsh was also taken for the large scale manufacturing and food processing industries that relied on the port import/export facilities. Tinned food was first canned by Bryan Donkin in 1811 at Bermondsey. A roll-call of leading food brands operating at Bermondsey from the late 19th century, often producing secondary commodities based on the established sugar refining capacity, include Crosse &amp; Blackwell, Pearce Duff, Liptons, Peek Frean and Courage Brewery. The advent of steam meant bigger and bigger steamships. The railway network revolutionised cargo distribution. Free trade and the liberalisation of port legislation also allowed many other ports to open up and take business away from London. Whilst the Second World War saw a period of intense use, in the 1960s the inability of the older parts of the Port of London to compete with the expanding container ports downstream became rapidly evident. The arrival of containerised shipping and a new preference for road transportation from the docks was ill suited to the traditional urban port. It led to a rapid decline in commercial traffic into the city port. Commercial shipping was rapidly driven out of the upper tidal reaches of the Thames and by the 1970s commercial river activity was virtually dead. <strong>Site Narrative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the command of Sir Hugh Willoughby to seek a north east sea route via the Arctic to China and India. Willoughby, with two thirds of his company, perished in the Norwegian sea. His navigator, Richard Chancellor, managed to reach Archangel and travel on to Moscow where he negotiated a company trading agreement with Tsar Ivan the Terrible.

Sir Martin Frobisher, who was later knighted for his service in repelling the Spanish Armada in 1588, also prepared at Ratcliff for voyages undertaken 1576-78 seeking the north west passage, which resulted in exploration of north eastern Canada.

Both Wiloughby and the Frobisher were advised by the mathematician, astronomer and geographer John Dee, advisor to Queen Elizabeth I. He put navigation and scientific knowledge acquired from studies in Europe at the service of the 1553 expedition and, as a result, became a scientific adviser to the Muscovy Company. Dee was again brought in as an adviser in 1576 and gave a crash-course to Frobisher, Hall and others in the mathematical science of navigation and was an adviser on the smelting of iron ore, which Frobisher planned to exploit in order to finance the expedition.

In 1649 the Dean and Chapter sold the drained marshes and in 1665 Thomas Neale developed a waterworks on the site of the former drainage/mill ponds. He also created a new riverside settlement west of Ratcliffe that became known as Lower Shadwell, which included St Paul's Church, built in 1656. Chiefly inhabited by professions and trades connected with shipping, St Paul's became known as the 'mariner's church'. Seventy five sea captains and their wives were buried in the grounds between 1725-95. Other notable people associated with the church include Captain James Cook, whose eldest son was baptised there in 1763. Also Jane Rudolph, mother of Thomas Jefferson, American Founding Father and principal author of the Declaration of Independence, was baptised at the church in 1718.

The construction of the second of London's enclosed docks in 1805, on the site of Neale's waterworks and adjoining land, transformed Shadwell. Its riverside communities suffered overcrowding and displacement, with dock labourers replacing sea captains. The docks continued to dominate the area and in 1904-08 the Rotherhithe tunnel was constructed to carry foot and horse-drawn traffic between the docks on either side of the river.

In 1922 the London County Council realised the creation of a park to commemorate the reign of George VII. First considered by committee established by parliament in 1910 the construction was delayed by WWI. Many of Shadwell's streets and buildings were cleared, including the derelict fish market which had been established under powers conferred on a private company in 1882 and transferred with adjacent property to the City Corporation in 1901.

The Royal Foundation of St Katherine adjoins Bekesbourne. Created in 1147, the Foundation has benefited from the royal patronage of the female monarch for over 850 years, administering religious and charitable services to the poor of East London. This role of the Queen and the social welfare of East London had particular resonance during the Second World War.

Founded by Queen Matilda, the wife of King Stephen, the founding Charter described the Foundation as, "My hospital next to the Tower of London", which she placed in the custody of the Priory of the Holy Trinity at Aldgate. Queen Eleanor granted a new Charter in 1273 stipulating that the Foundation was to be in the patronage of the Queens of England.

The duties of the Foundation lay in celebrating Mass and in serving the poor infirm in the Hospital. At the
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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beginning of the 18th century the Foundation also provided charity schools for both boys and girls.

Having survived both the 16th Reformation and the 17th puritan Protectorate, the Church and Hospital was demolished in 1825 to make way for an extension to St Katherine’s Dock, which was opened in 1828. George IV’s estranged wife, Queen Caroline, had died in 1821 and the Foundation was without a Queen Patron at this crucial time. It was the King who agreed to the destruction.

