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PART I: ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

1. Introduction

In 1992, English Heritage set out a national policy for resolving possible conflicts between development and archaeological sites in built-up areas (Managing the Urban Archaeological Resource, 1992). Funds have been made available to individual Planning Authorities to undertake work aimed at providing a framework for dealing with archaeological issues encountered during the development control process.

Known as the Extensive Urban Survey Programme, Gateshead is one of the historic towns to be completed, as part of a collaboration between Gateshead Council, The City of Newcastle, Northumberland County Council and the other districts which formed the former County of Tyne and Wear. Tyne and Wear Museums have provided staff and support in the record collection phase for the English Heritage-funded project, and the printed reports have been compiled largely by staff of the Tyne and Wear Specialist Conservation Team, with the help of John Nolan of Northern Counties Archaeological Services.

Historic town surveys involve the collection and analysis of documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence of the extent and character of the urban development of the town. An outline history of the town is then followed by a strategy for managing the archaeological sites revealed in the data-collection phase. The final section provides a step-by-step guide to the stages of a Planning Application on, or in the vicinity of, a site of archaeological interest.

The area covered (Fig 1) represents the historic core and the adjacent riverside, and includes the major areas of industrial development from the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Two Conservation Areas are included, the Bridges CA from the Sage Gateshead to the Queen Elizabeth II bridge, and a much smaller area comprising the early nineteenth century terraced housing of Regent Street and Walker Terrace.

All relevant information has been recorded on the Tyne and Wear Historic Environment Record, where possible, using ArcView.

1.1 Location, Geology, Topography

Gateshead (NZ 25 63) is situated on the south bank of the river Tyne approximately eight miles from the coast. The river runs in a deep channel at this point, between steep clay scarps that provide the stable riverbanks necessary for an all-year-round crossing point. The southern bank rises from approximately 5m AOD at the riverside, where the land is reclaimed, to 32m AOD at the top of the scarp, which bulges slightly northward into a shallow promontory where St Mary’s Church
now stands. From the top of the scarp, the land continues to rise southwards towards Gateshead Fell, crossed by a number of post-glacial streams running southwards to the river. At least one such watercourse is probably broadly reflected by the street of Bottle Bank. The riverside and the steep topography of the route south from the bridging point have formed the focus of development of the town.

The geology of the area is predominantly Upper Carboniferous Coal Measures of Westphalian age, which outcrop all over the district. Glacial erosion is also evident, having cut deeply into solid rock creating buried channels. The maximum depth of material above bedrock is 30m but generally it is approximately 10m (British Geological Survey, 1989-92, sheet 20). The presence of coal deposits in the geology has been a major influence on the development of Gateshead from the medieval period onwards.

1.2 Documentary and Secondary Sources

Gateshead is well covered by nineteenth and early twentieth century histories of both the Palatinate of Durham, and Gateshead in relation to Newcastle. These have been drawn on by the more recent authoritative source, “The History of Gateshead” published in 1973 by F. M. Manders, a work cited in almost every paragraph of this account. Most of the industries represented in Gateshead are covered to some degree by individual studies. A full list of the sources consulted as part of this Assessment is provided, along with other relevant sources in the Appendices.
1.3 Archaeological Data

As recently as 1990, it was possible to state that “no scientific excavation had ever been made within the boundaries of Gateshead” (Harbottle, 1990, p 2). Since then, two major excavations and several small-scale archaeological evaluations have been carried out, providing evidence that significant deposits representing Roman, medieval and post-medieval settlement in the area survive. These investigations have shown that, like many urban environments, the survival of archaeological deposits is variable, with some areas of well-preserved and deep stratification and others where later development has resulted in significant truncation. Areas of severely truncated deposits may be more difficult to interpret in excavation, but the surviving archaeology may still be of national importance.

1.4 Cartographic Sources

The cartographic coverage of Gateshead is reasonably comprehensive, partly because of its proximity to Newcastle. For a full list of maps studied as part of this Assessment see the cartographic bibliography.

2 The pre-urban archaeological evidence

2.1 The Prehistoric Period

Archaeological evidence relating to the prehistoric period found in Gateshead is limited to finds recovered from the Tyne during dredging activities in the 19th century (Miket, 1984, p 43).

Three bronze swords of Late Bronze Age date are known. HER 767 is said to have been dredged from the Tyne below Newcastle. The date of recovery is not recorded and it is now in the British Museum (Greenwell, 1889, p. 309 and Dodds (ed), 1930, XIII, p. 22 and 21). Another bronze sword (HER 768) was dredged from the river in the same place, near Tyne Bridge (Blair, 1887, 2, II, p 333), reputedly in 1885 (Miket, 1984, p.44 and 46), but it was included in J Evans survey of bronze finds from Great Britain in 1881 (Evans, 1881, p 281). A third sword, HER 770, came into the possession of R Blair before 1922, reported as coming from “Between King’s Meadows Island and the High Level Bridge, more than fifty years ago”. He bequested it to the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle, and it is now in the Museum of Antiquities.

Also of Bronze Age date are two rapiers and a socketed spearhead. The bronze rapiers (HER 1416 and 1380) are said to have been recovered from the Tyne at Newcastle, the former before 1887 (Miket, 1984, p 40 and 44 and Dodds (ed), 1930, XIII, p 20 and 22) and the latter located to the north channel of the river, but without a date of recovery (Miket, 1984, p 40 and 44 and Dodds (ed), 1930, XIII, p 20 and 22). The bronzer spearhead is thought to have come from above the bridge, (ie west of the Swing Bridge) in 1867 (Miket 1984,p.43 ), and is now in the Museum of Antiquities.
British Museum, arriving there via the Blair and Greenwell collections (Greenwell, 1889, 2, III, p 309).

These objects may have entered the archaeological record as votive offerings at a natural river-crossing, marking the site of ceremonies that defined and re-enforced territorial or social boundaries. A similar pattern is seen at the Hylton crossing of the Wear, 12 km to the south-east, where three bronze swords (HER 386-8) were recovered from where another putative prehistoric and Roman route crosses a major river. It should not be forgotten that some of these artefacts could conceivably have arrived at the Tyne in ballast deposits which derive principally from the Thames estuary.

Fragments of flint occurred residually at Oakwellgate and Bottle Bank (HER 5631), where two worked flakes were possibly of Mesolithic origin. Some possibly prehistoric, or at least pre-Roman, features were found at Bottle Bank (HER 5632).

There is insufficient evidence for prehistoric settlement in Gateshead to map any specific area where it is likely to be found, although that does not preclude the possibility of the existence of prehistoric settlement on the south bank of the Tyne.

2.2 Roman

2.2.1 Archaeological Evidence

The earliest stratified archaeological deposits in Gateshead are of Roman date and are likely to have developed in association with the bridging of the Tyne. Throughout the Roman period the main eastern route from the south into Scotland was along Dere Street, crossing the Tyne at Corbridge. (Bidwell and Snape, 2001, p. 265). However, a bridge, the Pons Aelius, (HER 450) across the Tyne at Newcastle was part of the original planned construction for Hadrian’s Wall. Since work on the Wall began at the Newcastle, Pons Aelius was probably one of the first structures to have been built (Breeze and Dobson, 1987, p 28). Bidwell and Holbrook (1989, p 99-103) suggest that the bridge may have stood at the original terminus of the Wall (before it was extended to Wallsend) explaining why the bridge would have had such an important dedication. Whatever the significance of the location and association, the bridge itself would have been a substantial structure since a bridge crossing the Tyne at Newcastle spanned a wider river than further up stream at Corbridge.

An altar dedicated to Neptune (HER 1462) was dredged up in 1875 during construction work on the Swing Bridge (Hodgkin, 1885, 2, I, p 163-4 and Bruce, 1887, 2, XII, p 7-8) and nearby in 1903 an altar dedicated to Antoninus Pius (HER 1464, Heslop, 1905, 3, I, p 72-74) and a companion to the altar to Neptune, dedicated to Oceanus (HER 1463, Heslop, 1905, 3, I, p 50-52) were also found.

A relief carving, in local buff sandstone, of Fortuna (HER 1482) was recovered
Fig 2. The Roman Period

from the north channel of the Tyne at the Swing Bridge in 1884. Rather worn and with some damage, it measures 0.44m high x 0.253 x 0.088. It consists of a draped female figure standing in an arched niche and holding in her left hand a cornucopia, and in her right “what appears to be a patera over a round altar by her right side”. Though without wheel or rudder, the probability that it stood on the Roman bridge suggests that she is Fortuna and not Abundantia (Hodgkin, 1885, 2, I, p 163).

A small number of coins complete the catalogue of Roman finds from the river. Two Roman coins (HER 1475) were recovered from the Tyne, near the find spot of the altar to Oceanus, and reported to the Society of Antiquaries by R. Blair. One dated to the reign of Hadrian the other to Trajan (Blair, 1905, 3, I, p 52). Two Roman coins (HER 499) recovered from the Tyne were reported to the Society of Antiquaries by R. Blair, 27 April 1904. The first was dated to the reign of Galba (AD 69) the second to Septimius Severus (AD 193-211). Two more coins (HER 500), a sestertius of Hadrian and the second of Antoninus Pius were found in the Tyne on the site of the medieval bridge. Probably, like the other coins from this vicinity, they were probably votive offerings to the spirits of the river (Archaeologia Aeliana, 1906, 3, II, p 188).

While this evidence could suggest that the site of the Roman bridge was similar to that of the medieval crossing (where the Swing Bridge now stands) no definite remains of the original Roman structure have been seen. The piers identified by J.C. Bruce during the construction of the swing bridge and discussed in “The Three
Bridges over the Tyne at Newcastle”, (Bruce, 1885), are now thought to have been part of the medieval bridge (Bidwell and Holbrook, 1989). The altars may be residual in the fabric of the medieval bridge and so the position from which they were recovered may not reflect their original site. The position of the Roman fort (HER 204), Pons Aelius, on the north side of the bank, is on a promontory overlooking the supposed northern end of the Roman crossing and a similarly commanding bluff, at almost the same level, exists on the south bank of the Tyne in Gateshead, on the site of St. Mary’s Church and west of Bottle Bank. Topography, chance finds and recent excavations suggest that this was the position of the southern bridgehead of the Roman river crossing (HER 5633), and settlement is likely to have developed here, mirroring that on the north side.

Chance finds dating to the Roman period were reported from this area in the late 18th and early 18th century. An urn containing Roman coins was found when Church Street was constructed in 1790 (HER 271), and coins were found in roadworks at the head of Bottle Bank in 1802 (HER 5634) (Richardson, 1842, Vol. II, p 332). John Hodgson asserted that the ‘shape and hewing’ of the stones of St. Mary’s church ‘prove that it has been built out of the ruins of some Roman edifice’ (HER 284; Fig 3). A Roman altar (HER 5635) found built into the garden wall of the Rectory in Oakwellgate (Archaeologia Aeliana 2nd Series, I, 263-4) was an antiquarian relic from Vindobala (modern Rudchester in Northumberland).

Roman road (HER 276; Fig 2)
It has been generally agreed since the eighteenth century that a Roman road connected Chester-le-Street with a bridge across the Tyne. Two stretches are thought to lie under existing roads, one now followed by the line of Durham Road through Birtley, and the second now comprising Old Durham Road - High Street - Bottle Bank through the centre of Gateshead. Between these stretches, in open country outside the study area, R. P. Wright located it in three places in 1938-9: at NZ 2714 5695, Leyburnhold Gill; NZ 2707 5835, garden of 15, Chambers Crescent; and at NZ 2704 5876 (Archaeologia Aeliana 4th series, XVII, p 54-46).

Roman settlement (HER 5633; Fig 2)
The survival of stratified Roman deposits and features in Gateshead were first demonstrated in an evaluation to the rear of properties fronting the west side of Bottle Bank in 1994 (Ev. No. 2182; Nolan 1995). A second series of evaluation trenches helped define the extent of surviving deposits (Ev. No. 2045; T&WM, 1998). In 2000 much of this area was subject to open-area excavation (Ev. No. 2082), which revealed a complex of ditches, stone-lined cisterns, fragmentary stone buildings and a section of roadway, with some surviving horizontal stratigraphy. Pottery suggests an occupation date ranging from the early second century to the fourth century. The ditches appeared to define plots orientated approximately NE-SW, extending beyond the excavated area to the east. The western extent of the plots appeared to be defined by a larger NW-SE orientated ditch which had been re-cut on several occasions and had at least four stone-lined wells or cisterns along the excavated length. There were some features west of the large...
ditch, suggesting that this was not the limit of settlement. Within the plots, east of the large ditch, there was evidence for some form of industrial activity represented by at least one hearth and a possible kiln. The remains of a stone building may have been a strip-house or workshop. A short section of worn metalling incorporating a drainage gully was interpreted as part of a road surface, apparently on a NE-SW alignment.

2.2.2 Definition of Settlement

The extent and character of Roman settlement (HER 5633; Fig 2) in Gateshead cannot be positively defined from the evidence which has been recovered. The remains found at Bottle Bank appear to be part of a civilian settlement extending further to the north, south and west, and probably flanking an approach to the Roman river crossing. The settlement did not extend as far as the east side of Oakwellgate, and may have been bounded by a road coming in from the west. If the southern bridgehead was defended, a small fort may have been sited where St. Mary’s Church now stands, though the small-scale archaeological investigations which have taken place there have not revealed any evidence. The area where, on the basis of the evidence, Roman deposits are most likely to occur has been mapped. The boundaries of this area cannot be regarded as definitive and Roman material may be present elsewhere.

2.3 Early Medieval (A.D 410-A.D 1066)

2.3.1 Archaeological and Documentary Evidence

No indisputable physical evidence for settlement at this period has been found, and therefore no attempt has been made here to map settlement, but the street name Bottle Bank is suggestive of the Saxon word, botle meaning village habitation (dwelling?) (Mackenzie, 1827, p 749 and Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 223). Other street names with the Old Norse ending -gate: Oakwellgate, Hillgate (formerly St Mary Gate), and the name Gateshead itself, also suggest a pre-Conquest presence. The earliest recorded use of the placename ‘Gateshead’ occurs in Bede’s Ecclesiastical History for the year 653AD, which mentions Adda the brother of ‘Utta …a renowned priest and abbot of Gateshead’ (Radice (ed.), 1968, p 177).

Bede’s reference is ambiguous, and may simply mean that Utta was a native of Gateshead, rather than abbot of a monastery there. No other documentary references to Utta, or suggestive of a monastery in Gateshead, are known. The possible location of the monastery (HER 273) of which Utta may have been abbot, has been the subject of speculation by Hinds, Bourne and Brand in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the consensus of opinion placing it near to the site of the medieval chapel of St Edmund, or of St Edmund’s Hospital. Sykes (1866, p 26) says that the hospital of St Edmund ‘is supposed to occupy the site of the monastery …. established before 653’. Boyle, re-assessing the evidence in 1890 is
categorical - ‘the tradition which fixes the site where bishop Farnham’s chapel of St Edmund stands is perfectly valueless’. The situation of the Hospital, alongside the High Street and 700m south of the River Tyne, would not appear to have been perceived as favourable for the establishment of a monastery at this period.

The only possible indication of an early medieval, possibly pre-Conquest, origin for Gateshead is provided by a short length of curving, double ditch, located at Robson’s Yard on the east side of Oakwellgate in 1999 (ARCUS 2003). The ditch may be part of a curvilinear enclosure (HER 5636) extending from near the east end of Church Chare, across the High Street, along Bailey Chare and swinging north-east along the line of Mirk Lane to Low Church Chare and around the north side of St. Mary’s church. If such an enclosure exists, it may define a lay, or even the hypothetical monastic, settlement.

To summarise, there is to date only one ambiguous documentary reference, and no incontrovertible archaeological evidence, for an Anglo-Saxon presence in Gateshead. The present lack of archaeological evidence is not particularly remarkable when it is remembered that on the north side of the Tyne, almost directly opposite Bottle Bank, a large cemetery of probably eighth century origin is known to exist (Harbottle and Nolan, forthcoming) without any evidence having yet been found for an associated or contributing settlement or settlements.

2.3.2 Definition of Settlement

The documentary and archaeological evidence is too tenuous to locate or define the form and character of any possible settlement at this period. It is probable however that if early remains survive they may lie within the area defined as the urban form of Gateshead for the medieval period, and particularly the postulated curvilinear enclosure. If this in fact exists, it would encompass the high ground and escarpment overlooking the Tyne, at a similar height to the site of the fort and cemetery on the north bank, and thus topographically favourable and appropriate for settlement. It would also enclose the known area of Roman settlement and St. Mary’s church. Beyond these bounds, the area of St Edmunds Chapel and Hospital can also be highlighted as being of particular importance for potentially recovering evidence for the postulated monastery or settlement.

3 Medieval Gateshead (A.D. 1066-A.D. 1600)

3.1 Historical Background

The earliest post-Conquest reference to the Gateshead, which was then part of the estates of the Palatinate of Durham, occurs in Symeon’s History of the Church of Durham when he describes the murder of Walcher, the bishop of Durham, outside the church at Gateshead in 1080 (Mackenzie, 1827, p 745). It is not known when the church was founded, though if a pre-Conquest monastic institution did exist, it is possible that a monastic church or chapel had survived. The site of the 1080
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Church has traditionally been placed to the east of the present St. Mary’s, though there is no archaeological evidence for this, and it is unlikely that, once consecrated, the site would have moved significantly.

Gateshead achieved limited borough status by an undated charter by Hugh du Puisset of c.1164, (Beresford, 1973, p 106, dates it to 1153), and was confirmed by Philip de Poitou (Bishop from 1195-1208) in 1195. The charter is largely concerned with rules for taking wood and undergrowth from the forest and exemptions from the jurisdiction of the forester. Boundaries between the forest and the borough had been fixed, and the borough court was limited to settling disputes between the two. When distrained, the burgesses’ cattle were to be returned in the borough. A pinfold (HER 5619; Fig 7), where stray livestock could be impounded, is shown on an eighteenth century plan as standing in Jackson Street. As in Newcastle, the burgesses could freely give and sell their land, unless there was a suit against it. The right of the burgesses to the common pasture of Saltwellmede is confirmed. There is no mention of a chief official of the borough. (Hope Dodds, 1915, p 92). The charter granted the burgesses of Gateshead the least amount of the privileges which made a borough, and the town at this time has been described as ‘a forest vill which occupies such a favourable position geographically that it is slowly establishing its claims to borough privileges in spite of very adverse circumstances’ (ibid.). By comparison, Puisset’s charter to Wearmouth was much more expansive in its liberties (Manders, 1973, p 3). This grant of limited rights prefigures the later economic subordination of the town to its more powerful neighbour on the north side of the river, a situation which led Beresford to dismissively describe medieval
Gateshead as a ‘suburban offshoot of another town’ that is, Newcastle (1967, p 431).

Little is known of the extent or nature of the borough in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. One party to the earliest known deed, dated c.1178-84, and concerning lands not in the town, is given as Radulfo tinctori(dyer) in Gateshevid, suggestive of the early appearance of commercial activity (Surtees Society, 137). Further evidence for this is provided by the Boldon Book, compiled in 1183, which mentions ‘Gateshead with borough and mills and fisheries, and bakehouses…’ (Surtees Society 25, p 44). The 12th century also saw the beginnings of large private estates in and around Gateshead such as Pipewellgate, stimulated by Hugh du Puiset’s disposal of tracts of the bishopric’s estates in and around Gateshead.