Consequently, the Foundation was removed to a new site in Regents Park at the time when it was needed most in East London. The nineteenth century saw a rapid deterioration in the district. The squalid conditions led to frequent outbreaks of disease and in 1866 there was a cholera epidemic. Father Lowder, working among the poor in the new church of St Peter’s, London Docks, in Wapping, struggling to raise money for food and medical supplies as the people of its old area were dying of starvation or lack of medicines, looked bitterly at St. Katharine’s with its large endowments. Whilst several attempts were made by the clergy of Stepney to obtain the benefit of St. Katharine’s endowments, the Foundation in Regents Park remained "a kind of aristocratic Almshouse".

It was not until 1914 that St. Katharine’s funds were put to more appropriate use. The Foundation’s two functions, of worship and charitable works, were separated and funds transferred to the Royal College of St. Katharine, which was set up by Queen Alexandra, the widow of Edward VII, to undertake welfare work in Poplar. After the Second World War the future of the Foundation was once more reconsidered, and under the patronage of Queen Mary, the widow of George V, it was reconstituted in 1948 as the Royal Foundation of St. Katharine and returned to its home area, its two functions of worship and service to the community once more united.

The Foundation moved to the blitzed site of St. James Ratcliff. The surviving Georgian manor-house Vicarage became the Master’s House. In 1952 a new Royal Chapel was built in a plain modern style, incorporating carved wooden stalls and Jacobean pulpit from the previous Foundation church. New accommodation was also built for conferences and retreats, forming a villa shaped complex with the Chapel and Old Vicarage. In 2002 renovation and extension of the retreat and conference facilities was undertaken and the Chapel re-ordered in memory of Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother, for 49 years Patron and friend of the Foundation.

The Chapel of 1951, a simple brick-faced portal frame monument to post-war austerity is important in the history of English architecture, housing, as it did, exceptional fittings preserved from earlier sites, alongside more radical furnishings of its time. Fine medieval and modern wood carving is juxtaposed to the great slate altar of 1951; the modern glass rose windows by Alan Younger FMGP cast light onto finely preserved carvings of the 14th century; a modern Christus looks down on Sir Julius Caesar’s pulpit and a chamber organ dating from the 18th century.

The Foundation now provides conference and accommodation facilities more suited to contemporary ecclesiastical needs and ministers to the changing facets of East London life and beyond.

The site is located between the Channelsea River and the Three Mills Walls River, both elements of the multi-channelled tidal Stratford Back Rivers, fed by the River Lee. Elongated ‘islands’ separating the river channels are a characteristic feature.

This natural tidal drainage system was easily adapted to power early watermills, with five recorded in the Lower Lee in the 11th century Domesday Book. The Lower Lee was formerly part of the estates held by
### Heritage Character
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| BESTW | the Abbey of Stratford Langthorne, founded in 1135. Prone to flooding, the estate was reclaimed to create economically productive medieval grazing marsh that the Abbey drained and protected in tandem with operating tidal mills at Three Mills. The medieval Abbey Mill was separately owned by Barking Abbey, as an endowment to support the maintenance of the Bow and Channelsea bridges. Further expansion of the medieval mills followed the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538/39, with products including gunpowder and grain for gin distilleries.  
Building A, known as the 'cathedral of sewage', was constructed from 1865-8, initially by the engineer Sir Joseph Bazalgette to the designs of the architect Charles Driver, for the Metropolitan Board of Works' Main Drainage Project. It is an exotic hybrid of architectural styles with elements drawn from the Byzantine, Italian Gothic and Russian Orthodox schools. It was originally set within formally landscaped gardens and a series of semi-detached workers’ cottages on Abbey Road are contemporary with the main pumping station (1865) and designed in a similar Gothic derived style.  
Building B was originally built in 1891-6 to deal with flows from the Isle of Dogs branch sewer and diverted flows from the West Ham pumping station. Building C was originally a gas engine house built during 1910-14. Building D was built in 1970-1 to divert flows from West Ham to Abbey Mills and to pump storm water to Abbey Creek.  
Building F, a replacement principal pumping station, was constructed during the 1990s on the north bank of the Channelsea River. The contemporary design is in stark contrast to the highly ornamented appearance of the 19th century complex.  
Located to the east of Barking Creek, the tidal inlet formed by the mouth of the River Roding the site is more typical of the lower reaches of the Thames beyond the immediate influence of urban London.  
Up to 10m of Holocene deposits seal a basal floodplain complex of undulating gravel surfaces and infilled channels. These deposits provide a high resolution record of local environmental change linked to sea level change and cultural activity for a period of c12k years, i.e. the Mesolithic through to the medieval period.  
By the late middle ages the site formed part of the extensive marshland holdings of the nearby Stratford Langthorne and Barking Abbeys. The historic grazing marshes in the lower reaches of the Thames were especially prone to inundation, despite the extensive infrastructure of earthen flood embankments and drainage systems. Piecemeal recovery was still continuing in the early 16th century following two or more powerful storm surges in the 1370s. A pragmatic adaptation to the changing environment is evident, as the Abbey’s economic interests shifting from farming to the licensing of fishing weirs or kiddles placed in the flooded marshes.  
Permanent reclamation occurred as a consequence of London’s increasing demand for cheap land suitable for large scale industries and its need to provide waste management infrastructure during its rapid expansion in the mid-19th century. Up to 5m of made ground deposits raised the land above the level of the vulnerable historic grazing marsh on which gas works, etc. were constructed, completely transforming the character of the riverside. |  |
### Appendix F – Opportunities and Constraints

#### F.1 Site Specific Heritage Asset Associations

Table F.3 – Site specific heritage asset associations (refer to relevant Tideway ES volume for additional asset descriptions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Designated Heritage Assets</th>
<th>Non-designated Heritage Assets</th>
<th>Archaeology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAMPS</td>
<td>Fulham Reach CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winslow Road APA Saxon settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caselnau CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17th century brick and glass making industries associated with Brandenburg House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hammersmith Bridge Grade II*</td>
<td>listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parr Ditch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locally listed buildings;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Hammersmith Pumping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 to 64 Chancellor’s Road,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and St Mark’s Church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAREL</th>
<th>Fulham Reach CA</th>
<th>Barn Elms Park</th>
<th>Barnes Common APA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishops Park CA</td>
<td>Barn Elms School Sports Centre Grounds</td>
<td>Barn Elm Plane Tree, London's oldest and largest plane tree</td>
<td>Palaeo-environmental remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eyot between the Thames and Beverley Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Age settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUTEF</th>
<th>Putney Embankment CA</th>
<th>Putney Embankment</th>
<th>Neolithic to Roman settlement remains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putney Bridge grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely Saxon settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group of 5 grade II listed bollards on Putney Embankment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval crossing point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Church grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brick vaults associated with Putney Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locally listed buildings: Star and Garter Hotel; Star and Garter Mansions; and Richmond Mansions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A: Heritage Interpretation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Site</th>
<th>Interpretation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRMST</strong> Wandsworth Town CA</td>
<td><strong>19th century river wall</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Wentworth House grade II listed building</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>19th century causeway wall</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>19th century cobbled granite setts</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Armoury public house&lt;br&gt;<strong>19th/20th century barge bed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARRR</strong> Sands End CA</td>
<td><strong>Wandsworth Bridge</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Wandsworth Park grade II registered park and garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Prehistoric activity&lt;br&gt;<strong>19th century West Wharf ambulance centre of the Metropolitan Asylums Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNGGP</strong> Down Lodge grade II listed building</td>
<td><strong>King George Park</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Palaeo-environmental evidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;River Wandle APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALPS</strong> 100-112 York Road formerly part of Price’s Candle Factory</td>
<td><strong>Falcon Brook palaeo-environmental evidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;APA defining the potential of the prehistoric and historic floodplain of the Thames along the Wandsworth riverside&lt;br&gt;Post-medieval remains of the early 20th century Falconbrook pumping station and cellars of mid 19th century terraced housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREWD</th>
<th>Thames CA</th>
<th>Lots Road Power Station</th>
<th>Palaeo-environmental evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots Road Pumping Station grade II listed building</td>
<td>Chelsea Wharf</td>
<td>Prehistoric evidence – higher dry ground and wetland/floodplain fringes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19th century Cremorne Pier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19th century river wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counter’s Creek 19th century sewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEEF</th>
<th>Royal Hospital CA</th>
<th>River Westbourne</th>
<th>Neolithic silty peat deposits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>19th century CSO outfall apron of the Ranelagh Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Hospital of Chelsea Grade I listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranelagh Gardens Grade II registered park and garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Battersea Park Grade II* registered park and garden and CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Embankment river wall Grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chelsea Bridge Grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bull Ring Gate Grade II listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Interpretation Strategy</td>
<td>Document Ref [Subject property]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td>Uncontrolled when printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MBW sewer ventilation column</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEAPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin Square CA</td>
<td>Views of Heritage Value as set out in the ES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico CA</td>
<td>Tide Mill Dock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Gardens CA</td>
<td>South Western Storm Relief Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea Power Station grade II*</td>
<td>Post-medieval wall possibly surviving boundary wall of industrial buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALBEF</strong></td>
<td>Thames floodplain APA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace of Westminster WHS</td>
<td>Palaeo-environmental or Archaeological deposits within alluvium associated with the Battersea Channel and the River Effra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment CA</td>
<td>Saxon activity on the foreshore including fishtraps and land reclamation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Dock Wharf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial buildings from the 18th century onwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piled jetties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesolithic Roundwood structure and peat deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Interpretation Strategy 118</td>
<td>Document Ref [Subject property]</td>