In the thirteenth century Gateshead grew as more land was cleared of forest. A number of deeds from the late 1200s attest to land transactions, and in one case to a ‘booth’, all described as being in Gateshead. In the early thirteenth century the first surviving references to a burgage, and to tenements and premises, occur. By the second half of the century messuages are mentioned. This cleared area was brought under cultivation and roads were constructed. (Manders, 1973, p 5). The mining of coal in the area led to an increase in the amount of forest that was cleared as timber was utilised in the mines.

Trades indicated in charters of this period include clothworking and processing (fulling and dying), building (cementarius), and metalworking (fabri), while surnames such as ‘of Bowes’, ‘of Stockton’ and ‘of Usworth’ may be indicative of the early town’s population catchment area (Surtees Society 137). Further evidence for the importance of milling in the middle ages is provided by a rent roll of 1307 in which mills in Gateshead yielded £6.3.4d (Surtees Society 25 xxv), and the placename Windmill Hill (see HER 3492 and 3494 immediately west of the study area) first mentioned in 1436 (Welford 297).

One of the principal identifiable developments which would have had a significant impact upon the subsequent history of the town was the construction of the Tyne Bridge (HER 310; Fig 3) in the mid thirteenth century. The bridge was endowed by grants of land, a number of leases of which mention a ‘keeper’ (capellanus or custis) of the ‘pontis de Tyne’ (Surtees Society 137). The bridge is discussed in detail in paragraph 3.3.3.

The first reference to a bailiff of the borough, acting as the Bishop’s chief officer, occurs in 1287 when the office was held by Gilbert Gategang. At this time Gilbert is described as holding land which has been cleared from waste in the fields of Gateshead, and he appears as bailiff again in 1295 owning land in Pipewellgate (DRO EP/Ga.SM 14/4).

In the fourteenth century the bailiff of Gateshead combined the post with that of steward of the bishop’s coal mines (Manders, 1973, p 7; HER 5637). During the
fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the manors of Gateshead and Whickham became the richest coalfields in Europe, and a lucrative prize in the long-running battle between the Corporation of Newcastle and the bishop of Durham for economic domination of the Tyne. In 1553 the powerful and ambitious magnate John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland and Lord Lieutenant of Northumberland, Newcastle and Berwick, secured an Act of Parliament dissolving the See of Durham and annexing the coalmines of Gateshead and Whickham to the burgesses of Newcastle and placing the town of Gateshead and the Saltmeadows under its jurisdiction.

The annexation was brief and, following the accession of Mary Tudor, Dudley was executed, and in 1554 a bill was passed re-establishing the bishopric and Gateshead re-united with it, though the manor was not restored until 1566 (Manders, 1973, p 15). Nevertheless the following year bishop Tunstall leased the Saltmeadows and the tolls of Gateshead to the mayor and burgessess of Newcastle for 450 years at 44s. per annum (Manders, 1973, p 9-10).

The merchants who dominated the Corporation of Newcastle persisted in their attempts to win control of the Gateshead and Whickham coalmines through complete annexation of the town. In 1576, while the see of Durham was vacant, a bill for uniting Newcastle and Gateshead was introduced into Parliament, but failed. There was no serious further attempt at total annexation, but the bishopric had been severely weakened by the events of 1554-5 (op cit p 15).

In 1577 Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, patron at court to Thomas Sutton, master of the Ordnance at Berwick, applied on Sutton’s behalf for a lease of the Gateshead and Whickham coal mines (the Grand Lease) from the Crown, which was lessee under the bishop. Sutton was granted a lease for a term of 79 years. In 1581 the bishop conveyed the Grand Lease manors to the Crown. Although remaining nominally the owner of the mines, the bishop had renounced his rights in the manors in return for a fixed yearly income which bore no relation to the value of the property, and coal revenues dropped substantially. Sutton then profitably negotiated the transfer of the lease from Elizabeth to two Newcastle aldermen and merchants in 1583. From 1599 the full title to the Grand Lease manors rested with the Corporation of Newcastle (op cit, p 15-16, 25).

There are important elements of Gateshead in the medieval period, which are not urban in character and these are described below before discussion of the urban form.

3.1.1. Bishop’s Park and House (HER 290 and 721; Fig 3)

The bishops of Durham held extensive tracts of land on both the east and west sides of Gateshead. Part of the Bishop’s lands on the east side of Gateshead was retained as one of the episcopal demesnes later known as Gateshead Park. Adjoining the Park on the east, and separated from it by a burn flowing into the Tyne through the Friars Goose Dean was the favoured hunting chase of Heworth.
This chase was on land belonging to the prior and the convent of Durham, not to the bishop, and separated from Gateshead by the Mereburn, a small stream running into the Tyne, which still forms the boundary between Gateshead and Felling. The chase falls outside the area covered by this assessment.

Manders (1973, p 5) states that the Bishop’s Park (HER 290; Fig 3) was enclosed by a hedge and ditch, and covered the eastern part of modern Gateshead with boundaries, in present day terms, of the High Street, Sunderland Road and Felling. Harbottle (HER 290) alters this definition to the rear of the properties on Oakwellgate and High Street, Split Crow Road rather than Sunderland Road and the River Tyne, on the basis of a plan of the land leased from the bishop of Durham by Cuthbert Ellison in the 19th century (TWAS DT/BEL/2/167). A late thirteenth century deed mentioning ‘the Lord Bishop’s waste in Aykwellgat’ appears to support the latter (Surtees Society 137 no.165). However neither description may represent the original extent of the medieval park, since it is known that from an early date the bishops were disposing of considerable areas of land. The area shaded on Fig 3 is merely indicative.

Part of the line of the bishop’s park boundary west of Gateshead was the ‘high ditch’ or ‘bishop’s head-dyke’ above Pipewellgate, which occurs in deeds from 1295. On the east side of the town the boundary may have followed the course of Maiden’s Walk, where excavation in 1999 showed evidence for a partially silted-up and then backfilled ditch or natural gully on the course of the later footpath, the bottom of which was some 2m below modern pavement level.

In 1225, the chief forester stated that du Puiset frequently resided at Gateshead and enjoyed the hunting (Manders, 1973, p. 2). The bishop retained a considerable area of ‘forest’ at Gateshead, and he and his and his successors had a small manor house (HER 721) for residence while in Gateshead (Manders, 1973, p. 25) from which the forests and the chase were accessible. The site of the manor house is uncertain, though it may have been the large building at the south end of Oakwellgate, known as Palace Place when sold in 1586 and later as King John’s Palace (HER 5589). Alternatively this could have been on the site of the later Park House and ironworks (HER 5094; Fig 12), recently demolished and built over.

3.1.2 Lordship of Pipewellgate (HER 4384)

The beginning of private estates in Gateshead can be traced to the twelfth century when Bishop Hugh du Puiset sold off parts of the ecclesiastic land. In the records of the Dean and Chapter of Durham a tract of land lying along the riverside and described as “his wastes lying westwards from Tyne Bridge to Redheugh” was sold to Thorold of London (Offler (ed.), 1968, p 169). Thorold’s son subsequently cleared land from the waste (Mackenzie, 1827, p 749 and Manders, 1973, p 4). This represents the beginnings of the so-called lordship of Pipewellgate – an area distinct from the borough of Gateshead. The remaining part of the Bishop’s estates on the west side Gateshead appears to have been defined in 1295 by ‘the
high ditch behind Pypewelleate’ (DRO EP/Ga.SM 14/4) and later called the Bishop’s Head dyke, which may be perpetuated by Rabbit Banks Road.

Subsequent bishops, while retaining the use of their park for hunting, and appointing a park keeper in 1348 (ref.), appear to have made increasingly infrequent visits and continued to dispose of their estates. Through acquisitions of former bishopic land one family, the Gategang’s, came to dominate Pipewellgate in the fourteenth century. In 1312, thirty-three acres of land in Gateshead were sold to John Gategang, and in 1348 Alan Gategang was refereed to in a deed as “Lord of Pipewellgate”. At his death in 1351 Alan Gategang held all the land of Pipewellgate in barony of the bishop, other land, and 12 burgages in Gateshead. Gategang seems to have held his own manorial courts and to have appointed his own bailiff. Evidence of the degree of administrative independence achieved by Pipewellgate in the fourteenth century is provided by a document of 1349, in which both John Scott of Pandon, ‘bailiff of Pipewellgate’ and Waleran Lumley bailiff of Gateshead, appear together (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 242 and Manders, 1973, p 6).

3.2 Gateshead Medieval Urban Form

Medieval Gateshead developed from a village to a significantly-sized urban settlement as land was progressively cleared of ‘forest’, and industry was established in the area. Evidence for the elements of this development is discussed below, and they have been mapped where possible.

3.2.1 Documentary Evidence

Deeds and charters from the twelfth century to the fifteenth centuries suggest that the focus of settlement was an area broadly centred on the Tyne bridge, defined by Maiden’s Walk on the east, the Angiport (Mirk Lane) on the west, but also extending southwards as a straggling settlement on either side of the High Street (via Regia) at least as far as Collier Chare (Jackson Street). This area included the principal streets of High Street, Pipewellgate, Oakwellgate, Hillgate and Bottle Bank (Manders, 1973, p 5), and a number of cross-streets. While this was a substantial area, it is not clear how intensively developed the settlement was beyond the church/bridgehead focus.

Early evidence that Gateshead was a burgeoning settlement is shown by its paying a demesne tax of £10 in 1186, the highest payment by a Durham vill at this time (Manders, 1973, p 5). Many tenements were freeholds, held by burgage tenure, which granted certain obligations and rights to the holder such as attendance at the manorial court, as shown in the Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, a survey of 1430 (Greenwell (ed.), 1871, p 4-7). The burgages carried the privilege known as Borough Right, which was conveyed with the premises on payment of an entry fine. Such premises were also called ‘ancient tenements’. The owners of these were called burgesses, freeboroughmen or Borough Holders. They were
bound to attend the borough court, held a share in the common fields, had power to make byelaws and were exempt from toll. In the early nineteenth century there were about 135 burgages conveying Borough Right.

3.2.2 Cartographic Evidence

There is no medieval cartographic evidence but post-medieval mapping such as Thompson (1746), Hutton (1771/2) and particularly Oliver (1830) show burgage plots which are likely to have medieval origins (Figs 9 & 13). This evidence has been used to broadly define the core area of settlement for Gateshead in the medieval period. In some cases there is extant evidence for now-vanished burgage plots, for example in Pipewellgate where the Tyne forms a historic northern boundary, and sections of the surviving river wall of differing builds can be related to earlier burgage plots. Since some of the plots shown on post-medieval mapping may have been the result of the division or amalgamation of earlier holdings, more detailed reconstruction of the medieval pattern of burgage plots may only be achieved through detailed analysis of property deeds.

3.2.3 Evidence from Archaeological Recording

Archaeological records which provide information related to medieval urban settlement are discussed below. Those relating to medieval religious sites are considered in paragraph 3.3.2.

Excavation in 1990 at the site of Swan National car hire depot in Church Street (Ev. No. 2179) recorded stratified deposits to a depth of 1.90m overlying natural boulder clay, much of which produced medieval pottery. This excavation showed that while there was some truncation of medieval deposits by later foundations important archaeology survived in this area (O’Brien, 1990).

The first open-area excavation in Gateshead was carried out on the east side of Oakwellgate in 1998, on the site of the former Rectory (Ev. No. 2092) A burgage plot (Robson’s Yard) to the south of the Rectory was investigated at the same time. Deposits in Robson’s Yard had been severely truncated by post-medieval redevelopment. There had been significant loss of horizontal stratigraphy in the western southern part of the Rectory site caused by construction of a car park in the 1980s, but deeper deposits survived north of the Rectory building where ground levels began to fall towards the edge of the river escarpment. A substantial assemblage of stratified pottery was recovered spanning the twelfth to sixteenth centuries. Evaluative excavations have been carried out on sites in Oakwellgate to the east of the precincts of St Mary’s Church (Ev. No. 2180). The first was at the site of the public baths and wash house in Oakwellgate which had been destroyed by fire in 1986. Levelling of the site was found to have occurred prior to the construction of the buildings in 1855 and the foundations of these buildings extended for more than 2m depth, truncating earlier deposits in the area. Two pits containing material of the later medieval period were excavated (Bidwell, 1990).
A further evaluation in Oakwellgate (Ev. No. 2181; Speak, 1991), immediately to the north of the one described above, showed that successive cellars and deep foundations had removed much of the medieval archaeological deposits of the area. In a small “island” of stratigraphy a pit dated to the medieval period was found to have been backfilled and sealed by a stone wall which had been subsequently covered with a deposit identified as plough soil which contained pottery and domestic refuse dated to the fifteenth century. The report suggests that the wall may lie within the precinct of the monastery believed to have been sited either where St Mary’s Church now stands, or within the precinct of the church. The area is marked as open land on post-medieval maps (eg Hutton, 1770), but clearly represents an area of settlement in the medieval period, the character of which cannot be defined from the available evidence, although the church precincts do not appear to have changed from 1772 onwards.

The second open area excavation took place on the west side of Bottle Bank in 2000 (Ev. No. 2082). This site had been subject to an evaluation excavation in 1994 (Ev. No. 2182) which first demonstrated the extensive survival of deeply-stratified medieval backland deposits containing finds principally of thirteenth to fourteenth century date (Nolan, 1995). The 2000 excavation confirmed the survival of deep and well-preserved backland deposits and features dating principally from the late twelfth century onwards. Some burgage plot walls were found to have medieval foundations, and there was evidence for backland buildings. Two wells were found. Where the street frontage was investigated (in Stobb’s Yard), it was found that post-medieval cellaring and rebuilding had removed most earlier deposits and features.

The river wall at Pipewellgate (HER 4828), which contains evidence of burgage plot divisions, has been recorded (Jubb and Ayris, 1995). The stretch of river wall here may be the only portion in Gateshead and Newcastle which has not been rebuilt in the modern period.

3.3 Medieval Gateshead - Components

3.3.1 Streets and tenements (Fig 3)

The earliest street names, occurring in documents of the twelfth century, are the High Street/Fore Street/Via Regia (from 1295), Pipewellgate (from 1295), Oakwellgate (from 1290/91), and St. Helen’s Street/Elyngate (1270) and another street called Bergate in c.1295, cannot be identified (EP/Ga.SM 14/6). St. Helen’s Street may be associated with St. Helen’s Well and two associated fields close to the river west of the borough and just inside Redheugh estate in the nineteenth century, which were known as Little St. Helen’s Close and St. Helen’s Close. No reason for this name has yet been found.

Street names from the fourteenth century include Hellegate(Hillgate), also known as St. Mary Gate (1368), and Bottle Bank.
Mirk Lane apparently extended further southwards into what is now West Street, and was called ‘the Angiport’. The principal route into the town of Gateshead until the early nineteenth century was from this lane into Bailey Chare, now Half Moon Lane (Nolan, 1995).

According to Longstaffe (1852, p. 63 note), the medieval road from Durham did not follow the Roman route (Wrekendyke, which formed part of the eastern boundary of Gateshead Fell) but passed between the old and the new Durham roads and entered Gateshead by West Street. A dyke, recorded in 1748, dividing High and Low Fell, may have marked the line of a road (Manders, 1973, p 5).

The core area of settlement represented by the burgage plots around the principal medieval streets has been mapped from the available evidence.

The term tenement need not necessarily imply a dwelling/buildings, and the land could be put to other uses. One fifteenth century document refers to ‘a tenement by the name of an aqueduct and a messuage thereon’ situated in Oakwellgate (Welford, 1883 p 277). The 1999 excavation at Robson’s Yard in Oakwellgate showed evidence for small-scale coal mining which predated the establishment of the later buildings.

3.3.2 Medieval Religious Sites

St Mary’s Parish Church (HER 284; Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
The earliest visible fabric of the church has been dated to c.1200 (Pevsner 2000, p 283), but it has reasonably been suggested that the existing building occupies the site of the church outside which bishop Walcher was murdered in 1080 (Surtees 1820, Vol. II, pp 118-125; Mackenzie 1827, p 751), and a cross-shaft and head (now lost) of possibly pre-Conquest date was found built into the east wall of the south transept in 1908 (Pevsner 2000, p 283). Boyle (1890, p137) supports this interpretation, and notes (op cit pp 143-144) three fragments of medieval grave cover inserted into the walls beneath the chancel arch, two in the walls of the porch. The first reference to a rector occurs in 1275, when the incumbent was Robert de Plessis (Mackenzie 1827, p 123).

There were four chantries in the church, one to St. Mary in the north porch, and others to the Trinity, St.John and St. Loy (Mackenzie and Ross 1834, p 85). In 1340, a licence was granted by the bishop of Durham for the erection of an anchorage which was sited on the north side of the chancel. This was later used as a school and vestry.

In 1988, prior to the restoration and conversion of the church, a series of trenches were excavated to ascertain the level of archaeological survival below floor level. Most of the excavated material was of post-medieval date but some evidence of the development of the church was found. The foundations of 12th century walls were seen to be very shallow (0.30m below ground surface) and it was suggested
that the floor of the church had been lowered at some time, possibly by 0.50-0.60m (Passmore, 1988, p 2). An undisturbed burial found 0.80m below the modern ground surface indicated good preservation of archaeological deposits at this depth including evidence of earlier building phases.

Gateshead Rectory (HER 4858; Fig 3)
The earliest recorded incumbent of St. Mary’s Church was Robert de Plessis in 1275, and it is likely that from at least this date a rectory building stood on the site of the later Rectory on the east side of Oakwellgate and opposite the east end of the church. Excavations here in 1999 (HER Event 2092) revealed large quantities of twelfth century pottery and fragmentary remains of a building or buildings, measuring c. 6m north-south x 10m east-west, of 13-14th century date, fossilised within the remains of the post-medieval Rectory.

The structural remains consisted of parallel east-west wall foundations, between which were the remains of a hearth. The wall foundation on the south was substantial and formed of sandstone slabs set in a herringbone form reminiscent of twelfth century structures at the Castle in Newcastle; the wall to the north was composed of boulders and horizontally coursed sandstone rubble. A fragment of dressed masonry found in one of the earlier evaluations may have derived from the church rather than being structurally associated with the rectory.

To the north of the walls was an area of metalling composed of compacted small sandstone rubble and apparently forming a linear south-west/north-east orientated trackway surface. The stony surface again contained twelfth century pottery.

Holy Trinity Chapel and the Chapel and Hospital of St Edmund, Bishop and Confessor and St. Cuthbert (HER 288; Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
The existence of a chapel or hospital called Trinity Chapel is known from land grants of 1196-1207, when it had an establishment of a chaplain and three poor brethren (Mackenzie and Ross, 1834, p 95). In 1248 the brethren of Trinity Chapel were united by Bishop Farnham into a new foundation called ‘The Chapel and Hospital of St Edmund, King and Confessor, and of the glorious Bishop Cuthbert, in Gateshead’ (Hutchinson, 1787, Vol. II, p 455-6). It is not clear however if the Trinity Chapel had occupied the site of Farnham’s Hospital and was physically incorporated into a new building, or if the Trinity Chapel stood elsewhere.