<td>Uncontrolled when printed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Millbank CA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Palace CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Square CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Bridge grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment river wall, lamp standards and benches, all grade II listed structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VCTEF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace of Westminster WHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazalgette’s grade II listed Victoria Embankment river wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Joseph Bazalgette memorial grade II listed structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catenary lamp standards grade II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential early medieval ferry crossing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Ludenwic and Thorney Island ASAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattershall Castle Registered Historic Ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London plane trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Tyburn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Strategy 119</td>
<td>Document Ref [Subject property]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listed structures</td>
<td>Grade II listed benches with sphinx and camel design</td>
<td>Victoria Embankment Gardens grade II* registered park and gardens</td>
<td>Ministry of Defence grade I listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLABF</td>
<td>Whitefriars CA</td>
<td>The President Registered Historic Ship Bazelgette’s No. 1 lower level sewer</td>
<td>River Fleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temples CA</td>
<td>Former London Fire Brigade Pump House</td>
<td>Roman, medieval and post-medieval shipwrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bank CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Barge House CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unilever House grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sion College grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of London School grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton House grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncontrolled when printed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Interpretation Strategy 120</th>
<th>Victoria Embankment grade II listed building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benches with sphinx and camel design grade II listed structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River wall and sturgeon lamps grade II listed structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge grade II listed building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHTPS</th>
<th>Tower Bridge CA</th>
<th>St Saviours Dock CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheat Wharf grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anise Warehouse grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shad Thames Pumping Station and Superintendents House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough, Bermondsey and River Archaeological Priority Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th to 19th century riverside warehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPCS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford High Street CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Church grade I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Churchyard walls grade II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncontrolled when printed
## Heritage Interpretation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Area</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Strategy 122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREPS</strong></td>
<td>Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site</td>
<td>London and Greenwich Railway and lifting bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creekside CA</td>
<td>London Electric Supply Corporation Substation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashburnham Triangle CA</td>
<td>Bazalgette sewage infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich Pumping Station, two Beam Houses and linking Boiler House grade II listed buildings</td>
<td>Brick chimney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two Coal Houses grade II listed buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Rail viaduct grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected London Panorama from Blackheath to St Paul's Cathedral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEMPF</strong></td>
<td>Wapping Wall CA</td>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherhithe Tunnel airshaft grade II listed building</td>
<td>Sir Hugh Willoughby, Stephen Borough, William Borough, Sir Martin Frobisher Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Paul's Church grade II* listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEKES</th>
<th>St Paul’s Terrace grade II listed building</th>
<th>structures and industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABMPS</td>
<td>Three Mills CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbey Mills Pumping Station buildings grade II* listed buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow Gasholders grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channelsea River Bridge (carries the Northern Outfall Sewer) grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Ham Pumping Station grade II listed building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESTW</td>
<td>Sewage treatment works chimney grade II listed building</td>
<td>Thames floodplain APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Outfall Sewer (embankment and ‘Greenway’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Lee, Prescott Channel, Channelsea River and Abbey Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palaeo-environmental remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prehistoric occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F.2 Public realm and interpretation opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description of proposals for permissive public realm sites</th>
<th>Long-term ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTST</td>
<td>No permissive public realm</td>
<td>Operational Thames Water Site no public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAMPS</td>
<td>No permissive public realm</td>
<td>Operational Thames Water Site no public access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAREL</td>
<td>Landscape features</td>
<td>Thames Water to own assets only and maintenance rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUTEF</td>
<td>New permanent platform that could become permissive public open space</td>
<td>Foreshore area under TWUL ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRMST</td>
<td>No permissive public realm</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARRR</td>
<td>New riverside walkway</td>