The new foundation consisted of 4 priests, one of whom was the master. In 1325, the buildings of the hospital included, in addition to the chapel, a buttery, a kitchen, a brew-house, a granary, a byre and a pig-sty. Burials seem to have taken place from an early date; a medieval grave slab discovered in 1836 is now set in a reconstructed Elizabethan gateway (Ryder, 1997, p 4). In 1361 John Appleby the Master of St. Edmunds, was paying a wayleave of ten shillings for use of a road, possibly the later Park Lane, from the Hospital to the ‘manor of Frere-Goose’ (NRO ZAN M12/C9). The Hospital’s lands at Friar’s Goose included about a
quarter of a mile of the riverside, and may have been associated with the salmon yare (fishery) known as ‘Turnwater’ in the fourteenth century. In 1448, Bishop Neville appropriated the hospital to the Nunnery of St Bartholomew, Newcastle. Following the dissolution of the monasteries, the lands of the hospital were acquired by William Lawson, whose daughter inherited it. Her husband, William Riddell, built a mansion east of the chapel, later known as Gateshead House.

St Edmund’s Chapel is a relatively rare example of a medieval hospital chapel, the shell of which survived relatively unaltered until the late nineteenth century. The degree of archaeological survival within the chapel is unknown, though it is likely that underfloor heating installed in the nineteenth century may have truncated deposits. Earlier wall surfaces may survive below later plasterwork, which make it difficult to ascertain the extent of nineteenth century restoration work. The remains of a medieval range may lie adjacent to the west side of the chapel ((Ryder 1997, p 8).

Excavation on the north side of the chapel in 1992 recorded several walls, which may have been of nineteenth century date, and an undated burial in a wooden coffin. Medieval deposits had been truncated by the construction of modern garages on the site (Goodrick, 1992, p 4-5).

Chapel of the Hospital of St Edmund, King and Martyr (HER 287)
It was founded before 1315, and appears to have been more concerned with spiritual refreshment and assisting the poor than the Hospital of St. Edmund Bishop and Confessor. The hospital continued to function after the Dissolution, Dr. Belassis being master in 1544 (Mackenzie and Ross, 1834, p 96 and Ryder, 1997, p 4).

The relationship of this institution to the Hospital is confused, with some historians assuming that both apellation referred to a single site. Oliver’s map of 1830 however clearly marks King James’s Hospital as being on the east side of Old Durham Road some 400m south of the building now known as Holy Trinity, and outside the assessment area. Manders (1973, p 138) also clearly indicates that the two were separate buildings.

3.3.3 The Medieval Bridge (HER 310; Fig 3)
In 1070-2 William the Conquoror, returning south after battle with Malcolm, King of Scotland, saw no bridge by which the river could be crossed (Clack and Gosling (ed.), 1976, p. 118). The existence of a bridge across the Tyne before c. 1200 can however be inferred from early Newcastle deeds (eg. Oliver 1924, p 68, no 95), and this may have been built to serve Roger Curthose’s ‘New Castle’ of 1080.

According to the chronicler Matthew Paris (Bourne 1736, 28) this bridge was destroyed by fire in 1248 and was reconstructed two years later in 1250. It has been assumed that the reconstructed bridge was that which survived until the eighteenth century, Other evidence has been taken to suggest that the stone
bridge was actually in existence by the late twelfth or early thirteenth century (Clack and Gosling (ed.), 1976, p 118).

One complete land arch of the stone medieval bridge survives under the present swing bridge, and another can be found in the basement of Watergate Buildings in the Sandhill i.e. on the Newcastle side (HER 310).

Near the middle of the bridge was a tower belonging to the town of Newcastle, south of which the administrative and judicial division between the Palatine of Durham and the Borough of Newcastle was marked by two cross-marked stones, popularly called “Cuthbert’s Stones” set into the piers. These were later superceded by a single ‘Blue Stone’ in the parapet. South of the Blue Stone, the bridge was the responsibility of the bishops of Durham. Another stone tower stood at the southern end of the bridge, with a wooden drawbridge (the latter was re-removed and replaced in stonework in 1770) and the bishop’s coat of arms. Both sides of the road were lined with shops and houses (Buck 1745, Brand, 1789; Manders, 1973, p 118-119) although when these were built is uncertain. The southernmost part of the bridge also formed part of Gateshead’s market area.

From the eleventh century the Tyne was the boundary between Northumberland and Durham, and the width of the river was divided so that the northern third belonged to Northumberland, the southern third to Durham, while the centre third was common. The bridge however was not so equally divided, the northern two-thirds of the Tyne Bridge belonging to the town of Newcastle, and only the southern third to the bishopric. The determination of the burgesses of Newcastle to achieve economic domination over the River Tyne meant that the bridge was often a point of dispute. In 1383 the burgesses of Newcastle took control of the whole bridge and began to build a tower at the south end. In 1416 Bishop Langley regained control of the palatinate’s third of the bridge and the burgesses of Newcastle were obliged to surrender the tower they had begun to erect. The southern third of the bridge remained the responsibility of the bishopric until 1836 (Manders, 1973, p 8 and HER 310).

**Medieval waterfront**

The low water mark of the Tyne formed the northern boundary for some tenements in Pipewellgate, and possibly represented a plot with a dwellinghouse on the south side of the road and a section of foreshore or reclaimed land on the north which could be developed with wharfs or staiths. Evidence of such burgage plot divisions can be traced in part of the extant river wall (HER 4828) at Pipewellgate (Ev. No. 2050; Jubb and Ayris, 1995).

Pipewellgate Staiths (HER 4385)
Land was bought in 1349 with the purpose of building ‘ley staiths’ and in 1408 William Sire contracted a mason, Thomas Fourneys, to construct a staiths at Pipewellgate (Boyle and Knowles, 1890).
3.3.4 Medieval Market (HER 5638; Fig 7)

By 1246, it is known that a market was being held because the mayor of Newcastle sued the Bishop of Durham over whether he should permit a market to be held on the same day as in Newcastle. J.R. Boyle (1890, p 219) quotes from court records of 1336 relating to a dispute between the Bishop of Durham and the Burgesses of Newcastle that Gateshead borough held a market two days a week ‘even as far as the middle of the bridge’ (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 219 and Manders, 1973, p 6). The site is mapped at the location confirmed in later periods, but a location close to and extending onto the bridge, as suggested by the 1336 dispute, is the most likely medieval location.

3.3.5 Gateshead Head, boundary cross (HER 292: adjacent to HER 288; Fig 3)

“In front of the chapel of St. Edmund, Bishop and Confessor, stood formerly a stone cross. It is mentioned in an inquisition held in 1430 as ‘a certain cross standing in the King’s highway at the head of the town of Gateshead’ (ad caput villae de Gateshed). It is again mentioned in a survey of the boundaries of Gateshead Fell, taken in 1647, as ‘a blew stone near Sr Thomas Riddell, Knt. his house, which is fixed in the ground or earth near to the high street leading to the Southwards, close by the East side of the causeway’. Its base remained in 1783, and is shown in Grose’s engraving of St. Edmund’s Chapel. It marked the site known in former times as Gateshead- Head. In the year 1594, it was the scene of a martyrdom. The martyr was John Ingram, ‘a seminary priest’” (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p237-8).

3.3.6 Gateshead Fell, site of medieval battle (HER 705)

“In the year 1068, Northumberland was invaded, and the town now called Newcastle taken by Edgar Etheling, heir to the crown of England, together with Malcolm, King of Scotland, and some Danish pirates, whom William the Conqueror encountered in person, and overthrew on a heath adjoining to that place, and now called Gateshead Fell. Having recovered this place, King William is said to have laid it almost level with the ground, to prevent its becoming in future an asylum to his enemies” (Brand, 1789, II, p 384).

3.3.7 Medieval Wells

St. Elyn’s Well (HER 706)
Welford recorded two mentions of this well: 1324: a tenement in Gateshead lay between the land of Gilbert the weaver and the vennel leading to St. Elyn’s Well. 1356: St. Helen’s Well Croft. St Helen’s Street or Elyngate is first documented in 1270. This street may be associated with the well. Two fields west of the borough inside the Redheugh estate, were called Little St Helen’s Close and St Helen’s Close. Is this the location of the well? (Welford, 1883, I, p 62 and 147).
St. Mary’s Well (HER 707)
Welford (1884, I, p 236) notes one mention of this well: 1403: a tenement bounded on the south by a spring called St. Marywell. A second source (Binnall and Dodds, 1947, 4, X, p 82) gives a date of 1330.

Gateshead Fell, Chill Well (HER 708)
“The Chill Well on Gateshead Fell, where the king’s justices in eyre met the lords of the franchises of Durham, Hexhamshire, Tyndale and Redesdale, who claimed freedom from his jurisdiction. The well was used as a convenient landmark, but does not seem to have been considered holy”. (Northumb. Assize Rolls (1279), Surtees Soc. vol. 88, p 358-9).

3.4 Medieval Industries

3.4.1 Medieval Milling (HER 5639 and 5640)

Gateshead is described in the Boldon Book, a survey of 1183 of the holdings of the See of Durham, as being ‘with borough, mills, fisheries and bakehouses, and with three parts arable land…with the intakes which the lord bishop ordered to be made and the meadows are in the hands of the lord bishop with the stock of two ploughs….’. The Boldon Book makes it evident that cereals were brought into Gateshead from the surrounding countryside, and that together with Durham and Darlington the town was a milling and baking centre, for the bishopric (Austin (ed.), 1982, p 11). The specific locations of the mills (HER 5639) and bakehouses (HER 5640) are not known.

3.4.2 Medieval Fisheries (HER 5641)

A number of fisheries in the Tyne, between the Team and Friars Goose, are referred to in the 1183 Boldon Book and were an important cause of dissension between the Bishop and the town of Newcastle over rights to the river. These were salmon fisheries called yares, which were dams and traps set for the fish as they came up river. In the fourteenth century the fisheries are first named as ‘Greneyare’, ‘Maleyare’ (near Redheugh), ‘Kirkyare’ (opposite St Mary’s Church), ‘Helpeyare’ (off Gateshead Park) and ‘Turnwater’ (off Friar’s Goose).

In 1322 an inquiry was held after three of the bishop’s fisheries on the Tyne had been destroyed. A further inquiry in 1336 stated that the bishop had fisheries on the south side of the Tyne and the fishermen of Pipewellgate were free to sell their fish as they pleased, but recently they had their catch taken by force to Newcastle and if they attempted to sell it elsewhere they were heavily fined. The King directed that the liberties of the see of Durham should be respected, but a further inquiry was necessary nine years later and interference in fishing and shipping on the south side of the Tyne continued. In 1393, Richard II confirmed the rights of the see of Durham over its rights of navigation, mooring and unloading on the south side of the river but, in 1447, the King granted conservatorship of the whole of the Tyne to
the mayor and burgesses of Newcastle effectively giving the Corporation control of all riverine trade (Manders, 1973, pp 7-8). By 1505 the bishop’s bailiff in Gateshead was reporting that the revenues of three fisheries, ‘Gayreyare’, ‘Feuleryare’ and ‘Heleryar’ were in decline (op cit, 1973, p 4).

3.4.3 Medieval Coal Mining (HER 5637)

The earliest explicit reference to coal mining in the town is in 1344 when coal was conveyed from coal workings by pack horse to the river side and tipped in to keels for shipment (op cit, 1973, p 6). Evidence for earlier mining activity is provided by the streetname ‘Colyercher’ in a deed probably of the late twelfth century (AA, New Series, Vol. 15, p189, document 210).

In 1349 land was bought with the purpose of building staiths and in 1408, William Sire contracted a mason, Thomas Fournys, to construct a staiths at Pipewellgate (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, HER 4385). In 1364, timber from the bishop’s park was granted to the lessees of the coal mines to construct pits and watergates (Manders, 1973, p 7). Disputes over trade with Newcastle affected mining; in 1367, proprietors of coal mines in Gateshead were obliged to ship their coal across the river to Newcastle (op cit, p 8).

There is evidence that coalmining in the medieval period took place close to, and even within, the inhabited part of the borough. Excavations in 1999 at Robson’s Yard on the east side of Oakwellgate revealed two circular pits 3m diameter which were interpreted as shafts for coal pits. The infill contained twelfth to thirteenth century pottery. In this area the uppermost coal seams are relatively shallow, at c.5m/15’ below ground level, and such seams would have been easily winnable by means of bell (or crop)-pits - vertical shafts sunk to the top of the seam which was then worked outwards until the roof became unstable and the shaft was abandoned (Ev. No. 2092; ARCUS 2003).

3.4.4 Medieval Pottery Production

Little is known about the medieval pottery industry in Gateshead but it seems possible that small scale production was underway by the fourteenth century, clay being brought from clay pits in the Heworth area (HER 722) to kilns in town. A kiln (HER 5586) was found on the site of the former Ritz Cinema on the High Street during the construction of Gateshead Highway (Manders, 1973, p 62).

3.5 Summary of Medieval Urban form

The medieval core area of settlement, or urban form (HER 293) has been mapped on the basis of documentary evidence, archaeological evidence, and the earliest extant maps, which are post-medieval.
The town was not walled, though there is a possibility that an early core settlement around St. Mary’s Church was enclosed within some form of semi-defensible curvilinear boundary. From this postulated early core, the town expanded southwards, possibly in the twelfth century, in what may have been an attempt to create a planned settlement with back lanes to the east and west, cross-streets (chares) and properties fronting onto the central High Street. As part of this the High Street may have been realigned westwards to serve the Tyne Bridge, leaving a section of an earlier north-south approach to a river crossing fossilised as Oakwellgate.

The extent of the medieval built form may be extrapolated from contemporary deeds, rentals and surveys, and by reference to post-medieval mapping. From these sources it appears that tenements extended at least as far south along the High Street as Collier or Jackson’s Chare (modern Jackson Street). If the distribution of burgages identified as holding ‘Borough Right’ in the early nineteenth century can be regarded as having medieval origins then the medieval town probably had as its southern boundary the Busy Burn, which rose on the east side of the High Street.

4. Post-Medieval Gateshead (AD 1600-1799)

4.1. Historical Background

After the Corporation of Newcastle gained control of the Grand Lease manors in 1599 the coalmines were exploited and Gateshead prospered until the disruption caused first by the invasion of a Scottish Covenanting army in 1640, the ‘Bishop’s Wars’, and then by the Civil War of 1642-50. Following the defeat of the English army at Newburn Ford in 1640 and a brief skirmish on the Windmill Hills (HER 5240; Fig 7), the Scottish army occupied Newcastle and Gateshead for a year, causing considerable damage to Sir Thomas Liddell’s coalmines. Three years later in 1644 another Scottish army under General Leslie, allied to Parliament, besieged Newcastle. Batteries of cannon were placed along the edge of the river escarpment, probably between Windmill Hills and to the east of Oakwellgate to bombard Newcastle. The vestry book of St Mary’s gives an idea of the devastation caused by the Scots, recording that the rectory was destroyed and the church was left in a deplorable state (op cit, 1973, p 17). Further indication of post-war dilapidation is the report by the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1647 that there was no manor house ‘except one house for the farmer (bailiff) to live in which is built with clay and thatched’ (Kirby, 1972).

There do not appear to have been any lasting adverse impacts of the Civil War, and Newcastle continued to control Gateshead’s coal trade into the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Between 1576 and 1676 the population of Gateshead more than doubled (Manders 1973, p 16).

The manors of the Grand Lease were recovered by the bishop of Durham in 1679 but leased again in 1684, first to the Gerards, then in 1716 to the Cotesworths, and
finally to the Ellisons who were the last lords of the manor of Gateshead (Manders 1973, 26-7). By the 1680s the coalmining industry, which had been the source of prosperity before the Civil War, was stagnating. The dry and most easily worked upper coal seams close to the town were becoming worked out, and without effective pumps to overcome flooding the lower seams were virtually unworkable (Manders 1973, p.17). For a time the focus of the coal industry shifted to the well-drained seams of the high ground to the south and south-west of the town, taking with it much of the profits from wayleaves across the town fields which Gateshead had previously enjoyed. For a period there was economic stagnation, and the town’s population in the century between 1681 - 1781 remained static at around 6,000 - 7,000.

There was a gradual recovery in the eighteenth century, assisted by the development of powerful pumping engines which opened up the low-lying coal seams near the river, and by the introduction of new industries. Some new streets were formed, but the overall form of the town and its buildings altered little until the 1830s.

4.2  Post-Medieval Urban Form

4.2.1  Cartographic evidence

The earliest known pictorial representation of part of Gateshead appears in the foreground of a bird’s-eye view of Newcastle dated 1590 (Cotton Mss; Fig 4). This shows buildings clustering around the bridge end and the church, and a suggestion of Pipewellgate, Bottle Bank. In this view Gateshead is foreshortened and secondary to the subject - Newcastle - consequently it cannot be taken as a reliable representation of the extent of settlement. Speed’s 1611 map of Northumberland has a marginal enlargement of Newcastle and Gateshead, (Fig 5) showing Pipewellgate, Hillgate and Bottle Bank as recognisable streets, but only part of St Mary’s Church. Both are stylised and partial representations, and add little to an understanding of the urban form at this period, and little more detail is supplied by the map produced by Sir Jacob Astley (Fig 6), showing the defences at Newcastle and Gateshead at the time of the Civil War.

Beckman’s map of 1684 shows tenement divisions. A similar arrangement is shown by James Corbridge’s map of Newcastle, surveyed 1723-24. It shows some development towards the south along Bottle Bank. Isaac Thompson’s map of 1746 (Fig 9) and Charles Hutton’s map of 1770 maps show field and property boundaries in considerable detail and accuracy, and pre-date the first significant phase of urban development in the 1780s and 1790s. Tenement divisions shown on these maps are likely to have had their origins in the medieval period.

Thompson and Hutton show that much of the former bishop of Durham’s east park maintained a rural appearance until the late eighteenth century, with evidence of agriculture provided by features such as the lime kiln (HER 5588) on Park Lane. Eighteenth century plans also show reservoirs (HER 5593; Fig 7), close to the
Fig 4. Bird’s eye view of Newcastle, Cotton Mss. Unknown, c.1590

Fig 5. Speed’s map of Northumberland, 1611
source of the Busy Burn and on the east side of the High Street, from which water was conveyed into the town, and even into Newcastle, by wooden pipes.

A comparison of Thompson’s map of 1746 and Oliver’s of 1830 (Figs 9 & 13) shows a marked degree of development, both in infilling and in extending the boundaries of Gateshead east and west along the riverside and southwards.

4.2.2. Evidence from Archaeological recording

Post-medieval features, deposits and finds have been revealed in open area excavations at Oakwellgate (Ev. No. 2092) and Bottle Bank (Ev. No.2082). There have also been small scale evaluations in St. Mary’s Church (Ev. No. 2185), Pipewellgate, (Ev. No. 1974 & 2049) Oakwellgate (Ev. No. 2181), Windmill Hills (Ev. No. 1978) and St Edmund’s Chapel (Ev. No. 2152). As with the medieval and earlier periods the depth, quality and survival of archaeological material has been shown to vary greatly between and within these areas. The Bottle Bank excavations took place in an area of burgage plots on the west side of the medieval town where the sloping ground had been terraced to provide building platforms. Most of the available area comprised the backlands to properties fronting onto Bottle Bank and The High Street. Some 0.7m of stratified deposits, with rubbish pits, spanning the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries survived over a large part of the site. Stone walls divided the burgage plots, one of which was still standing, and some were found to have medieval origins. Of particular interest were two dumps of clay tobacco pipe maker’s waste (HER 5625; Fig 7), one dating from the second half of the seventeenth century and the other from about the mid eighteenth century. The former included fragments of muffle kiln.

The Oakwellgate excavations were mainly focussed on the site of the Rectory (HER 4858; Fig 7) on the east side of the street, but also took in a burgage plot further to the south known as Robson’s Yard. This area had been subject to earlier
evaluations (Bidwell, 1990 and Speak, 1991). Substantial structural remains of the rectory cellars survived, showing extensive reconstruction and expansion principally in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. South-east of the rectory a garden area with bedding trenches was found. North-west of the rectory part of the east side of Oakwellgate a street was found buried beneath seventeenth century midden (domestic refuse) material. Among the ceramic finds from this area was a large fragment of cooking pot from Jutland, evidence for maritime links across the North Sea. Large pieces of clay tobacco pipe maker’s muffle kiln and mis-shapen fragments (known as “wasters”) of the 1650s were also found here, associated with a fragmentary brick kiln of the same date. A female human skeleton (HER 5604; Fig 7) had been buried in a north-south grave cut into the road surface, and was dated from associated artefacts to the period 1645-50. It is very possible that this was the ‘witch’ whose burial in 1649 was recorded in the Churchwarden’s Accounts for St. Mary.

4.2.3. Documentary Evidence

The Churchwarden’s Account books for St. Mary contain references to events in Gateshead during the seventeenth and eighteenth century, including aspects of highway maintenance, poor relief, and provision of a whipping post (HER 5642) and ducking stool (HER 5643). There are also references to the Gateshead witch-hunt of 1649 (Mackenzie and Ross 1834, p 89-90).

In 1770, Tobias Smollett described the country on both sides of the Tyne from
Gateshead Fell as ‘a delightful prospect of agriculture and plantations’ (Manders, 1973, p 126).

At the end of the eighteenth century parish registers show a regular flow of specialist workers and tradesmen into Gateshead (op cit, 1973, p 52). The first trade directory in which Gateshead is included is Whitehead’s Newcastle Directory (1782, 3, 4). It lists a great variety of trades; 145 tradesmen are listed, 65 were located in Bottle Bank, 25 in Pipewellgate, 10 in Hillgate and 6 in Oakwellgate (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 225). The character of the urban form of Gateshead in this period is a mixture of commercial, industrial and domestic occupation with an increasing emphasis on the industrial component.

4.3. Components of the Urban Form

4.3.1 Post-Medieval Bridge (HER 310; Fig 3)

The Parliamentary Commissioner’s Survey of 1647 lists the leaseholds to a number of properties, shops and houses on the bridge (Kirby (ed.), 1972, p 117-121) and the bridge continued to be part of the site of the market (see below) demonstrating the inter-relationship between different urban elements.

In 1771 a great part of the medieval bridge was destroyed by a flood. An engraving in J. Brand (1789, Vol 1, opp. p 49) shows the flood-damaged bridge. A temporary wooden bridge was built and a ferry was established between Sandgate...
and South Shore. The rebuilt bridge was not completed until 1781 (Manders, 1973, p 118-119).

4.3.2   Post-Medieval Market (HER 5638; Fig 7)

A market was held twice a week in Gateshead from the market cross, between the tollbooth and the pant, to the blue stone on the Tyne bridge (until 1771), or to the Brig-gate. The tollbooth stood in the main street nearly opposite to the west end of Oakwellgate (Sykes, 1866, p 78). Witnesses in a court case of 1577 between Richard Natrass and the town of Newcastle said that “wheat, bigg and cattle … were on sale about a cross between the tollbooth and the pant; and beans, pease and oatmeal and other goods and merchandice sold at Brige-yate” (Mackenzie, 1827, p 750). The tolbooth (HER 5613) stood on the west side of the High Street, and on the south side of its junction with the nineteenth century Swinburne Street. The Parliamentary Commissioners in 1647, however, noted that no fairs or markets were being held at that time (Manders, 1973, p 25).

At some time, (Manders suggests the late seventeenth century), a shoe fair developed, which by the 1720’s was attracting traders from as far away as Teesdale.

Gateshead House (HER 291; Fig 7)
At the Dissolution the Hospital of St. Edmund Bishop and Confessor was acquired
by William Lawson of Newcastle, whose daughter and heir, Anne, married William Riddell, sheriff and 3 times mayor of Newcastle in the late C16. He built the mansion, to be called Gateshead House, behind and east of the hospital. The Riddells continued to live there into C18 when, in 1711, it passed to the Claverings. As Royalists at the time of the Civil War, the Riddells’ property was damaged by the Scots who “…spoiled many Acres of his ground by making their Trenches in it”, and because the Claverings were Roman Catholics, with a chapel in their mansion, the house was burnt by a mob in 1746 when the Duke of Cumberland passed through Gateshead in pursuit of the Scottish Jacobite Army. It was never reoccupied. Surtees described it as “the ruins of a building in the high style of Elizabeth or James, with large bay windows, divided by stone mullions and transoms...”. The only fragment to survive is an Elizabethan gateway, not on its original site, southwest of Holy Trinity (Surtees, 1820, II, p 127 and Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 234-7).

Lawses Close (HER 4857; Fig 7, approximate extent)
‘Lawses Close’ is shown north of the Rectory on a pre-1771 plan of the Ellison estates. An undated copy of a plan probably made in the early C18 marks the same field as ‘Laws Close’ and this form of the name can be traced back at least as far as 1690. The spelling ‘Lawless’ has been used by extrapolation to make this field the scene of the murder of Bishop Walcher in 1080, which is recorded by Symeon of Durham as having taken place ‘outside’ the church at a place called ad caput caprae or Gotesheved. According to a tradition dating back at least to the beginning of the C18, St Mary’s Church was the successor to an earlier foundation which ‘stood before in the Field below where Brick-kilns now are’ (Bourne, 1736, p 168). Mackenzie (1827, p 751) says the church ‘stood in the field on the northeast side of the rectory, once called Lawless Close, and afterwards the Miller’s Field’. It has further been postulated that this early church was the site of the 7th century monastery referred to by Bede (HER 273). No plans have been yet found indicating the presence of brick kilns sufficiently near to the Laws Close to equate this with the field in Bourne’s description. Church sites do not tend to move, and the present church of St Mary’s was almost certainly in existence by the mid twelfth century. A church or monastery would also be expected to have a burial ground and there are no records of human remains being found in the area of Laws Close. On the available evidence it would be difficult to sustain an argument for an earlier church on another site.

Redheugh Park (HER 5238)
Although beyond the western boundary of the study area, the Redheugh estate was an important part of the township and influenced the form of later development. It was in the possession of Redheugh family since before the thirteenth century. By 1713 the land had passed out of the family. Richardson described the garden, pleasure grounds and plantations as being laid out with great taste. The land was purchased from Cuthbert Ellison in 1836 and by the time it was illustrated on the OS First Edition map, a designed layout was established, but it is unknown to what extent this represents the actual boundary of the earlier park. To the west, planta-
tions shielded the railway which ran parallel to the River Tyne. The southern end of the gardens were on a steep bank which ran along the boundary. The kitchen gardens were protected by sections of walls. To the south of the house the lawn was divided by flower beds. Serpentine walks led around the gardens into the woodland. Eventually railway and industrial activity interfered with enjoyment of the house and it was no longer suitable as a gentleman’s residence. In 1850 the estate was put up for sale. This was unsuccessful and the house fell into decay and was finally demolished in August 1936 (Green, 1995, p 6; Manders pers. comm.).

King John’s Palace, Oakwellgate (HER 5589; Fig 7)
Shown on Thompson’s plan of 1746, as a large building at the south end of Oakwellgate, it was known as Palace Place when sold in 1586.

Pinfold, Jackson Street (HER 5619; Fig 7)
Shown on an eighteenth century plan and on Oliver 1830, this may be a survival from the medieval period.

4.3.3 Post-Medieval Streets

An Act dated 1555 required each parish to appoint a Surveyor of Highways in an attempt to improve the streets, and authorised the use of broken stones from any quarry within the parish. When new streets were formed they too fell under the
Surveyor’s jurisdiction. In 1633, the street from Hillgate end to Pipewellgate, the approach to the Tyne bridge, was laid with ‘hewen’ stones, because of a visit made by the King. Evidence of infrequent highway repairs is found in the Vestry Minute Books for St Mary Parish records (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 224 and Manders, 1973, p 98).

The first recorded significant road improvement was made in 1745 when the gradient of Bottle Bank was reduced and 6 feet of soil was removed from the street (Mackenzie and Ross, 1834 p 100). In 1788, Bottle Bank was widened as far as Hillgate, and as the upper part of Bottle Bank still presented problems it was decided to introduce a new street, to curve from the end of Hillgate to join Bottle Bank at the point at which it merged with High Street. David Stephenson was the engineer responsible for the new street which was completed in 1790, on maps of this time it is referred to as “new street”- only in 1826 was it named Church Street (Manders, 1973, p 99). The arterial roads passing through Gateshead became Turnpikes, with the road to Durham and Tyne Bridge turnpiked in 1746. (op cit, 1973, p 99 -100).

There was one major coaching inn in Gateshead The Black Bull (HER 5644) on the High Street which had room for 150 horses (op cit, 1973, p 103).

4.3.4 Post-Medieval Religious Sites

St Mary’s Church (HER 284; Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
There are records of a schoolmaster being dismissed in 1693 from teaching in a room above the vestry known as the anchorage (Smith, 1964, p 17). In 1701 Theophilus Pickering, rector of Gateshead, gave money by deed to fund a free school in Gateshead, including the provision that if no better building could be found the money could be used for the continuance of the school at the anchorage (Smith, 1964, p 17). The anchorage was rebuilt in the 18th century (Pevsner, p 283). The tower and part of the nave adjoining were rebuilt in 1740 (Mackenzie and Ross 1834, p 84).

Chapel and Hospital of St Edmund (HER 288; Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
The hospital of St. Edmund King and Martyr was re-founded in 1611 by James V and VI as ‘the hospital of King James, in Gateshead, in the Palatine of Durham’. King James’s Hospital had three poor bretheren, with the Rector of Gateshead as Master, and was granted all the lands at Friar’s Goose and Claxtons which had formerly belonged to the Hospital of St.Edmund.

Rectory (HER 4858; Fig 7)
Shown on Thompson’s map of 1746 as two-storied with three dormers and three large chimneys. It was enlarged in 1783, and altered again in 1814 during the incumbency of Rev. John Collinson, when it probably acquired the apsidal east end found in the excavations(Ev. No. 2092). Described as late as 1834 as being ‘a commodious house, with gardens, and commands a fine view towards the river’
(Mackenzie and Ross, 1834, p 89), the Rectory was soon surrounded by industrial development and was abandoned for a new building in Bensham in 1839 (Manders 1973, p 138). Part of the building was subsequently used as a public house called the ‘Brandling Arms’, and later as the first Co-op store in 1861-3. By the 1880s it was a muniment store for the North East Railway, and then as gas and water offices for the company. It was mostly demolished c.1914. One photograph of the building survives, probably dating to the late 1850s or early 1860s (Gateshead Public Library), and it is shown in more detail in John Storey’s lithographed bird’s-eye view of Newcastle of c.1865.

Quaker Meeting Houses (HER 700 and 702; Fig 7)
The first Quaker Meeting House was established in Pipewellgate (HER 702) in 1657 when George Fox made his second visit to the area (Howell, 1967, p 285). This Meeting House became the ‘old Fountain Inn’ (HER 4830; illustrated in Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 32) which was demolished in 1905 and replaced with a new Fountain Inn (Lumley, 1932).

In 1660 the Gateshead Friends’ meeting house was in the High Street (HER 700; Fig 7) on property belonging to Richard Ewbank, i.e. they had left their first meeting house in Pipewellgate. There were some repairs to the house in the 1680s, but the Friends were anxious to have a meeting house in Newcastle and duly opened one in 1698, the Gateshead one being closed in 1699. In 1731 the Gateshead site was reoccupied by Thomas Powell’s almshouse which survived until 1947. The site appears to have been on the east side of High Street opposite the end of Swinburne Street.

Fountain Inn (HER 4830; Fig 7)
The meeting house in Pipewellgate later became the Fountain public house. From this time is also said to date the existence of steps leading from Pipewellgate to the river at the foot of Bottle Bank, often referred to as the Quaker Steps. The date of the founding of the Fountain Inn is not known. The appearance of the building on a photograph of 1879 could indicate that it was seventeenth century in origin. It is recorded in Parson and White’s Directory of 1827 and is identifiable in Carmichael’s painting of Gateshead in 1825. Also in situ at the time of the painting is a three storey warehouse which stood two building plots to the west of the Fountain Inn. The Fountain is thought to have been pulled down in 1905. By the 1950s a single extensive building, used as office furniture works, covered the sites of the inn and warehouse. This was later used by Fife Engineering.

Quaker Burial Ground (HER 701; Fig 7)
The burying ground (HER 701) adjoined the second house, and was located on the east side of High Street, approx opposite the end of Swinburne Street, on land belonging to Richard Ewbank. In 1677 he was cited in the Archdeacon’s court at Durham “for enclosing a burial place for sectaries”. There is some disagreement as to the period of use, but it was almost certainly redundant by the mid eighteenth century. Boyle reported a total of 101 burials. One was in 1679, Abagail Tizack,
whose stone was later removed to Heaton Park (Phillips 1891, p 189).

Presbyterian Meeting House (HER 5645; Fig 7)
In 1786, a Presbyterian Meeting House (HER 5645) in Half-Moon Lane, or Bailey Chare was opened (Mackenzie, 1827, p 755).

Wesleyan Meeting House (HER 5646; Fig 7)
The Wesleyans had a meeting house in High Street (HER 5646; Mackenzie, 1827, p 755).

4.3.5 Post-Medieval Roads

In 1663 an act was passed to permit parishes responsible for roads which passed through them to collect money from travellers to be spent on the upkeep of the roads. The roads were called Turnpikes owing to the fact that a pole or pike, resting on a central post was put across the road and swung round when the toll was paid to allow the traffic through.

Newcastle to Durham Road (HER 4125; Fig 7)
The toll road from Newcastle to Durham was the earliest to obtain a Turnpike Act to fund the upkeep of the route. It had a toll house at Shipcote (HER 3787; Fig 7)

Gateshead to Hexham Toll Road (HER 3628; Fig 7)
The Gateshead - Hexham Turnpike, constructed in 1776/7, came from Gateshead, opposite Gateshead House, via the bridge at Swalwell, to the brickworks at Blaydon Burn, from where it ran up Summerhill Bank to Path Head and then onto Ryton. Typical tolls would be 1/2d for people on foot, 2s for coaches, chariots or landau drawn by six horses, two horses 9d, every drove of cows, hogs, goats, sheep per score 3d. People travelling to church on Sundays were exempt, also when travelling to funerals or visiting the sick. There were nine toll bars on the Gateshead Hexham Turnpike, of which only the Borough Turnpike Toll House (HER 3493; Fig 7) was in the study area. In the 19th century footraces were run on the turnpike (Yellowley 1986).

Gateshead to Monkwearmouth Road (HER 2315: Fig 7)
Toll road from Gateshead to Monkwearmouth, the subject of an Act of 1796, included the Felling Turnpike Toll House (HER 3798), which was located just outside the study area.

Other Roads
Outside the study area, the town was linked to other local centres by further turnpikes, to Wolsingham, County Durham, (HER 3792) and to Swallwell (HER 4330)
4.4 Post-Medieval Industries

By the mid eighteenth century, there were four main industrial areas, Teams (outside study area), Pipewellgate, Hillgate and South Shore. These were the sites of brick and tile yards, potteries and iron works (op cit, 1973, p 52). All these areas had the necessary access to rivers for transport and in some cases water for power, and were sited on conveniently level ground.

4.4.1 Post-Medieval Coal Mining

The mines at Gateshead were specifically mentioned in the lease the Bishop of Durham granted to the crown in 1582 which included all the coal-pits and coal-mines, all common waters and parks (Brand, vol 1, 1789, p 481). There is a post-medieval survey of the collieries of Gateshead and Whickam carried out by the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1652 (Kirby (ed.), 1972). The listed mines in this survey all fall outside of the study area of this project, nevertheless the industry is of primary importance in the development of the area. Coal shipments from Newcastle increased from 56,487 tons in 1574-75 to 602,610 tons in 1677-78 (Manders, 1973, p 16). However, by the 1680s coal was almost worked out from accessible levels in mines in the area and no means of pumping water away to gain access to the lower seams had been found. The parish registers, land rentals and poor rate all show the town to have been stagnating, but the greater distance from river transport meant increased transportation costs and expensive wayleaves.
By the mid eighteenth century the development of pumping engines allowed the lower coal seams to be exploited, a factor which was instrumental in the economic recovery of the town. (op cit, p 17). At Friar’s Goose a building labelled ‘old engine’, marked on a plan dating from between 1756 and 1796 [NRO ZAN M17/197/C/15], was presumably a pumping engine sited so as to conveniently discharge into the Friar’s Goose Dean (HER 5595; Fig 12).

Coal was shipped from staiths on the Tyne such as Rock Staith (HER 4862; Fig 11) on the South Shore (on the site of the present Baltic Flour Mill) which belonged to the Liddell partnership and served their Bensham mines by a wagonway, the Bensham Way. Rock Staith and Dock Staith (HER 4863; Fig 11) which lay some 70m further east, were collectively known as the ‘Bishopps Staiths’ (Manders 1973, p 59), suggesting they originated when the bishop of Durham controlled the manor of Gateshead. West of the town lay the Trunk Staith (HER 5611), off Pipewellgate.

Tyne Main Colliery East (HER 3532; Fig 11)
Tyne Main Colliery, served by two wagonways, (HER 3522 and 3533; Fig 11) was a Grand Allies/Ellison venture, sunk in 1798 (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, II, p 156). Tyne Main Colliery, also called Friar’s Goose Colliery had not been extensively worked until the 1740s when the Liddell partnership installed two Newcomen engines at Friar’s Goose on the riverside, which overcame the minewater problems in this area, connected through the under-river workings with Byker. In spite of all precautions, however, the water was increasingly in excess of the power of the many pumps to deal with it, and in 1763 the Friars Goose engines ceased to work, being drowned out.

The exact location of the Gateshead Park Colliery, owned by William Losh is not known (Durham Mining Museum web-site: www.dmm.org.uk).

4.4.2 Post-Medieval Wagonways and Railways

The two volumes of “A Fighting Trade – Rail Transport in Tyne Coal 1600-1800” (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding 1989) give a detailed description of post medieval colliery wagonways south of the river. In 2004 Alan Williams Archaeology was commissioned to incorporate these features into the HER (Williams, 2004).

Tyne Main/Friar’s Goose Wagonway HER 3533; Fig 11
Tyne Main Wagonway ran from the two Tyne Main Pits, (HER 3532 and 3538; Fig 11), to the Tyne Main Staiths, (HER 3534). It probably followed the line of the earlier Friar’s Goose Way, built c.1746 (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 156).