<td>Under Thames Water ownership (long lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New permissive public realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KNGGP</td>
<td>New hard-standing area with ventilation column.</td>
<td>Hard-standing and kiosk area under Thames Water ownership (150 year long lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-modelling of soft landscaping and paths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New depression (700mm deep) for flood mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown roof on kiosk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALPS</td>
<td>Above-ground project mostly within pumping station compound</td>
<td>Thames Water will retain ownership of pumping station area and retain access to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New landscaping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Heritage Interpretation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREWD</th>
<th>Half permissive public realm, half TWUL operational site</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intertidal terrace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped area to Bull Ring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEEF</td>
<td>New foreshore including planting, seating, ventilation columns and electrical and control kiosks.</td>
<td>Foreshore area under TWUL ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ‘Bull Ring’ is owned by the local highway authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTST</td>
<td>Landscaping within the highway.</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the public realm of the Thames Path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPS</td>
<td>Mixture of existing and new foreshore</td>
<td>Thames Water under a 150 year lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the overall site is a Thames Water operational site, but just Middle Wharf is in Thames Water ownership.</td>
<td>Foreshore area under TWUL ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new foreshore is mostly a concrete structure with LED light strips.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBEF</td>
<td>2 new foreshore structures: extension of existing and alterations to existing walkway.</td>
<td>New foreshore areas under Thames Water ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lockable gates to circular foreshore structure to prevent public access/use, for security reasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Interpretation Strategy</th>
<th>Subject property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New shaft structure including</strong></td>
<td><strong>VCTEF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Path, planting, seating,</td>
<td>New foreshore development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ventilation columns and electrical</td>
<td>Granite finishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and control kiosks</td>
<td>Ventilation column in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertidal terraces.</td>
<td>walk/highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VCTEF</strong></td>
<td>Foreshore area under TWUL ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Granite finishes</strong></td>
<td>Vent Column owned by Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ventilation column in public</strong></td>
<td>Replaced trees, owned by TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>walk/highway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLABF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Foreshore area under TWUL ownership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lift and stairs on the eastern</strong></td>
<td>New river wall, handrail and balustrades under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>side of Blackfriars Bridge</strong></td>
<td>Thames Water ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New foreshore structure including</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing river wall is under ownership of either TfL or</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Path, planting, seating,</td>
<td><strong>CoL (tbc), they wish for Thames Water to purchase it</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ventilation columns, kiosks,</td>
<td><strong>due to the tie-ins to the wall, though Thames Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lighting and water feature.</td>
<td><strong>does not agree. Discussions are on-going.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New access to relocated</strong></td>
<td><strong>If Thames Water does not need access to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blackfriars Millennium Pier</strong></td>
<td><strong>commercial space and kiosk they may be, subject to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reinstatement of coach parking.</strong></td>
<td><strong>planning permission.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New mooring to President vessel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHTPS</strong></td>
<td><strong>No permissive public realm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAWF</strong></td>
<td><strong>No permissive public realm.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thames Water will retain ownership of a small area next to river wall to accommodate kiosk and</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARPS</strong></td>
<td>Existing public right of way along outside the perimeter of the site along Loftie Street, Chambers Street and East Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPCS</strong></td>
<td>Works sit at the back of pavement on Croft Street. Replacement street trees within Croft Street may be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREPS</strong></td>
<td>Re-landscaped public open space incorporating possible new children's play area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEMPF</strong></td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible ‘green wall/trellis type screen along Deptford Church Street frontage illustrated on submitted drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New ventilation columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streetscape enhancements outside of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No permissive public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New foreshore structure with surface to be incorporated as extension too existing park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area adjacent to foreshore structure and access route to site through park from Glamis Road to be public realm within existing park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential areas outside of limits of land to be acquired or used (LLAU) and within the park for improvements through Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEKST</th>
<th>Potential area around Shadwell Basin for improvements through Section 106 agreement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABMPS</td>
<td>No permissive public realm, Thames Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESTW</td>
<td>No permissive public realm, Thames Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G Generic and Site Specific Design Principles