Parkmoor Wagonway HER 5241; Fig 11
The Parkmoor Wagonway was a diversion of the Bensham Wagonway, constructed c1770. The northern part of the Riddells’ wagonway route from Windmill Hills to Pothouse staith on the river established in C17 was supposedly reused by
this diversion. This route came through the fields and closes on the west side of Gateshead and crossing the west end of Jackson’s Chare, ran north across East Pipe Hills pasture, bending sharply west to join the river at the Trunk Staith. Shown on Gibson’s 1788 Plan of the Colleries. This has been mistakenly identified as depicting a cutting down Rabbit Banks and the present Riversdale Road. Excavation in 2000 across the estimated position of the wagonway failed to recover any archaeological evidence (Northern Counties Archaeological Services, 1999 and Tyne and Wear Museums, 2000).

Gateshead Park Way HER 5944: Fig 11
Serious production did not begin at Gateshead Park Colliery until three engines were installed here between 1740 and 1746 (location not known) and two at Friar’s Goose in 1749 (HER 5595; Fig 12 and on site of HER 1012; Fig 8), to solve drainage problems. The first Gateshead Park wagonway was laid to the original staith at the Trunk, and was still in use in 1754. Not long afterwards it was replaced by another, much shorter, way giving access to the below-bridge Salt Meadows staiths. The colliery may have been taken out of production in 1767. A new deeper colliery was opened outside Gateshead Park in 1798. It was nearer the river and took over the Salt Meadow facilities, probably using an iron way; together with the staith, it was given the name Tyne Main (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 156).

Gateshead Head Way HER 5945
The route of the Gateshead Head Way is uncertain but may have been that recorded in the lease of a small staith in the Salt Meadows with wayleave for a wagonway in September 1656 (Lewis, 1970, p 95). It was granted to Edward Green, a shipbuilder and may have terminated at Salt Meadows in the north-east corner of Gateshead, which was part of the Bishop’s Grand Lease manor and was an ideal place for shipbuilding. There had once been a small colliery here too but this did not belong to Green. His reason for gaining the lease is unclear. In 1636 there had already been a Gateshead Head colliery, initially worked by a wain, but a wagonway had been laid by April 1660. The small profit from the colliery, a mere £300, leads Bennett et al (1989, p 55) to remark that it was odd for a wagonway to be constructed. Although nothing is known about the colliery, wagonway or its staiths, the wagonway of the post-1750 Claxtons colliery may be a truncated remnant of the Gateshead Head Way. However, other possibilities for the site of the Gateshead Head Way staith exist at downstream from the present Redheugh Bridge. If so, the wagonway would have been much longer and probably not an independent one but a branch of other ways (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, pp 54-56).

Bensham Way HER 5946; Fig 11
The Bensham Way first appears on the 1728 plan, which shows it running from Rock Staith on South Shore southwards to a point just short of the Bensham estate boundary along Kells Lane. The plan implies it was laid by Sir Henry Liddell after 1688, but the wording is very loose. It appears again on an estate map of the mid
18th century and is still traceable on the First Edition Ordnance Survey (6 inch), roughly along the present-day West and West High Streets, crossing Durham Road at Shipcote and continuing to Dryden Road. However, this way does not end at Rock Staith, but at the Old Trunk Staith, formerly the principal Riddell outlet, 150 yards above Tyne Bridge. An earlier layout can be discerned crossing High Street below the Sunderland Road corner and using the passage through the town, surviving still as East Street, to reach the river below the bridge – this was clearly the Bensham Way of 1728.

At Trunk Staith (HER 5611, Fig 11), by the end of the seventeenth century, there were 22½ keelrooms (berths for keel boats) extending along what was later King Edward Wharf, enough to handle over 2500T. Many of these must have existed by 1647 when a survey of Gateshead manor shows 18 keelrooms at Trunk and Redheugh. It remains unclear who the first Bensham Way can be attributed to, whether Sir Henry Liddell or William Riddell. A new partnership was formed in 1685 between the sons of the second Ravensworth baronet, John Rogers and Creagh. It is implied by Bennett et al (1989, 79) that this must have necessitated a general redevelopment of the wagonway and drainage, although nothing is recorded. Bensham Colliery was virtually worked out by 1720 and the eastern end of the wagonway was not worked again until after the mid 18th century. The Way did undergo several rebirths in later years, together with others, such as Sheriff Hill, Gateshead Fell and Gateshead Park Way, although they belong to a different era. It is unknown what happened to the Bensham Way in the 1720s and 1730s, although it may have remained open for collieries on Gateshead Fell (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 78-80).

Sheriff Hill Way HER 5947
Although it is not known what happened to the Bensham Way in the 1720s and 1730s, it may have continued operating for collieries on Gateshead Fell. In the 1760s there was certainly one operating this route, using the old staith at Trunk, although the name of the colliery is unknown. The wagonway is shown on a plan of the Shipcote Estate dating from before 1768, and is shown on the First Edition ordnance Survey 6 inch map running from Kells Lane down, what was then, Back Lane to Shipcote. In 1768 Gateshead Park Colliery was replaced with a new Sheriff Hill Colliery on Gateshead Fell called Parkmoor. The Bensham Way was rebuilt to carry the projected output. A better approach to the Tyne was built, apparently using part of the old Windmill Hill descent down Pasture Banks upstream from Trunk Staith. Much of it survives today and is used as a footpath; the remainder of the line must have followed the Old Bensham Way. Part of a later redevelopment of the Bensham Way, made possible by deeper shafts. A redevelopment of Parkmoor Colliery on Gateshead Fell in about 1790 required better staiths to be built. They were provided at Friar’s Goose on the Felling Boundary. To reach these new staiths the line left the old Bensham Way north of Shipcote and swung east in an arc above Gateshead town. It remained in use for at least ten years after the next (Sheriff Hill Way III) was built in about 1805, but had disappeared before 1820. A new Sheriff Hill Colliery, Ellison’s Main, was sunk at Beacon Lough (outside the
study area); it was the largest and most important of all Gateshead collieries. A much shorter wagonway was constructed direct to the river using the new technology of the self-acting incline. The inclined plane appears to have joined an old Heworth Way, taking advantage of the closure of the old Heworth Colliery and its staiths, which now became Sheriff Hill Staiths (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 156).

Windmill Hill and Redheugh Way (Saltwellside Way) HER 5948; Fig 11
The wagonway is recorded on the Wagonways on South Bank of the Tyne plan of 1728 after Stella Grand Lease. It was laid out no later than 1647. The plan shows a very short line, less than three quarters of a mile long, serving the colliery on Windmill Hill on the Bensham estate and running to the Pott House which stood at the east end of Pipewellgate. Its staith must have stood near the southern abutments of the High Level Bridge (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 53, 80-84).

Sir Ralph Carr, predecessor of Sir Henry Liddell, was the great man of coal in Gateshead. He worked the extensive Fieldhouse and Saltwellside collieries and probably used the Windmill Hill wagonway to staiths at Stinking Burn and South Shore. In 1707 he took over the top end of the Windmill Hill Way and relaid the wagonway across Robson’s closes, Town Fields, Stinking Burn and Bradley Head.

Possibly the work of Sir George Vane, Saltwellside was a very considerable colliery by 1670 and Vane had keelrooms at Team Staith. These could not have handled the output of a major colliery however, and the alternatives were an outlet through Fieldhouse, or a way down to the east bank of the Team and then along into Redheugh. Early Ordnance Survey maps show some evidence of such a way. Saltwellside Way probably existed on the east bank of the Team from around 1670 to about 1720. When both Team and Dunstan became overcrowded after 1725 they were relieved by an overflow branch from Team to Redheugh staiths and this might have been a reinstatement of the lower end of the Saltwellside Way (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 53, 80-84).

Friar’s Goose Way (HER 5963; Fig 11)
The shortest of all wagonways belonged to Friar’s Goose Colliery, which is mapped under its later name of Tyne Main Colliery, East (HER 3538; Fig 15). It was made possible by the effort to drain Gateshead Park and was about a quarter of a mile long. Both workings and staith were later reused in developments of the Tyne Main Colliery and in the reshufflings of Gateshead staiths (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989).

4.4.3 Post-Medieval Iron Founding and Engineering

The earliest mention of iron founding houses, at the east end of old Trunk Staith (HER 5611) on Pipewellgate, occurs in 1721 when they were leased by Cotesworth to Cookson and Button (Cotesworth Mss CA/2/65). The concern worked from two premises (HER 4403 and 4404; Fig 12) and prospered. By 1760
the firm also had premises in Newcastle and at Whitehill near Chester-le-Street (Manders, 1973, p 65).

Another foundry (HER 5585; Fig 12), reprocessing iron waste used as ballast, was established to the east of Hillgate in 1747 by William Hawks, foreman blacksmith to Sir Ambrose Crowley of Stourbridge, and was called “New Greenwich” after Crowley’s old works on the Thames. Hawks’ works produced spades, shovels, bar iron and steel. In 1774 the works consisted of four rooms, a smith’s shop, and a mill powered by a water course which ran through the Park Estate (Manders, 1973, p 66-67). The foundry had a mill (NZ 2608 6386) and a mill pond (NZ 2614 6386). New Greenwich Iron Works is shown on Oliver’s plan of 1830 and on Hutton’s plan of 1770. William Hawks’ son William inherited the works in 1755 and he expanded the works until his death in 1801. In the nineteenth century, it expanded into the larger Gateshead Iron Works (HER 5177; Fig 15).

Iron foundry, Pipewellgate (HER 348; Fig 12)
This may have been the concern of John Whinfield who owned an iron foundry in Pipewellgate in the late eighteenth century. In 1798, Whinfield became the sole agent for Andrew Meikle’s threshing machine.

Park House, St. James Road (HER 5094; Fig 12)
Park House, Listed Grade 2, was demolished in 1996. Built in 1730 by James Gibbs for Henry Ellison, it was a fine red brick mansion in Flemish bond with stone dressings. The interior had long been gutted apart from two brick passage arches.
The building had been in industrial use, forming part of Clarke Chapman’s factory. Sir Charles Parsons developed the design of the first steam turbine in secret in this building. The site was later part of the Victoria Engineering Works (in 1882 the company was called Clarke, Chapman and Gurney). In 1884 Parsons, who had bought a partnership in the company, took over the newly organised electrical department. The company now became Clarke, Chapman, Parsons & Company. On April 23rd 1884 Parsons took out his first patent numbers - 6734 and 6735 - covering the design of steam turbo-dynamos.

On November 10th 1891 Park House was gutted by fire. The fine staircase, shown in Boyle and Knowles’ “Vestiges of Newcastle and Gateshead”, along with the oak panelling, were destroyed. Park House is shown on the OS First Edition as an isolated stately home within its own grounds. The outside walls of Gateshead Park House were still standing in 1973.

4.4.4 Post-Medieval Glass Working

In the seventeenth century glass making was concentrated in Newcastle, although individuals, (for example Timothy Tyzack) lived in Gateshead. There may also have been glassmakers operating in Gateshead at this time. In the eighteenth century glass works were established in Gateshead at Pipewellgate and South Shore.

The New Stourbridge Glass Works were established in 1760 by John Sowerby at the west end of Pipewellgate (HER 3482: Fig 12). The works manufactured flint glass. Later the firm moved to East Street where pressed glass and hand-made cut table glass was made (Manders, 1973, p 77). In 1881 it became the Ellison Glass Works (Campbell, 1968, p 15).

A glasshouse at South Shore (HER 4363; Fig 12) is shown on a map of 1747 (Manders,1973, p 76), possibly that which was let by Joseph Liddell in 1753 to a partnership. This was a bottle works, owned in 1795 by Ilderton and Barker. The work’s buildings are shown again on Hutton’s map of 1771-2.

4.4.5 Post-Medieval Ship Building

Despite opposition from the Newcastle guilds, shipbuilding and related industries existed in Gateshead from at least the sixteenth century (Manders, 1973, p 81). In 1705, Thomas Reed, who leased two smith’s shops and a wet dock near Rock Staith, was selling keels (Clarke, 1997, p 16; HER 5648; Fig 12), and his family, like others working on the south bank of the Tyne, prospered by joining the Newcastle guild and working through its structures. In the second half of the eighteenth century the shipbuilding industry in the town was dominated by the Headlam family, with a yard at South Shore (HER 5649; Fig 12). There were various other South Shore yards, but by the end of the eighteenth century the industry was being concentrated down-river although the Gateshead firms continued for some time further.
4.4.6 Post - Medieval Ropemaking

George Wray, brick maker on South Shore, also owned a rope-walk (HER 5650; Fig 12) in 1771 (op cit, p 78). This may be the same as that established by Stoddart and Co. in 1795 at Saltmeadows (HER 4366: Fig 12) and soon owned solely by a former partner Anthony Hood. In 1799 Hood introduced a rope-making machine, patented by William Chapman in 1798. This technological innovation eventually superceded the earlier rope-walks and marked the beginning of the growth of ropemaking in Gateshead (op cit, p 78).

Hillgate Ropery (HER 4856; Fig 12)

‘Lawses Close and Ropery’ is shown north-east of the Rectory on a pre-1771 plan of the Ellison estates. Leases of a ropery ‘near the River Tyne’ apparently in the vicinity of Laws Close occur at least as early as 1691, when a Newcastle roper, William Davidson, took a lease on a ropery in Hillgate, with a ropewalk parallel to the Tyne. This is presumably the one shown on Isaac Thompson’s map of 1746. Edward Softley, ropemaker, appears in Trade Directories as working on the South Shore in the 1780s and 1790s (Whitehead 1782 and 1790). Rope making continued to be the dominant industry along this part of the riverside until the late 1830s. About 1800 Peter Haggie took over the existing ropery along what is now South Shore Road, later forming a partnership under the name of Haggie and Pollard, finally becoming known as Haggie Brothers. Haggie’s Works, which in 1858 included a timber yard and saw mill beside Sculler Stairs at the east end of Hillgate and an open rope walk on the south side of South Shore Road, was one of the principal employers of labour in Gateshead at this time and David Haggie Jnr was mayor at the time of the Gateshead explosion of 1854. By 1864 part of the saw mill was converted into a wire rope factory. This had become the firm’s principal product, with new wire-roperies being built in 1873 and 1899. Hemp ropemaking was discontinued in 1884. After a fire in 1884 the wire ropery was expanded. This period saw a number of subsidiary works being formed, including a general engineering works and the Tyne Wire Drawing Company. By the 1890s the firm enjoyed a high reputation. In 1918 a new wire drawing shop was built on part of the former Abbot Works. This began a move away from the riverside and by 1940 the quayside was cleared of buildings. The company became part of British Ropes in 1926, and manufacture on the former Abbot’s site continued under the name of Bridon Ropes until the 1980s.

4.4.7 Post-Medieval Clay Tobacco Pipe Making

(HER 5045,5615,5616,5623 and 5625; Fig 12)

In 1629 the burial of James Wilkinson, pipemaker, is recorded, and by the mid seventeenth century Gateshead was the centre of clay tobacco pipe manufacture in the north-east. The industry may have been encouraged by pre-existing industries also using pipe clay, particularly glass-making, almost all of which was shipped from south-east England via King’s Lynn (Parsons 1964, p 233-4). The first recorded Gateshead pipe maker was William Sewell who was buried in St.
Mary’s in 1646. By 1675 the pipe makers were sufficiently important to join the 
apothecaries and grocers in the formation of a guild, granted by Bishop Crewe. 
Known pipe makers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries include the 
Holmes and Parke families, Taylor Ansell, Michael Swaddell and John Hastings 
(Parsons, 1964, p 249-254).

Evidence for clay tobacco pipe manufacture has been found in archaeological 
excavations at Bottle Bank (HER 5615, Oxford Archaeology North 2004; Fig 12) 
where a dump of clay pipe waste was located, some with the maker’s mark of 
Michael Parke (working c. 1692-1737). Parke held a mortgage on a burgage on 
the west side of Fore Street (probably High Street or Bottle Bank). A muffle kiln 
was found at Oakwellgate (HER 5045, ARCUS 2000; Fig 12).

4.4.8 Post-Medieval Textile Manufacture

Jorewin de Rocheford visited Tyneside from France in 1672 and noted that Gates-
head ‘is inhabited by divers manufacturers, employed in making cloth and worsted 
stockings in great quantity, which are here very cheap; wherefore they are sent all 
over Europe’ (Grose, 1807, vol 4, p 611). One woollen yarn factory (HER 5651), 
the location of which is not firmly established, was owned by Henry Peareth in 
1751, and organised on a factory basis. The workers had an annual public parade 
from the factory to the owner’s house in Newcastle. The establishment of another 
manufactory was reported in the Newcastle Courant in 1762, possibly that known 
as ‘Oswalds’, working between c.1766-1835. Linen was also produced, as a fire 
in a flax dressers, reported by the Newcastle Courant of 17 March 1753, indicates 
(Manders, 1973, p 51-52).

4.4.9 Post-Medieval Potteries

In 1699 William Davidson of Beamish took a lease from the Corporation of New-
castle of a messuage in the Salt Meadows ‘with liberty to carry away clay to make 
pots and other earthen vessels’ (Long Box 15/13/49). The location of Davidson’s 
pottery (HER 5652) is unknown, but may be the ‘Pot House’ (HER 5607; Fig 12) 
shown on an early 18th century map (Gateshead Public Library Local Studies 
Centre CAB A1/6).

In the eighteenth century there were several potteries working in Gateshead. In 
1757 William Hillcoat and Joseph Warburton had a pottery at South Shore, which 
may have been the same ‘Pot-house’ referred to above. Others were established 
at Carr Hill and another at Sherriff Hill which lie outside the Study area.

4.4.10 Brick making

Bourne (Bourne 1736, 168) refers to the field ‘below where the Brick-Kilns now 
are’, identified as Lawses Close (4857, Fig 12) on the north-east side of the Recto-
tory. Traces of kilns (HER 5600; Fig 12) were found in excavations on the east side
of Oakwellgate in 1999 associated with clay tobacco pipe making waste dated to c.1650 (ARCUS 2000).

A ‘Tile yard’ (HER 5628; Fig 12) is marked on an eighteenth century plan (pre-1746?) on the Saltmeadows, and a ‘Brick Kiln Close’ south of Park Lane (Gateshead Public Library Local Studies Centre CAB A1/6).

4.4.11 Windmills

The importance of Gateshead as a milling centre for County Durham in the medieval period has already been noted (Manders, 1973, p 61).

By 1647 the high ground to the west of study area was known as the Windmill Hills (HER 3492; Fig 12), an important open space close to the western edge of Gateshead. Early usage is likely to have been agricultural but by the seventeenth century its elevated situation was recognised as useful for wind powered milling. Windmill Hills was also a traditional meeting place and popular racecourse during the eighteenth century (Ayris and Linsley, 1994, p 54 and Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1999).

It is possible that the windmills marked by Oliver in 1830 on the east side of West Street (HER 5609 and 5610; Fig 12) originated at this time.

4.4.12 Chemical and Tanning Industries

The oldest chemical manufactory in the town (HER 5655; Fig 12) can be traced to the ‘Jew of Oakwellgate’ who is said to have manufactured a compound of cyanogen, prussian blue, in the district in the 18th century (Manders, 1973, p 74). He moved his apparatus from Corbridge to Gateshead, possibly to be nearer the expanding markets for his products but still outside the jurisdiction of the trade companies of Newcastle. (Campbell, 1968, p 31).

4.5 Summary of Post-Medieval Urban Form

The extent of the urban form in this period has been mapped based on Beckman’s map of 1684, Thompson’s map of 1746 and Hutton’s map of 1770. Documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence suggest that even by the late eighteenth century the pattern and density of settlement had changed little from the medieval period. Within the urban core there was a mix of small-scale manufacturing and commercial activity with domestic occupation, though in the seventeenth century some industrial processes were being carried out on the periphery of the settled area, particularly along the South Shore and in the Salt Meadows. Within the settled area existing buildings were utilised for new purposes, and new outbuildings and workshops were constructed on the tenement plots. Areas of specifically industrial development, particularly along the riverside, also grow in this period.
5. Nineteenth Century Gateshead

5.1 Historical Background

By 1840, Gateshead had developed into a large industrial town with a population approaching 20,000. In the period from 1820 the population had grown by approximately 5,000. From the mid-1860s, the selling of many of the landed estates within the borough led to the building of hundreds of cheap dwellings for workers. This tendency increased in the 1880’s (Taylor and Lovie, 2004). The relative cheapness of land and a favourable rating system led to the building of more houses than were needed for Gateshead and it became, in part, a dormitory town for workers from outside (Manders, 1973, p 18). Boyle describes Pipewellgate in 1890 in the following manner “Very few traces of the former importance of Pipewellgate can be discovered. Many of the old houses have fallen into ruin, others have been converted into workshops, whilst, on the sites of some, manufacturies of one kind or another have been erected. Behind the buildings, at the eastern extremity of the south side, is an old half-timbered building of the sixteenth century” (Boyle and Knowles, 1890, p 244).

5.2 Nineteenth Century Urban Form

5.2.1 Documentary Evidence

There is a wealth of potentially relevant documentary material to the history and development of 19th century Gateshead, the sheer volume of which precludes adequate synthesis in this assessment. For example, the vivid account in Thomas Oliver’s ‘Perambulatory Survey’ (A Picture of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1831, p137-138 quoted in Manders, 1973, p 52-53) provides a good picture of contemporary Gateshead, listing the many factories along the river side, and the streets of crowded tenements.

The Great Fire of 1854

The Great Fire of 1854 was instrumental in the destruction of large parts of both the Gateshead and Newcastle quaysides, causing the deaths of 54 people, but also destroying some of the most insanitary parts of the riverside, particularly on the south bank. The fire began shortly after midnight on Friday 6th of October, in Wilson’s worsted manufactory in Hillgate. The conflagration spread to a neighbouring naptha and sulphur warehouse, the resulting explosion causing the flames to spread along the quayside and burning debris to be hurled across the river. Virtually all of Hillgate was destroyed including the worsted factory, the sulphur warehouse, a temporary Catholic chapel and a large number of tenemented dwellings. St Mary’s church was also badly damaged. Hillgate did not recover as a residential district, and a Quay (HER 5654) was built on the vacant land on the north side of the street.
5.2.2 Cartographic Evidence

A comparison of Hutton’s map of 1770 with that drawn by Thomas Oliver in 1830 (Fig 13) shows that physically Gateshead had not significantly altered or grown in the intervening sixty years. Large scale and highly accurate mapping becomes available with the First Edition Ordnance Survey in 1858, the urban core of the town being mapped at a scale of 1/528 for engineering and planning purposes (frontispiece). The First Edition OS is the first to show in detail the impact of railway building and industrial development in the late 1830s-and 1840s. A comparison of Oliver and the First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1857 reveals the dramatic intensity of change that had taken place in just twenty-five years. The 2nd edition Ordnance Survey (1898) shows how complex and rapid the continued pace of development and change was during the second half of the 19th century.

5.2.3 Evidence from Archaeological Recording

Archaeological evaluation work in 1988 (Passmore), and 1990 (O’ Brien) has recorded evidence of the foundations of nineteenth century buildings. On the whole it would appear that these are regarded as truncations of earlier material rather than being recorded in their own right. Archaeological investigations at Bottle Bank (Oxford Archaeology North 2000) and particularly at Oakwellgate (ARCUS 1998) included investigation and recording of nineteenth century deposits and features.

The first upstanding nineteenth century industrial structure in the study area to be archaeologically recorded was the Maiden’s Walk Coal Drops (Nolan 1995) (HER
4860 Listed Grade 2; Fig 15). In 2002 the surviving structures of the Greenesfield Locomotive Works were also recorded (NCAS 2003; HER 3488 Listed Grade 2).

5.3 Nineteenth Century Gateshead - Components

5.3.1 Bridges

In 1810, the Tyne Bridge (HER 310; Fig 14) was widened, but by 1850, dredging of the Tyne had rendered its foundations insecure and this, together with its growing hindrance to up-river development, resulted in its demolition in 1866. A temporary bridge was built before the Swing Bridge (HER 1003; SAM County No. 5) was completed in 1876. The High Level Bridge was completed in 1849 (HER 4132; Listed Grade 1) and involved demolition of houses (Manders, 1973, p 119-120).

5.3.2 Public spaces and facilities

Shoe Fair (HER 5638; Fig 14)

The shoe fair was in decline in the nineteenth century. In 1845 there were only seven stalls ‘straggling from the top of Church Street to the railway bridge over High Street’ and the last shoe fair was held in 1853 (op cit, p 91-92).

Oakwellgate Public Baths and washhouse (HER 4859; Fig 14)

The Oakwellgate Public Baths and Washhouse (laundries), designed by William Hall the Borough Engineer, were erected at a cost of £4,300 in 1854 on a site
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previously occupied by several small buildings belonging to the Rectory. The Baths opened in 1855. In 1884 it was reported that the laundry facilities were heavily used by the working class, but the Baths less so, due to high charges. By the First World War the Baths had become Reay Gearworks, and remained as commercial and manufacturing premises until burned down in 1986. The Baths were a Grade II listed building. A carved stone goat’s head, which surmounted the Corporation crest on the central gable of the façade has been built into the stone wall around the present car park (Northern Counties Archaeological Services, 1998).

Windmill Hills (HER 5239; Fig 14)
This had been a traditional meeting place and during the early eighteenth century a popular racecourse. Windmill Hills gradually became more and more popular as a park, but was not suggested as a People’s Park until 1857. It became Gateshead’s first public park in 1859. The importance of Windmill Hills as a place for public outdoor entertainment and leisure was established throughout the course of the nineteenth century. The Whitsuntide hoppings were held there in 1829. A ‘training ground’, apparently a circular running track, is shown in 1858 and the hustings for the 1868 election were held there. Throughout the 1850s the brass band from Hawks Crawshay’s works gave concerts on the Windmill Hills. The Windmill Hills continued to be a popular place of resort, although terraced housing developed on the west side from 1858. The upper part of the hills was extensively remodelled before 1974 with the creation of earthen embankments and playing fields. The site has now been developed with modern housing and a newly landscaped public space (Green, 1995, p 8 and Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1999).

East Cemetery (HER 5250; Fig 14)
Opened on 16 August 1862. The Church of England and non-conformist chapels survive as does the superintendent’s large house (bearing the Gateshead crest and the date 1862) and a lodge. The cemetery is divided into two by a path. Simple grid plan of paths with central circular circle on each side. The most prominent monument is to Mr. Brockett, Mayor of Gateshead 1839-40 and a major local political force of his day. There is also a monument to 222 cholera victims from an outbreak which lasted from December 1821 to November 1823. There is a small recreation ground to the north of the cemetery and the remains of Victorian drinking fountains can be seen here by Sunderland Road and Old Durham Road (Green, 1995, p 30).

5.3.3 Railways

The railways were a major influence upon the nineteenth century development of Gateshead, both in changing the urban landscape and in generating employment and industrial development in associated engineering works. The first connections were from east to west, while the major link to the national network, from north to south, following a decade later. In addition to the arterial routes, a number of minor lines, both wagonweays and railways, provided links across the township, most notably from the pits, both local and more distant, to the river in the eastern half of the study area.
Newcastle and Carlisle Railway (HER 3292)
The Newcastle and Carlisle Railway opened in 1837 – the first passenger railway to provide, at the outset, passenger facilities at intermediate stations. It terminated at Blaydon, where the Redheugh Branch Line (HER 3447) continued to Redheugh Station (HER 3480).

Brandling Junction Railway (HER 2289; Fig 14)
The Brandling Junction Railway from Gateshead to Monkwearmouth opened in 1839. In the same year the company completed a rope-hauled incline carrying coal and passengers from Redheugh Station (HER 3480) to Greensfield Station (HER 4374). From there locomotives drew the wagons along a viaduct over High Street and Oakwellgate, to Oakweelgate Station which had to be constructed on a platform raised 20 feet above street level (Manders, 1973, p 113 and Scott 1839, p 39).

Oakwellgate Station (HER 4368; Fig 14)
The Gateshead depot of the Brandling Junction Railway (B.J.R.) was situated on a high artificial mound east of Oakwellgate. The original intention had been to build the depot at a lower level on the same site, but the decision to carry the branch line from Redheugh Quay across Gateshead on a viaduct instead of a tunnel, necessitated a change in the plans for the depot. The level of the mound had to be raised from 12 feet to 32 feet, most of the filling material being cinders from the nearby Hawk’s works. The mound was surrounded on three sides by a brick and masonry retaining wall, that on the north side having 12 arched recesses which were intended to be let as warehouses; a further arch, of larger size, was formed over an inclined plane leading down to a coal drop on Gateshead Quay. A broad inclined carriageway led up from Oakwellgate to the north-west corner of the depot, and at the same corner was “a sort of tower which encloses a spacious staircase intended for those who arrive on foot”. This wooden staircase cost £515 15s 10d (Felling station, HER 1013, cost £175!). In addition to the passenger terminus of the B.J.R. there was room in the depot area for a carriage shed, warehouse, and engine repair shed. The Oakwellgate depot was not used for passenger traffic for many years. The local trains may possibly have been diverted to the new station of the Newcastle and Darlington Junction Railway at Greensfield (HER 4374), which was opened in 1844, and both stations were soon superseded by yet another new station (HER 4376) situated on the southern approach viaduct to the High Level Bridge (Fleming, 1977 and Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1998).

From Oakwellgate Station there were links to South Shields and Sunderland, while an inclined railway ran down to the riverside at Hillgate (HER 4868; Fig 14). The station ceased to operate for passenger traffic in September 1844, when the Brandling Junction Railway was bought up by the Newcastle and Darlington Junction railway. Oakwellgate became a goods terminus, with the Drops added to its eastern side (Maiden’s Walk, HER 4860; Fig 15) c.1838-9 for handling coal for the South Shore Coke Ovens and lime from the kilns in Hillgate via the incline.
Newcastle and Darlington Junction Railway (HER 2625; Fig 14)
In 1844 George Hudson’s Newcastle and Darlington Junction Railway Company secured parliamentary powers for a north-south connection to Gateshead, and a ‘high-level’ bridge across the Tyne. A new station was built at Greenesfield (HER 4374) between February and June 1844, and comprised an engine shed with a roof carried on wrought iron trusses and columns made by the Gateshead firm of Hawks Crawshay. On the north side was a two storied hotel, with platforms and waiting rooms. The station was opened on the 18th June 1844 with the arrival of a train which had taken 8 hours and 11 minutes to cover the journey from Euston (Manders 1973, p116).

With the construction of the station, Greenesfield was seen as a new focus for the administrative offices of the town, and a Town Hall (HER 5612) and a Police Station (HER 5620) were built to the east of the terminus. Greenesfield’s importance was short-lived, and within five years construction of the High Level Bridge and the Central Station in Newcastle drew passenger traffic to the north side of the river, and the budding new town centre atrophied. Following the collapse of the Hudson empire, the North Eastern Railway took over the network, and Gateshead suffered a slow decline as the company’s strategic planning favour investment in Newcastle at the expense of Gateshead (op cit, p 117). Greenesfield Station closed to passenger traffic in 1850 when Newcastle Central Station was opened. It was converted into railway workshops for the York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway. The hotel became offices and was demolished in 2003.

Minor Railways and wagonways
A railway loop (HER 3511; Fig 14) linked Tyne Main Colliery (HER 3512; Fig 15) to Gateshead Park Iron Works (HER 3504; Fig 14). The Tyne Main Wagonway (HER 3533; Fig 14) ran from the two Tyne Main Pits (HER 3532 and 3538) to the Tyne Main Staiths (HER 3534). It probably followed the line of the earlier Friar’s Goose Way, built c.1746 (Bennett, Clavering and Rounding, 1989, p 156). Another wagonway, HER 3528; Fig 14, linked the southern equivalent, Tyne Main Colliery, South (HER 3532; Fig 11) to the ballast hill (HER 3513) that occupied waste ground to the south of Gateshead Iron Works (HER 5177; Fig 15). Smaller routes connected minor sites, like the wagonway shown on the OS First Edition (HER 4126; Fig 14) from Claxton Quarry to the North Eastern Railway mainline, to enable goods and raw materials to be transported to wider markets. A branching wagonway system (HER 3522; Fig 14) served various sites in the Salt Meadows area of Gateshead.

5.3.4 The Quayside
Brandling Junction Railway Quay (HER 4861; Fig 14)
In 1838 the Brandling Junction Railway Company obtained permission from the Corporation to erect a quay at the east end of Hillgate, which was in place by 1844. This was the terminus of the inclined tubway from Oakwellgate Station goods depot, and included a timber drop for transferring coal and lime to shipping. By 1864 the Brandling Junction Quay had become the North East Railway Wharf.
By 1940 it was cleared of buildings, and rebuilt as a GPO sorting office by 1985. The site is now occupied by HMS Calliope (Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1998).

Hillgate Quay (HER 5654; Fig 14)
Hillgate did not recover as a residential district after the Great Fire of 1854, which started in Wilson’s worsted manufactory in Hillgate on Friday 6th October. After the fire Christian Allhusen put forward a proposal to Gateshead Council for a Corporation Quay. This would have involved removing the old Tyne Bridge to provide rail links at each end of the quay. It was hoped that the North Eastern Railway would provide much of the funding. A quay was built on the vacant land on the north side of the street but it was on a less grand scale than had first been anticipated. A new rope-hauled inclined railway was laid to the quay from Oakwellgate Station by June 1862. NER would not improve the rail facilities, so the landings of cargo at the quay remained insignificant. The quay had to be substantially subsidised by Gateshead Council. In 1922 it was leased to the Tyne-Tees Shipping Company. In 1929-30 large parts of the structure fell into the Tyne. It was rebuilt in the 1930s (Manders, 1973, p 47-48).

Associated with the provision of facilities for the shipping trade, and particularly necessary for colliers, was the growth of ballast dumping grounds. Two ballast hills are shown on the First Edition OS map, HER 3513 and 3520, both Fig 17.

5.3.5 Nineteenth Century Religious Sites

Church of St Mary (HER 284, Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
From 1838-9 much of the chancel and the windows of the nave and aisles of St Mary’s Church (HER 284) were restored by Dobson after damage in the fire of 1854. St Mary’s continued to be used as the parish church until it was damaged by fire in 1982 and ceased to be used as a school c.1870 (Smith, 1964, p 17).

Hospital of St Edmund Bishop and Martyr (HER 287, Listed Grade 1; Fig 3)
The Hospital of St Edmund Bishop and Maryr, and Gateshead House, were still in ruins in 1827 (Mackenzie, 1827, p 753). Subsequently Cuthbert Ellison gave the ruined Chapel to the Rector and churchwardens of Gateshead, and after restoration by John Dobson, the Chapel was reopened for worship as Holy Trinity Church in 1837. In 1894-96 a new church of Holy Trinity was built incorporating the old chapel as its south aisle (Manders 1973, p138). The Hospital chapel was rebuilt as St. Edmund’s Chapel in 1810 (Manders 1973, p 214-5, 219-220).

5.4. Nineteenth Century Industries

5.4.1 Coalmining

By this time coalmining had virtually ceased within the town, the last working pit being Oakwellgate colliery (HER 5616: Fig 15) which was closed after flooding in
1858, but production continued elsewhere in the township. Nothing remains above ground of the extensive facilities and infrastructure associated with the industry apart from the monumental ruins of the Friar’s Goose Engine House (HER 1012; Fig 15), the last of a series of engines built to drain the Tyne Coal Basin.

Tyne Main Colliery West (HER 3512; Fig 15)
Shown on OS First Edition.

Tyne Main Colliery East (HER 3538; Fig 15)
Tyne Main Colliery, also called Friar’s Goose Colliery, was not extensively worked until the 1740s when pumping made deeper levels close to the Tyne profitable. It closed and was then re-activated a number of times before ceasing production by 1895.

Friar’s Goose Engine House (HER 1012, Listed Grade 2; Fig 15)
The fragmentary remains of a nineteenth century beam pumping engine house massively constructed beam-wall survives showing the location of a beam pivot socket, gantry joist holes and a round headed opening; the pivot wall is buttressed. The engine house, as it appeared in c1840 is illustrated in a “View of the Collieries in the Counties of Northumberland and Durham” by the artist T.H. Hair.

Shipcote Colliery (HER 3529; Fig 15)
Shown on OS First Edition, when it was newly opened, by John Bowes and Co. It passed onto the Marley Hill Coal Company and then John Bowes and Partners before becoming worn-out in the 1880s (Manders, 1973, 58).

Mine shaft (HER 4866; Fig 15)
Possible mine shaft, to the north-east of Oakwellgate Colliery, identified on Oliver 1830.

Coal shaft (HER 3491; Fig 15)
A Coal Shaft, marked as Old on the First Edition OS mapping.

Tyne Main Staiths (HER 3534; Fig 15)
Tyne Main Staiths, shipped coal from the Tyne Main Collieries, via the Tyne Main Wagonway.

Maiden’s Walk Coal Drops (HER 4860, Listed Grade 2; Fig 15)
The Coal Drops were added as a secondary feature to the Oakwellgate station, built across open ground held by Cuthbert Ellison on lease from the Bishop of Durham. A clear butt joint separates the piers of the drops from the station’s east retaining wall which formed the rear of the drops. There are no precise records of the date of construction of the drops themselves, though they are likely to have been built after 1838 and before 1844. The drops consist of a series of 15 piers built of local sandstone rubble with dressed quoins. Two phases of construction are apparent in the drops themselves, with the eight southernmost drops having
thinner piers than the remaining six to the north. The eight southerly drops are shown on an undated plan by Thomas Bell. This increase in thickness may have been dictated by the fall of ground towards the river, and compensated for the additional weight of masonry in the higher piers. The Coal Drops did not as has previously been thought, serve the incline to the quay. On the undated plan by Thomas Bell the drops are clearly set off to the east of the incline and this arrangement is confirmed by Oliver’s plan of 1844 which shows the seven southernmost drops covered with a long building, while the remaining six are open. The Bell plan makes it clear that from the outset the drops were an independent facility, presumably providing an outlet for coals and lime, without any physical connection to the incline which began on the north side of Oakwellgate station. The First Edition Ordnance Survey map marks the drops as ‘Oakwellgate Depot (Coal and Lime)’, supporting the interpretation that it was a terminus for these products, where they were unloaded for local sale and distribution by road. Listed as a rare and interesting industrial survival with some architectural pretension, the site was archaeologically recorded in 1998 (Ev. No. 1595; Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1998; Ayris and Linsley, 1994, p 38).