#### G.1 Summary of design principles

#### Table G.5 Summary of design principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Generic design principles</th>
<th>Specific principles</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTST</td>
<td>HRTG.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction within operational site. No public realm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public realm outside operational site compound is responsibility of residential developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAREL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires design treatment of vent column, interception chamber and kiosk to minimise effects of designated bridge. Requires retention/reinstatement of heritage street furniture (bollards) and University Boat Race stone. Heritage Interpretation to inform design of foreshore structures and public art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNGGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires appropriate replacement of trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREWD</td>
<td></td>
<td>CREWD.02</td>
<td>Depot facilities to be reinstated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Heritage Interpretation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Generic design principles</th>
<th>Specific design principles</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRTG</td>
<td>HRTG.01; HRTG.02; HRTG.03; HRTG.04; HRTG.05; HRTG.06; HRTG.07; HRTG.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEEF</td>
<td>CHEEF.01; CHEEF.04; CHEEF.06; CHEEF.11; CHEEF.12; CHEEF.13</td>
<td>Requires design treatment of foreshore structure to respect existing river wall and views of Monument Walk and Royal Hospital Chelsea. Parish boundary stone to be retained and heritage interpretation to reference lost river Westbourne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTST</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site to return to operational wharf. Public realm outside operational site to conform to existing Strategy for adjacent development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAPS</td>
<td>ALBEF.02; ALBEF.03; ALBEF.10; ALBEF.13; ALBEF.14; ALBEF.16; ALBEF.20</td>
<td>Requires design treatment of permanent works to respect designated Vauxhall Bridge and landscaping to include suitable planting, interpretation referencing lost river Effra and creation of viewing points to Westminster WHS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCTEF</td>
<td>VCTEF.01; VCTEF.03; VCTEF.04; VCTEF.05; VCTEF.07; VCTEF.11;</td>
<td>Sturgeon lamps stand and sphinx benches to be removed and retained for later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Uncontrolled when printed
### Generic design principles

- **HRTG.01**
- **HRTG.02**
- **HRTG.03**
- **HRTG.04**
- **HRTG.05**
- **HRTG.06**
- **HRTG.07**
- **HRTG.08**

### Specific design principles

- **VCTEF.12; VCTEF.14 & VCTEF.17**

### Comment

Reinstatement at or close to original position. All new materials and street furniture to be appropriate to historic setting within Bazalgette's embankment and river wall. Design of viewing platforms on the new foreshore structure and position of reinstated listed benches to maximise views of the Palace of Westminster WHS. Pergola structure and railings to frame, but not obstruct, views of the River from Whitehall and Victoria Embankment Gardens.

### BLABF

- **BLABF.01; BLABF.03; BLABF.08; BLABF.11; BLABF.12; BLABF.14; BLABF.15; BLABF.17; BLABF.18; BLABF.19; BLABF.22; BLABF.23; BLABF.24; BLABF.26; BLABF.29 & BLABF.30**

### Comment

Design of new public realm and replacement Millennium Pier to recognise the historic context of the area and setting of listed bridge. Provision of new stair/lift access between Blackfriars Station and Millennium Pier, access to President Moorings and screening to voids below Blackfriars Bridge to limit visual impact and changes to fabric of heritage assets. All new materials, including the use of natural stone, and street
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Generic design principles</th>
<th>Specific design principles</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.01</td>
<td>KEMPF.01; KEMPF.03; KEMPF.06 and KEMPF.11</td>
<td>Foreshore structure and landscape design to reinforce character of the public park, with appropriate riverside trees. Memorial benches and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herit.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Strategy 132</th>
<th>Document Ref [Subject property]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncontrolled when printed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Generic design principles</td>
<td>Specific design principles</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRTG.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEPCS.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>GREPS.02; GREPS.03; GREPS.04; GREPS.09 &amp; GREPS.12</td>
<td>Condition of land between DLR and Network Rail listed viaduct to be suitable for future public realm improvements. Raised level shaft structure to be included in architectural and landscape design. York Stone slabs to be reused for interruption chamber roof. Fenestration to East Beam Engine House to be renovated/replaced and lantern to be refurbished (or replaced with a replica) as part of ventilation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABMPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABMPS.02</td>
<td>Located within operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Heritage Interpretation Strategy

#### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Generic design principles</th>
<th>Specific design principles</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TWUL</td>
<td>HRTG.01, HRTG.02, HRTG.03</td>
<td>HRTG.04, HRTG.05, HRTG.06</td>
<td>TWUL site. Design of the ventilation outlets shall be in keeping with the context. The signature design ventilation column shall not be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESTW</td>
<td>Covered by Lee Tunnel</td>
<td>HRTG.07, HRTG.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHTPS</td>
<td>HRTG.01, HRTG.02, HRTG.03</td>
<td>SHTPS.02</td>
<td>The materials for the new annex building shall be low-maintenance and durable. They shall preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed Wheat Wharf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEKST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G.2 DCO design designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite Name</th>
<th>Design Status for Worksite/Element of worksite based</th>
<th>Illustrative</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>For approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acton Storm Tanks</td>
<td>Appearance of the Ventilation Column</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms</td>
<td>Temporary and permanent replacement changing facilities</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Location of reinstated listed bollards</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” and illustrative elements)</td>
<td>Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnwath Road Riverside</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormay Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Georges Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconbrook Pumping Station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>Works outside the Listed Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Works to the Listed Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtling Street</td>
<td>Appearance of the combined kiosk and ventilation structure</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathwall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>Permanent moorings and Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>Permanent Mooring for “President”</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Wharf</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Finished site levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Pumping Station</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Pumping</td>
<td>Works outside the Works outside the Proposed works to the</td>
<td>Proposed works to the Maximum extent of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite Name</th>
<th>Design Status for Worksite/Element of worksite based</th>
<th>Illustrative</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>For approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acton Storm Tanks</td>
<td>Appearance of the Ventilation Column</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith Pumping Station</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Elms</td>
<td>Temporary and permanent replacement changing facilities</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Location of reinstated listed bollards</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” and illustrative elements)</td>
<td>Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnwath Road Riverside</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormay Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Georges Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconbrook Pumping Station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremorne Wharf Depot</td>
<td>Works outside the Listed Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Works to the Listed Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtling Street</td>
<td>Appearance of the combined kiosk and ventilation structure</td>
<td>Worksite (save for illustrative elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathwall</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Embankment Foreshore</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>Permanent moorings and Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Bridge Foreshore</td>
<td>Permanent Mooring for “President”</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>Maximum extent of loss to listed structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Wharf</td>
<td>Worksite (save for “for approval” elements)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Finished site levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Pumping Station</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Church Street</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Pumping</td>
<td>Works outside the Works outside the Proposed works to the</td>
<td>Proposed works to the Maximum extent of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Document Ref [Subject property]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite Name</th>
<th>Design Status for Worksite/Element of worksite based</th>
<th>Illustrative</th>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>For approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>loss to Listed Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Memorial Park Foreshore</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Mills Pumping Station</td>
<td>Worksite</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H Process for the development of Heritage Interpretation and Landscape Proposals
Process for the development of Heritage Interpretation & Landscape Proposals

**PREPARATION**
- Describe how designs will be undertaken prior to commencing the design, including objectives and planned deliveries, review of information, criteria, other inputs to the design and constraints. These include the following as regards Heritage Interpretation:
  - DCO Requirement PV11
  - The Design Principles
  - Parameter Plans
  - DA09

**CONCEPT DESIGN**
- Develop feasibility, preliminary outline and conceptual designs
- Develop the accepted concept design to show spatial arrangements, type of construction, materials and appearance which are co-ordinated with detailed proposals for civil, structural and MEICA design.

**DEVELOPED DESIGN**
- Prepare technical designs, calculations and specification sufficient to coordinate components and elements of the proposals including information on statutory standards, maintenance and construction and operational safety
- Details of interpretive artwork to be incorporated with Architecture and landscape proposals.

**DETAILED DESIGN**
- Provide further technical information to demonstrate how the design intent, objectives and requirements for the site have been realised in the detailed design.

**FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MANUFACTURE**
- Before ‘Gate 5’, the Contractor shall have obtained from the relevant Consent granting bodies all Consents applicable to that submission, unless otherwise agreed by the Project Manager.

**TESTING, COMMISSIONING, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
- The Contractor shall provide operation and maintenance documents, as constructed records, manuals and other information for the purposes of testing, commissioning, operation, maintenance and takeover of the works.

**WHO ACCEPTS PROPOSALS?**
- Thames Water (TWUL) teams including reviews against criteria of the HIS.

**WHEN IS THAMES WATER (TWUL) CONSULTED?**

**GENERAL REGS**
- Development of a design management plan to include strategies for stakeholder engagement and the Contractor's programme for further gate submissions.

**ADDITIONAL REGS FOR ILLUSTRATIVE ELEMENTS**
- Submit an initial site appraisal report and initial project brief
- Conduct feasibility and options studies

**ARTIST SELECTION AND INPUT**
- Brief Development for each site
  - Public Arts Consultants (PAC) collate Site information and HIS details.
  - Thames Tideway Tunnel Project teams meet to agree the possible sites, nature (eg. colour, lighting, sculpture)
  - PAC produce a draft brief. Includes budget and criteria for artist selection.
  - The draft brief is circulated both internally and externally for comment.
  - Brief signed off by Tideway Management Team.

**ENGAGEMENT WITH OTHERS & CONSENTS**
- Stakeholders invited to submit names to long list and (where appropriate and available) participate in shortlisting process
- Local Authority Representative (Typically Arts officer)
- Community and/or Arts organisations representative as appropriate

**ARTIST SELECTION**
- PACs collate long list of artists appropriate to the requirements of the brief.
- The longlisted artists are scored and ranked according to the criteria of the brief to establish shortlist of 3.
- The shortlisted artists are asked to develop an initial proposal.
- The artists' longlist proposals are by Artist Selection Panel.
- The highest scoring artist is appointed.

**Design Development**
- Artist Feeds into the design development process. The timing and scope will vary according to the type of commission and its level of integration with the overall landscape and architecture scheme.
- The artists will attend Independent Design Review by Design Council CABE where applicable.

**CABE REVIEW**
- The MWC design teams will lead this process but the artist shall produce/collaborate in the development of presentation material for the review.

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**
- Artwork to be fabricated and installed in accordance with the approved/as submitted details.
- Artist to produce a maintenance plan.
- Artist to be available to inspect works on site and offer support.

**DETAILS OF INTERPRETIVE ARTWORK TO BE INCLUDED IN SUBMISSION**
- MWCs' Applications (both Draft and Final) to Discharge DCO Requirements and to include a statement of how proposals respond to PV11 and HTG 07 (see evaluation criteria) including full details of Interpretive artwork for the site.
- The Artist and MWCs will present proposals to Local Authority arts and heritage panels as required.

<<<Discharge all Consents (Gate 5 cannot be awarded without this)>>>
- MWCs’ Applications (both Draft and Final) to Discharge DCO Requirements and to include a statement of how proposals respond to PV11 and HTG 07 (see evaluation criteria) including full details of Interpretive artwork for the site.
- The Artist and MWCs will present proposals to Local Authority arts and heritage panels as required.
Appendix I Heritage Interpretation – Design Statement

I.1.1 Applications to Discharge DCO Requirements are to include a statement of how the proposals respond to PW11 and HRGT.07, i.e. the Heritage Interpretation Strategy

Table I.7 Heritage Interpretation – Design Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HERITAGE INTERPRETATION - DESIGN STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS AIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Manifesto Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery will explore cultural attributes that provide</td>
<td>a platform on which to build and embed Interpretations that are integrated and relevant to the river setting, are meaningful to Londoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and re-connects people with the River.</td>
<td>and reconnect people with the River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery is to be grounded in the popular cultural</td>
<td>dimension of the lived experiences of former communities, to be made available to contemporary and future Londoners through heritage interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery will consider meanings and values represented</td>
<td>by the River's heritage that are open in nature and leave scope for responses particular to personal stories, whatever their specific nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery will explore the inherent richness and complexity</td>
<td>of the River heritage, and its capacity for multiple readings and plurality of meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery will presents heritage interpretations in a</td>
<td>contemporary setting with an awareness of emerging economic, social, political and environmental shifts that have a global dimension and are relevant to London’s evolving World City status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The approach to delivery will articulate the under-represented cultural</td>
<td>role of the River, exploring its potential as a physical, psychological and allegorical cultural entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tideway will emulate Bazalgette’s achievements, through new</td>
<td>representations at locations along the Embankments, but also more widely along the River, which reflect different values and will re-contextualize the mid-19th century architectural statement and its inherent cultural symbolism, whilst still recognising the design benchmarks set by local heritage character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>