South Shore Coke Ovens HER 3509; Fig 15
The ‘Cinder Quay’ belonged to the Marley Hill Colliery, and it consisted of a single battery of coke ovens ranged along the north side of South Shore Road. These were fed by coal brought from the colliery via the Lobley Hill branch of the North Eastern Railway to the Oakwellgate depot of the Brandling Junction Railway, which was then transferred to the inclined tubway and carried down to the Brandling
Junction Staith from where coal was transferred onto a short railway line into the oven complex. Technologically the Marley Hill cokeworks was a relative latecomer to the south bank of the Tyne, where ‘cynder ovens’ had been in existence in the Salt meadows area since at least 1745. By 1858 the ‘South Shore Coke Works’ had been supplemented by another battery of ovens closer to the river. These had been built after 1851 and the whole complex was fed by an overhead railway which was served by a branch line from the bottom of the Brandling Junction incline. References to the Coke Ovens in the trade directories cease after 1890, from which it might be inferred that production had ended. In 1893 the Marley Hill Colliery had no less than 230 coke ovens actually on the colliery site, suggesting that the South Shore Ovens were unnecessary and perhaps uneconomic by this time. The coke oven structures were still on the site in 1898 (Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1998).

Coke Ovens HER 3526: Fig 15
A small bank of coke ovens is shown on Saltmeadows n the mid nineteenth century maps.

5.4.2 Engineering

Most iron founders of significance had, by the 1830s, begun to engage in some branch of engineering. Abbot’s for example combined forge and foundry work with the construction of steam and hydraulic machinery. However it was not until the 1860s that specialist engineering firms were developed to exploit niche markets across the Tyneside industrial conurbation.

Locomotive engineering began in Gateshead with John Whinfield, who owned an iron foundry at Pipewellgate (see above, Section 4.2.2) and in 1803 became the sole agent for Richard Trevithick’s locomotive engine. Between 1804-5, a prototype railway locomotive was built and successfully run over a short distance at the Pipewellgate foundry, but the locomotive did not leave the works and was used as a stationery engine in the foundry. Whinfield subsequently lost the agency and went bankrupt in 1824 (Manders, 1973, p 71). A foundry is marked on the First Edition OS map of 1862, the only one in Pipewellgate (HER 3487; Fig 15), but it is not possible without further research to make a definite link between the two.

Elsewhere in the town, a locomotive engineering works was set up at Oakwellgate by John Coulthard in 1839 and closed in 1865 probably because of the development of the North Eastern Railway’s engineering works at the former Greenesfield Station from 1852.

Greenesfield Locomotive Works (HER 3488, Listed Grade 2)
The NER Greenesfield Locomotive Workshops were established in 1852 utilising and extending the 1844 station buildings. The works expanded in the second half of the 19th century, until lack of space prompted the company to moved locomotive building to Darlington. The Greenesfield site continued as a repairing facility until
The Greensfield Works was for many years the largest employer in the town. It was opened in the 1850s and by the early years of the 20th century over 3,000 men relied on it for their livelihood. But the cramped site limited its expansion and in 1910 locomotive building was transferred to a new works at Darlington. Locomotive repairing continued at Greensfield until 1932 when that ceased also; the works reopened during the Second World War but was finally closed in 1959. The Station Hotel of 1844 was a stone building with an unmodified façade to the north, with 7 bays and a hipped roof. It ceased to be a hotel in 1850 when the adjacent railway station closed to passenger traffic. The hotel was extended and converted into offices for the works in c.1869, finally being demolished in 2003.

The boiler shop was built c.1871. There is also a smith’s shop, pattern shop, L-shaped office block, 1851-2 railway workshop, Western Pacific Shed - the largest building on the site, built in the mid-late C20, and the 1844 train shed. A red sandstone parapet wall built on a base of reused firebricks survives. Extensive areas of wood block paving associated with the smith’s shops has been recorded. The sandstone retaining walls onto Rabbit Banks Road are of interest. There is an incised cross at one end, possibly a reused boundary marker relating to the Bishop Of Durham’s lands above Pipewellgate. Archaeologically recorded in advance of conversion to housing (Northern Archaeological Services 2000 and 2003).

Sunbeam Lamp Works (HER 4360)
This was part of the Victoria Engineering Works (HER 5095; Fig 15). The Sunbeam Electric Lamp Company was formed in 1880. They mostly made steam turbo-dynamos for use on ships for electric lighting. Charles Parsons joined the Victoria Works in 1884 and developed his steam turbine in this building. The Sunbeam Lamp Works incorporated Park House (HER 5094), an eighteenth century mansion. It burnt down in 1891.

Victoria Engineering Works (HER 5095; Fig 15)
The Victoria Works started life as a company called Clarke, Chapman and Gurney in circa 1874. William Clarke had previously owned a small factory at South Shore, Felling in 1864. In 1884 when Mr Gurney resigned, Charles Algernon Parsons bought a junior partnership in the firm. Parsons arrival at the Victoria Works coincided with the company’s interest in developing electricity for use on board ship. In the 1880s Parsons began his experiments with turbine engines at Park House (Manders, 1973, p 71-72). The Company became known as Clarke, Chapman, Parsons & Company until 1888, when Parsons left to further his development of the turbine at Heaton in Newcastle. Steam turbo-dynamos were made by the company. These were mainly used on board ships for electric lighting. The first generating plants were constructed by the company in 1884. In 1893 the Company
was incorporated and its name became Clarke, Chapman and Company Limited. The company fitted the Theatre Royal in Newcastle with a Butler gas engine and dynamo for electric lighting in 1895. They manufactured their first electric winch in 1896 (Pearson 1973).

Quarry Field Works, later Close Works & Davy Roll Co (HER 5443; Fig 15)
The Quarry Field Works (marine, locomotive and general engineers) were established by John Coulthard (ex Walker Iron Works) & Son in 1840. He was shortly joined by his brother Ralph. They commenced building locomotives for NER and collieries. In April 1853 the partnership between John and Ralph Coulthard was dissolved when John died and the firm became R. Coulthard and Co. In 1865 Ralph retired and the works were taken over by Black Hawthorn & Co. Building was concentrated more on industrial locomotives for collieries and iron works but a number of tender locomotives were also built and went to many parts of the world. Between 1871 and 1874 the works were extended to include the present-day site of Close Works south of Quarryfield Road. The firm developed into one of the premier builders in this area and up to 1896 when the firm ceased trading, over 1100 locomotives had been built and many rebuilt. The firm was bought by Chapman and Furneaux who produced a further 70 locomotives, but ceased marine engineering. The last locomotive built was in 1902. The firm’s drawings, patterns and templates were bought by R & W Hawthorn Leslie & Co of Newcastle. In 1904 Ernest Scott & Mountain, electrical and colliery plant engineers, purchased the site and rename it Close Works after their former works in The Close, Newcastle. They go into liquidation in 1911. In 1913 C.A. Parsons & Co Ltd acquire a section of Close Works. In 1915 Sir W.G. Armstrong Whitworth & Co. Ltd takes over Close Works. It is re-equipped as a foundry in 1920. Roll manufacture commences in 1933 and pneumatic tool manufacture is transferred here from Armstrong’s Elswick works in 1937. Wartime production included bomb casings, gun barrels, aero engine cylinder blocks and propeller hubs. In the 1950s Kue-Ken rock crushing equipment was made and the pneumatic tools division was sold to Thor Tools Ltd in North Shields. In 1968 Close Works was acquired by Davy Ashmore and in 1970 the Davy Roll Co. Ltd was formed (JW Lowe, “British Steam Locomotive Builders”, date unknown).

Engineering workshop, Kelvin Engineering Works
Surviving former engineering workshop of late C19. May originally have been built as part of the New Woolich Works (HER 4400). Red and yellow bricks with raised portion of the roof, or lantern, extending the full length of the ridge. Shown on Reid’s map of 1882 and OS First Edition 25” published in 1884. By 1940 it was part of the Kelvin Engineering Works.

North Eastern Railway Works HER 4370, with engine shed HER 4371 and goods shed HER 4372 are shown on OS Second Edition map.
5.4.3 Chemical and Tanning Industries

The river frontage at South Shore was one of the main locations for the chemical industry. By the nineteenth century, it was already a conglomeration of industries; glass, soap and iron. In the early nineteenth century, various chemical works opened. In 1828, Thomas Doubleday and Anthony Easterby, Newcastle manufacturers, sought to change the use of some land at Gateshead from whale oil to oil of vitriol manufacture (HER 3485; Fig 15). The high price of alkali led them to use recovered soapers salts. The first sulphuric acid chambers on the Tyne had been set up for this purpose in 1809 at Bill Quay (Campbell, 1968, p 17). A ‘Sulphuric Works’ on Pipewellgate is marked on the First Edition Ordnance Survey map of 1857 (HER 5627; Fig 15).

Tyne Soap Manufactory HER 3515; Fig 15 and Friar’s Goose Chemical Works HER 3537: Fig 15
Anthony Clapham, a Quaker, moved his soap factory (HER 3515) from Ballast Hills to Friar’s Goose (HER 3537) in 1827, largely resulting from continual prosecutions for causing a public nuisance. Soap making itself was not a problem, but the reclamation of black ash from the soap lees made a disagreeable smell (Campbell, 1968, p 18). This had the effect of opening out of the South Shore to Bill Quay and the establishment of the largest chemical works in the district (Campbell, 1968, p 18). Soap manufacture was in progress here from 1829 and soda manufacture from 1831. This was followed by the construction of Clapham’s chimney (263 feet) (HER 5598; Fig 15) then thought to be the tallest building on Tyneside (Campbell, 1961, p 30). By 1839, an educational society and library had been established. In 1852, the factory was bought by Gray and Crowe and was making bicarbonate of soda and Epsom Salts. It was sold at auction to Jarrow Alkali works 1858 and both were taken over by United Alkali in 1891. The works at Friars Goose closed shortly before the First World War but the main works at South Shore remained open (Manders, 1973, p 74).

Tyne Alkali Works/Alhusen’s Chemical Works (HER 3519; Fig 15)
The soda works at South Shore (HER 3519) were developed by Charles Attwood, initially a glass manufacturer. By 1835, his works had expanded and included a saw mill and soda manufactory. The venture was not a success until it was bought by Christian Alhusen in 1840 (HER 3537; Fig 15). The following year he added the neighbouring premises of Doubleday and Easterby who dealt in whale oil. The firm expanded rapidly as new land was acquired. At its peak, it covered 137 acres, bounded by Park Road, Neilson Road, Tyne Main Road, Saltmeadows Road and Albany Road. 50 acres of this was covered with buildings. In 1872, the capital of the company was increased by the creation of the Newcastle Chemical Works Company which went public the following year (Manders, 1973, p 74-75).

The largest section of Alhusen’s works were devoted to the production of sulphuric acid. There were also recovery plants for nitre, sulphur, chlorine and manganese. Riverside wharves and jetties were provided with steam cranes for rapidly unload-
ing lighters and railway sidings gave good access to transport for the finished products. Material was transported around the plant using an overhead railway known as Penman’s Gears (Campbell, 1968, p 24-26).

The United Alkali Co. took over Alhusen’s in 1891 and production concentrated on caustic soda. In 1909, at its peak, 1,200 men were employed. By the end of the First World War the chemical industry was concentrated on Teeside and was being run down on Tyneside. In 1926, United Alkali, (Alhusen) became part of ICI, and the Gateshead works were in decline, already much of the works had been re-let as small factories, garages, poultry houses and the like. The last great chimney was demolished in 1932. The remaining 2 million ton spoil heap - ‘The Great Heap’ (HER 5591; Fig 15) - was utilised for agricultural purposes in the 1950s. The recovered land was incorporated in to the East Gateshead Riverside Park 1966 (Manders, 1973, p 74-75).

Vitriol Works HER 3485: Fig 15 
In 1828 Thomas Doubleday and Anthony Easterby, Newcastle manufacturers, sought to change the use of some land at Gateshead from the manufacture of whale oil to oil of vitriol. The high price of alkali led them to use recovered soaper’s salts. The first sulphuric acid chambers on the Tyne had been set up for this purpose in 1809 at Bill Quay.

The Whellan Directory of 1855 lists 14 manufacturing chemists many of which were located at South Shore, Bill Quay and Pipewellgate. The latter area began to decline as an industrial area towards the end of the nineteenth century, some of the last manufactories being an Oil and Bitmo works (HER 5587: Fig 15) and an Asphalte works (HER 5603; Fig 15).

Green’s Tannery, Bankwell Lane HER 5164;Fig 15 
Now demolished but in origin an eighteenth century industrial building used as a tannery, a once flourishing Tyneside industry of which nothing now remains. The nine-bay, two-storey building had massive sandstone rubble walls with deep openings.

5.4.4. Ironfounding

Hawk’s Gateshead Iron Works (HER 3516, 4400, 5177, 5585; Fig 15) 
The Hawks’ works established in the previous century at New Greenwich (HER 5585) were described in 1801 as ‘extensive cast-iron work, where great quantities of cannon, mortars, balls etc for the use of the government are made… men are employed manufacturing hammers, large anchors, chains, bolts, spades, pikes etc. at the head on Bottle Bank’ (Baillie, 1801 and Manders, 1973, p 68). Additionally, works were erected at New Deptford (HER 3516) to the east side of the main works and, by 1819, at New Woolwich (HER 4400) on the west side. In 1889, the Gateshead Iron Works (HER 5177) was described as extending over 47 acres including boiler works, iron foundry, chain and anchor works, rolling mills for bars,
rolling mills for plates, steel works and other incidental and associated departments (Manders, 1973, p 68). Hawks works are marked on maps by John Wood, 1827, and Thomas Oliver, 1830.

In 1831, Hawks estimated that there were between 800 and 900 men employed in the iron trade in Gateshead. By 1839, Hawks alone was employing 800 and there were about 1,600 in the trade. A school for Hawks’ workers was begun in 1832. From the 18th century the firm had been buying houses which they subtenanted to workers and in the late 1830’s the company houses, ‘Hawks Cottages’ were built. These were pulled down in the 1960s (op cit, p 68).

Monument to George Hawks, Bensham Road HER 5176, Listed Grade 2; Fig 15 Hawks’ Iron Works (SMR 5177: Fig 15) became, at one point, perhaps the most important industrial complex in Gateshead, although George Hawks himself (1801-63) is better known as Gateshead’s first Mayor. The monument was erected by “his friends and by the workmen of Gateshead Iron Works, of which he was the fifth senior partner”. Monument dates to 1865. Stone with standing figure in mayoral robes and chain, holding a scroll and standing on a stepped base resting on a square plinth (Ayris and Linsley, 1994, p 78).

Park Iron Works HER 3504: Fig14
Another major iron works was that which had been founded by Joseph Abbot in 1795. In 1812, Joseph Abbot was succeeded by his son, John, who in 1825 moved the firm to Bush Yard, Oakwellgate and began to expand the business. The firm undertook brass, copper and pewter work and manufactured cables, chains and nails. In 1835 John Abbot took a lease of three fields belonging to the Ellison’s Park Estate, on which he developed the Park Iron Works. The Park Iron Works had its own internal railway system, and was supplied with coal from the drops at Maiden’s Walk. By 1889 the works covered 14 and a half acres, making chains, anchors, boilers, cranes, and steam and hydraulic machinery. There was also a brass foundry and copper workshops which turned out tinware and pewter pots, and undertook domestic and marine plumbing (Descriptive Account, p.39). Like the Hawks’ works, it lacked specialisation and in 1909 went into liquidation (Manders, 1973, p 70).

Cable Chain and Iron Works HER 4386, Fig 15
Described as Mr. Horner’s cable chain and iron works by Oliver in 1830, the site was later occupied by a timber yard (HER 3483; Fig 17).

Hymer’s Old Foundry HER 5594: Fig 15
The First Edition Ordnance Survey shows this foundry between High Street and Oakwellgate.

Iron foundry, Pipewellgate HER 3487; Fig 14
Shown on OS First Edition. This may have been the concern of John Whinfield who owned an iron foundry in Pipewellgate in the C18.
Iron warehouse HER 3507; Fig 15
Shown on OS First Edition in the area currently occupied by Baltic Square.

Two further iron foundries (HER 4378; on the site of the earlier Vitriol Works HER 3485; Fig 14 and 4380; Fig 15) in Pipewellgate are marked on the Second Edition Ordnance Survey. A small steel works was located at Saltmeadows (HER 436; Fig 15)

5.4.5 Glassmaking

The works established at South Shore and Pipewellgate in the eighteenth century continued to operate into the nineteenth century. The South Shore glassworks (HER 4363: Fig 16) belonged to the Tyne Glass Co. in 1824 (Manders, 1973, p 76), and are shown on Wood’s map of 1827, and by Oliver in 1830 and 1844.

Joseph Price took out a patent for glass manufacture in 1814, and c.1820 opened the Durham Glass Works for making flint glass near the west end of Pipewellgate (Oliver 327-8; HER 3486; Fig 16). By 1827, he had an interest in the nearby British Flint Glass Co. (HER 4405), where he manufactured patent plate glass (Manders, 1973, p 77). Sowerby’s New Stourbridge (Flint) Glass Works (HER 3482; Fig 16) moved from the western end of Pipewellgate to East Street in 1850, where it made pressed glass, though the Pipewellgate factory continued to produce flint glass for some years thereafter (op cit, 77).

The large glass manufactories declined dramatically in the 1830s, and the numbers employed by the works fell from 500 in 1833 to 280 in 1839. The Tyne Glass Company’s works (HER 4363; Fig 16) at South Shore closed c.1840, and by the end of the century there were only two large firms operating in the borough, Sowerby’s (Sowerby’s Ellison Glass Works, with a subsidiary Gateshead Stained Glass Co., started in 1889) and the Teams Glass Works established by George Davidson in 1868 (op cit. 77). A bottle works are however shown in Pipewellgate on the First Edition Ordnance Survey of 1857 (HER 5601; Fig 16). Another short-lived glass works (HER 4373; Fig 16) is marked as disused on the Second Edition OS map.

5.4.6 Clay tobacco pipe manufacture

Ten pipe makers are recorded in Gateshead in 1838. The First Edition Ordnance survey map (1857) marks three pipe manufactories on the north side of Pipewellgate (5614, 5615 and 5623, all Fig 16), one in Oakwellgate (HER 5045; Fig 16), and two on Bottle Bank (HER 5606 and 5625; Fig 16). Six makers are recorded again in 1890. Francis Finn was probably the only pipe maker to organise on factory lines, he gained control of his father’s business in 1884 and added dry-salting and a sweet business. More commonly, pipemaking was carried out by solitary pipemakers, the last of whom was George Stonehouse, whose shop off the High Street closed in 1935. Joseph Hardy’s shop in Bankwell Lane closed the previous year (Manders, 1973, p 80-81).
5.4.7 Potteries

Tyne Main Pottery on South Shore worked 1831-1853 (op cit, p 64). A Pottery (HER 4361; Fig 16) marked on Oliver 1844 map as the Tyne Main Pottery, becomes subsumed into Tyne Alkali works (HER 3519; Fig 15).

5.4.8 Brickmaking

A number of brickworks existed within the study area in the nineteenth and into the twentieth centuries, to supply the booming construction industry of this period.

Stourbridge Firebrick and Sanitary Pipe Works HER 3489; Fig 16 Stourbridge Firebrick and Sanitary Pipe Works. Established in 1853 by J. Snowball and a Mr Walker. Survived until at least 1885. Another manufactory by R.T. Wardman was being operated in Pipewellgate in 1861. The last brickworks in Pipewellgate was the Tees Scorrie Brick Company, working in 1890.

On the South Shore five brickmakers were recorded in the nineteenth century, one of which, Allhusen’s, were making firebricks in 1856. At Friar’s Goose a brickfield (HER 3530; Fig 16) and associated clay extraction pits (HER 5597) was in existence by 1857, as were the South Shore Brickworks (HER 3514; Fig 16) and, on the western boundary of the study area, the Rabbitbanks Firebrick Works (HER 3490; Fig 16).
5.4.9   **Ropemaking**

By c.1800 Davidson’s Hillgate ropery (HER 4856; Fig 16) had been taken over by Peter Haggie. Haggie formed at partnership to become the firm of Haggie and Pollard, later Haggie Brothers. In 1858 the works included a timber yard and saw-mill part of which had, by 1864, been converted to a wire-rope factory. This became the firm’s principal product, with new wire-roperies being built 1873 and 1889, and hemp ropemaking was discontinued in 1884 (op cit, pp 79-80).

The roperies shown on Fig 16 were all shown on the 1857 First Edition Ordnance Survey: on the south side of Pipewellgate (HER 5630); on the east side of High Street (HER 5626); in Jackson Street (HER 5618); and on the South Shore (HER 4366).

5.4.10   **Milling**

In 1827 the Windmill Hill (HER 3492; Fig 12), west of the study area, was still notable for the number of corn-mills upon it (Mackenzie and Ross, 105). MacKenzie, in his “History of Durham” published in 1834 wrote that Windmill Hills was “studded with corn mills which, seen at a distance, impart a lively and picturesque effect to the landscape”. Richardson’s mid nineteenth century engraving of the area shows ten mills in the area, seven on Windmill Hills. In style these were windmills of the post-mill variety, having timber bodies and sails set upon brick or stone roundhouses, some of which were later turned into dwellings. Gibbon’s windmill (HER 3495; Fig 16) stood on the south side of the Hexham Turnpike until after 1857, when it was shown on the OS First Edition. As late as 1830 two windmills lay within the study area, on the east side of West Street (HER 5609 and 5610; Fig 12). All of Gateshead mills were closed by 1890 and a report in the Evening Chronicle in 1927 marks the demolition of the last of the old windmills on Windmill Hills.

5.4.11   **Quarrying**

No active sandstone quarries, exploited for building stone, are recorded within the Study Area in the nineteenth century, though two quarries (HER 5621 and 5622) which are marked as ‘old’ on the 1857 Ordnance Survey map, may have been worked into the early 1800s. A number of small quarries are shown on Fig 16.

5.4.12   **Shipbuilding**

In the 1820s there was a sharpening of the distinction between ship and boat building, the latter remained at Hillgate, while the ship builders grouped at Friar’s Goose (Manders, 1973, p 81-82).

Robson and Gray/Gaddy and Lamb Shipbuilding Yard HER 3535: Fig 16
A yard is shown on Wood’s Plan of Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead (1827)
with the annotation Robson and Gray. Over the mid-nineteenth century, the yard was run by the partners Gaddy and Lamb. It was a small company and did not survive the general conversion of the river to iron ship construction over the 1860s and 70s. However, map evidence shows that the yard remained in use (owners not presently established) over the rest of the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century.

Fairs Boat Yard/Anderson’s Slipway/Mitchison’s, Friar’s Goose HER 5020: Fig 16 Mitchissons Ship Repair Yard was founded in 1919, on a site which had previously been known as Fairs Boat Yard or Anderson’s Slipway. Mitchison’s repair yard was taken over in 1955 by James Burness and Co. of London and refitted for ship construction, concentrating on tugs, trawlers and other small vessels. In 1964, the yard was closed and taken over by Friars Goose Marina Management Group. The yard is, today, within the marina development at Friars Goose.

An engine and shipbuilding yard is shown on the First Edition OS maps (HER 3517; Fig 16) on South Shore.

5.4.13 Gasworks

A Gas Works on Pipewellgate (HER 4377; Fig 17) is marked on the Oliver 1831 map and a building is shown on the same site on the 1844 Oliver map. Later the site becomes incorporated into the adjoining manure works (HER 4379; Fig 17). Gas House (HER 3524; Fig 17), possibly constructed to provide lighting for Allhusen’s Chemical works (HER 3519: Fig 15) was next to the reservoir on Saltmeadows.

5.4.14 Timber

Gateshead had several large depots for trading in imported timber, particularly Baltic softwoods. These were on (HER 3483 & HER 3508, both Fig 17) or near (HER 3506; Fig 17) the quayside and supplied timber a sawmill on Hillgate (HER 3510; Fig 17).

5.4.15 Lime Burning

Between 1802 and 1827 a bank of two lime kilns was constructed against the escarpment immediately west of Abbot’s Stairs (HER 4864; Fig 17). The kilns were probably operated by William Hymers & Co, the only lime burners in Gateshead at that time (Williams Directory 1841). The kilns were no longer marked by 1898 (OS 2) but a short railway branch line was shown leading from the incline to their site. A public house called the Lime Kiln Inn, presumably catering for thirsty limeburners, was established on the west side of Abbot’s Stairs by 1858 (Northern Counties Archaeological Services 1998). Oliver (1831) maps other kilns on the south road from Oakwellgate (HER 4399; Fig 17) and on the sloping ground above Pipewellgate (HER 4389; Fig 17).
5.4.16 Other Industries

A number of industries, mostly small-scale and common to any industrial town in northern England, are recorded within the urban core of Gateshead in the mid-nineteenth century, and shown on the First Edition Ordnance Survey map.

Candle manufactory, HER 5608
Gut Manufactory, HER 5590
Grease Works, HER 5592
Nail Manufactory, HER 3499
Drying ground HER, 3500
Tyne Paper Manufactory, HER 3481
Chatham Colour Paint Works, HER 3484
Gateshead Water Works, HER 3501
Wylams Patent Fuel Works, HER 3518
Pitch Manufactory, HER 3521
Reservoir HER, 3525
Reservoir HER, 3531
Portland Cement Works, HER 4364
Holzapfel’s Paint Works, HER 4365
Marble Works, HER 4381
Cudbear (dye) Manufactory, HER 4387
Farn (windlass) Manufactory, HER 4388
Whiting & Colour Manufactory, HER 4390
Glue Factory, HER 4391
Blacking Factory, HER 4392
Whiting Factory, HER 4393
Skinnery, HER 4394
Oil Mill, HER 4396
Vinegar Manufactory, HER 4397
Smiths shop, HER 4398
Paper Mill, HER 4401
Blacking Factory, HER 4402
Colour Works, Pipewellgate, HER 5596
Sulphuric Works, Pipewellgate, HER 5627

5.5 Summary

5.5.1 Nineteenth Century Urban Form Definition

The expansion of Gateshead and its industrialisation in this period has meant that the bounds of the urban form have extended beyond the study area. The principal industries and changes in infrastructure which affect the development of Gateshead, however, remained focussed around the bridges and quays of the original focus, and are well represented within the area studied. The speed of development in this period was very rapid, and sites are reused, amalgamated or reconstructed possibly several times during the period, as economic conditions fluctuated and technological developments led to increasingly centralised production.
PART II - ARCHAEOLOGICAL STRATEGY

6. Research framework

Decisions on the future management of the various archaeological sites and deposits likely to be affected by re-development in the historic town centre need to be informed by an appreciation of the importance of the archaeology encountered. That will be largely determined by their potential to add to our knowledge and understanding of the history of the town, its dependant hinterland, and, in certain circumstances, to contribute to national and international research themes.

To assist in assessing the RESEARCH POTENTIAL of the archaeological resource, it is helpful to draw-up a framework within which archaeological work should be undertaken, and to define (as far as possible, and in the light of present knowledge) in what parts of the town the differing research questions will come into play. As the results of new work are absorbed, new and more detailed questions will be formed, which can be brought into the research framework periodically, perhaps every five years.

6.1 The Prehistoric Period - relevant across the study area

6.2.1 Potential for Survival of Prehistoric Deposits

Given the fact that no stratified prehistoric material has been recorded in the study area, it is unlikely that extensive evidence for any possible occupation on the riverside or upper town will have survived. Stray finds may be encountered, and deposits of prehistoric date may be recorded under Roman stratigraphy in the Bottle Bank area. A number of general questions might be addressed.

6.2.2 Research Agenda

• what was the prehistoric land-use of the area, and to what extent did the forest cover of the later parks represent indigenous woodland?

• was the present river crossing used in prehistoric periods, and do the bronze objects from the river derive from boundary/riverine ritual deposition in the vicinity?

6.2 The Roman Period - Fig 2

6.2.1 Potential for Survival of Roman Deposits

While parts of the area mapped as having potential for Roman occupation have been severely disturbed by bridge and road building in the modern period, it is evident from excavations at Bottle Bank that Roman deposits do survive particu-
larly in the backlands of the later street frontages. In some cases these deposits may be water-logged or display good survival of environmental material, and have the potential to yield significant information relating to the early settlement of Gateshead.

6.2.2 Research Agenda

- Was there an early fort located on the south bank of the Tyne and how did the Roman occupation at Gateshead relate to the Hadrian’s Wall frontier zone?
- What was the extent, nature, economic base, date and duration of Roman settlement in Gateshead?
- Where was the river crossing/bridge located and were there permanent river side facilities on the south bank of the river?
- Where did the approach roads to the bridging point run?

6.3 Early Medieval Gateshead

6.3.1 Assessment of Potential Survival of Early Medieval Deposits

The documentary evidence, while hinting at the possibility that the town may have important settlement dating to this period, does not give any indication of the character or location of occupation. With this in mind, the research question must be framed in a general form, and be borne in mind when redevelopment takes place in the medieval core.

6.3.2 Research Agenda

- Was there a Saxon monastery in the town, and if so, where was it located and what was its form?
- Was there any early settlement around the church (first mentioned 1080)?
- Does the medieval urban form have a pre-Conquest origin?

6.4 Medieval Gateshead - Fig 3

6.4.1 Potential for Survival of Medieval Deposits

Above ground, the buildings of the modern town have obscured much of the medieval plan, although it still remains in a few areas. The only confirmed buildings of Medieval date are St Edmund’s Chapel and St Mary’s Parish Church.
Excavation has demonstrated that where below-ground remains have not been truncated by later development, they may lie within 1m of the modern ground surface and there is evidence that there may be good quality of survival. There is also evidence that property boundaries have survived, even sometimes as upstanding features.

6.4.2 Research Agenda

- Where were the boundaries of the Bishop’s Park, and where were the Episcopalian residences associated with it? Can the boundaries of the episcopal demesne and the borough be defined?

- What was the date of the establishment of the major streets?

- Is there evidence of centralized planning or standardization in burgage plot size and layout?

- How were the tenements used, how were the buildings constructed and how did building traditions change through time?

- What was the date, character and extent of the precincts of the religious foundations and how were the boundaries defined?

- What was the date of the establishment of the quayside, how was it constructed, by what agency and what commercial and industrial activities were located on the riverside?

- What economic and industrial activities were taking place in and around the medieval town, how did these change through time and what was the town’s relationship with the rural and the increasingly industrialized hinterland?

6.5 Post Medieval Gateshead (Figs 4-12)

6.5.1 Potential for Survival of Post-Medieval Deposits

The alteration of the gradient of Bottle Bank and the introduction of a new road, Church Street, undoubtedly caused some truncation of deposits. This development was the forerunner of more wide-scale alterations to routes and the construction of bridges in the 19th and 20th centuries and the civil engineering associated with the railways has created considerable destruction of earlier archaeology. However at Bottle Bank, archaeological evaluation has demonstrated the survival of stratigraphy, and the potential to analyse the development of the post-medieval town. Any understanding of the archaeology of this period must involve the integration of archaeological and documentary research.
6.5.2 Post-medieval Research Agenda

- what was the development of the street and tenement plan through this period? What were the form of buildings, extent of adaptation and improvement, and how was space used between and around buildings?

- what were the later histories of the religious and secular institutions?

- What was the nature of the interweaving of industrial, commercial and domestic occupation, exemplified by the manufacture of clay tobacco pipes. Can we identify the small textile, woollen and flax workshops suggested by the Assessment?

- How can archaeology improve our understanding of the site-specific development of industries located, predominantly, on the east-west axis along the riverside from South Shore to Pipewellgate - in particular iron working, glass making, rope making, ship and boat construction.

- What was the influence on the development of the town of the century mining and transport of coal.

- What does artefactual evidence show about prosperity/decline? And changes in the trading links of the growing town.

6.6 Nineteenth Century Gateshead (Figs 13-17)

6.6.1 Assessment of Potential for Survival of Deposits

The intensity of industrial activity, while offering the potential to yield information relating to the industrial development of the town, has often led to the removal of most above-ground remains of early industrial sites and the truncation of below-ground remains. Nevertheless, important components remain. Documentary and cartographic sources have the potential to substantially add knowledge of the early industrial development of the town.

6.6.2 Research Agenda

- What was the chronological order and relative spatial position of the layers of industrial development.

- To what extent did the older, small-scale craft and industrial activity in the historic core continue along side the dominating heavy industrial complexes?

- To what extent can the intensive study of individual structures and complexes shed light on the interaction between industrial processes, transport facilities and the development of the urban landscape?
• Detailed research is needed to trace the ownership histories of properties on a street-by-street basis

7. The Existing Statutory framework

The management of archaeological sites and deposits, both known and suspected, is achieved through a number of different legislative measures, concerning both archaeological monuments and planning law. These operate at a national level for the most important sites (Scheduled Ancient Monuments) and at a local level for sites thought to be of lesser (local or regional) importance. Sites of local and regional importance are managed through a combination of planning law and policy guidance notes.

7.1 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

The most important archaeological sites in England are inscribed and protected under the terms of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979. Consent is required from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (who act on the advice of English Heritage) for any works carried out on or in the vicinity of a Scheduled site. The main criteria for The only Scheduled Ancient Monument in the study area is the Swing Bridge (Tyne & Wear County Number 5).

After consideration of the importance of other sites in the town, it is not suggested that any new sites be recommended to the Secretary of State for the Environment for Scheduling. The survey has suggested that important monuments await discovery (if extant) including the southern abutments and approach of the Roman bridge of Pons Aelius and the putative Saxon monastery, and these would certainly merit the preservation in situ accorded to sites of national status, should they come to light in the future. Of known sites in the SMR, only the Chapel of St Edmund’s is of more than regional importance, and this is deemed to be too degraded by nineteenth century alterations to merit scheduling (Ryder, 1997).

7.2 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

Those archaeological monuments which incorporate substantial above-ground fabric and are deemed to contribute to the quality of the built environment can be listed under the terms of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. These enhance the powers of the Local Planning Authority and can indirectly preserve buried deposits by preventing development which would be permitted elsewhere. The Bridges Conservation Area is shown on Fig 1. The numerous listed buildings in the study area have not been mapped; further information on Listed Buildings in Gateshead is available from Gateshead Council.
8. Archaeology in the Planning Process

The principal burden for the protection and management of archaeological sites falls upon the Local Authority, and is effected through Planning Policy. In areas of the town where archaeological deposits are predicted a number of stages are recommended by the Department of the Environment (Planning Policy Guidance 16, DOE November 1990) to ensure that the Planning Department has sufficient information to achieve the correct balance between encouraging urban re-generation and economic development on one hand, and respecting and preserving the town’s rich and varied heritage on the other.

8.1 Pre-Application Discussion

Early consultation with the County Archaeologist and the Industrial Archaeologist is of enormous importance. They can provide an initial appraisal of the likelihood that archaeologically sensitive deposits need to be considered for any specific planning application, and give advice on the steps that may need to be taken at each stage of the process.

Should advanced warning be received, the applicant will need to provide the Planning Authority with information of the likely impact of the scheme on any buried remains. This is estimated from existing records (including this report), historical accounts, and reports of archaeological work in the vicinity, in conjunction with a number of sources which suggest the nature of deposits on the site, like bore-hole logs and cellar surveys. This is presented in a standard format, known as a Desk Top Assessment, prepared by an archaeological consultant on behalf of the applicant, to a specification drawn-up by the County Archaeologist/Industrial Archaeologist, who can also assist by providing a list of organisations which do work of this sort. A Desk Top Assessment must be done to the highest professional standards, by staff who are suitably qualified and experienced in handling the source material (documentary, cartographic, archaeological) and aware of the wider research background for the period under study.

On the basis of the information provided in the Desk Top Assessment, the Planning Authority will determine the need for further work to test whether deposits predicted in the Assessment have survived on this plot. This is usually achieved by trial excavation and is known as a Field Evaluation. This programme will also be defined by the County or Industrial Archaeologist, and may employ a range of survey and analytic techniques besides excavation. Should important remains be brought to light, the preferred option would be avoidance of disturbance for example by the use of building techniques that ensure minimal disturbance of the buried remains on the site.

With the benefit of the Assessment and Evaluation reports, the Planning Authority can make the appropriate decision on whether to give consent to the scheme or not, and, if so, what further steps need to be taken to mitigate the destructive
effects of the development on the archaeological remains. This will ensure that any remains that will be unavoidably destroyed are archaeologically excavated, ana-
lysed and published, so that the site is “preserved by record” if not in fact. The requirements for further work will normally be attached to the Planning Consent as negative conditions, such as the model condition outlined in PPG16 (Section 29):

“no development will take place within the area indicated (this would be the area of archaeological interest) until the applicant has secured the implementation of a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Planning Authority”

8.2 Archaeological Planning Conditions

The Written Scheme of Investigation is a detailed document which sets out the precise work required, covering the area to be excavated, the volume of deposits to be recorded, the methodology employed, the degree of expertise required, the amount of analysis and research required, finds collection policies, conservation of perishable artefacts, the deposition of finds and archives and the eventual publication of the results. While such programmes may be costly and time-con-
suming, and represent to the developer a construction cost against which to bal-
ance the real benefits of locating in the historic centre of the town.

Clearly, many sites in the urban area will not require the degree of work outlined above. In many cases the small scale of the disturbance associated with the development, or the low probability that archaeological remains will have once existed, or survived on the site, will mean that a much lower level of observation and recording is required. Known as a Watching Brief, this is the timetabled at-
tendance of a suitably qualified archaeologist at the point when digging is underway. Any archaeological deposits encountered will be quickly recorded and any finds collected, without undue disruption to the construction work. Again, the County Archaeologist will provide the specification for the Watching Brief.

Where standing buildings form a component of the archaeological resource, there may be a need to undertake Building Recording in advance of demolition or renovation. This will not be restricted to Listed Buildings, which are selected mainly on an architectural criteria. Gateshead has a number of outwardly unprepossessing structures which are important in forming a link with past communities and indus-
tries, and which will merit recording by qualified archaeologists or building histori-
ans to an agreed specification which will reflect the importance of the structure and detail the most suitable recording methodology (eg photographic survey, elevation recording etc).

8.3 Unexpected Discoveries

PPG16 provides advice on the extremely rare circumstance that exceptional and unpredicted remains are encountered while development is in progress. There are
powers at the discretion of both the Secretary of State, and the Planning Authority to intervene to ensure that nationally important remains are protected. The developer can insure against any resultant loss, and would, if all appropriate steps have been taken, be entitled to compensation. In most cases, it has proved possible to achieve a satisfactory conclusion through voluntary negotiation. The best insurance is to take the appropriate steps (Assessment, Evaluation etc) at the right time.

Further advice is available from:

The Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer
West Chapel
Jesmond Old Cemetery
Jesmond Road
Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 INL
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