

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
5.1 INTRODUCTION	2
5.2 POLICY CONTEXT	3
5.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS	4
5.4 PREDICTING THE IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT	6
5.5 MITIGATION	7
5.6 RESIDUAL IMPACTS	8
5.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	8
5.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	9

### **APPENDICES / TABLES / FIGURES**

Appendix 5.1: Archaeological Desk Based Assessment

### **TABLES**

Table 5.1 : Summary of Impacts

Table 5.2 : Summary of Residual Impacts

### **FIGURES**

Figure 5.1 : Summary of Cultural Heritage Designations

## **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

5.1.1 This chapter of the ES presents an assessment of the Teddington Studio's potential for below ground heritage assets (archaeological remains).

5.1.2 This chapter has been prepared by Richard Meager BA MA PG Cert FSA MIfA, Archaeology Director at CgMs Consulting.

### **Scope of Assessment**

5.1.3 The chapter contains a description of relevant heritage planning policy, describes the existing baseline conditions and the likely significance of assets present, describes the methods used to assess potential impact and assesses the potential impact of the development, and recommends appropriate mitigation measures designed to offset such impact.

5.1.4 Appendix 5.1 reproduces the archaeological desk based assessment for the site, which should be referred to for any further details regarding below ground heritage assets at the site.

### **Data Collection Methodology**

5.1.5 The desk based assessment and ES chapter for archaeology has been prepared in line with all relevant guidelines, including those provided by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) and the Institute for Archaeologists (IfA).

5.1.6 In assessing the Site's below ground heritage potential the following datasets have been reviewed:

- A 750m radius search of information held on the Greater Historic Environment Record (GLHER);
- Relevant maps from the British Library;
- Relevant maps and background information from Richmond Local Studies Library;
- Relevant published and unpublished sources covering the archaeology of London and the site area in particular (see Appendix 5.1).

## 5.2 POLICY CONTEXT

### **National Planning Policy**

- 5.2.1 Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012) entitled Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, provides guidance to local planning authorities, property owners and others on the conservation and investigation of heritage assets. The Practice Guide issued with the previous national guidance (PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment, March 2010) is still valid, and English Heritage have provided a document which enables the PPS5 Practice Guide to be applied to the NPPF.
- 5.2.2 Heritage Assets are defined in Annexe 2 of the NPPF as: a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. They include designated heritage assets (as defined in the NPPF) and assets identified by the local planning authority.
- 5.2.3 Annex 2 also defines archaeological interest as heritage asset which holds or potentially could hold, evidence of past human activity worthy of expert investigation at some point. Heritage assets with archaeological interest are the primary source of evidence about the substance and evolution of places, and of the people and cultures that made them.
- 5.2.4 A designated heritage asset is defined as a World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area.
- 5.2.5 Significance is defined as: The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. This interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

### **Regional Planning Policy**

- 5.2.6 The London Plan, Spatial Strategy for Greater London, adopted 2011, contains Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology which supports the protection of archaeological and cultural heritage assets.

### **Local Planning Policy**

5.2.7 Richmond Council's Development Management Policies (DMP) documents forms part of the wider Local Development Framework (LDF) implemented within the Borough in 2009. The DMP was adopted in November 2011 and contains the following policies relating to archaeology and heritage:

#### **POLICY DM HD 4**

##### **ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES**

**THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO PROTECT, ENHANCE AND PROMOTE ITS ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE (BOTH ABOVE AND BELOW GROUND), AND WILL ENCOURAGE ITS INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION TO THE PUBLIC. IT WILL TAKE THE NECESSARY MEASURES REQUIRED TO SAFEGUARD THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS FOUND, AND REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION WHERE PROPOSALS WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS OR THEIR SETTING.**

5.2.8 In considering any planning application for development, the planning authority will be mindful of the framework set by government policy, in this instance the NPPF, by current Development Plan Policy and by other material considerations.

### **5.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS**

5.3.1 The site is currently occupied by the Teddington Film Studios facility. The site comprises open areas of hardstanding to the north fronting the River Thames and to the west, with substantial masonry buildings to the southwest, centre, east and northeast, principally of twentieth century date, with Weir Cottage to the southwest dated to the 1870s (see Figure 5.1).

5.3.2 In terms of cultural heritage designations for below ground archaeological remains, as shown on Figure 5.1, the site does not contain any designated heritage assets, or any known undesignated heritage assets. In addition, no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Wreck or Historic Battlefield designations lie within the 750m study area search radius. The site does however lie adjacent to an Archaeological Priority Zone as designated by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

- 5.3.3 Topographically the site is generally level with spotheights of 5.7m AOD, 6.1m AOD and 5.9m AOD situated along Broom Road on the southern boundary. Geologically the site lies within an area of Kempton Park river terrace Gravels.
- 5.3.4 The site's geological and topographical location, upon well draining gravels adjacent to an important watersource indicates a potential for activity associated with the prehistoric periods, from the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age.
- 5.3.5 Given a general absence of material dating to the Roman period within the study site or a 750m search area radius, the potential of the site for this period has been identified as generally low.
- 5.3.6 Saxon settlement is supposed within the Teddington area, although no finds of Saxon date have been identified within the 750m search area. Medieval settlement is known at Teddington from c.1100 AD onwards, although the core of this, centred around the church, lies to the west of the study site. It is considered that the site lay within open fields during the Saxon and Medieval periods, beyond the limits of known settlement and activity, and therefore a generally low archaeological potential can be evidenced for these periods at the site.
- 5.3.7 The study site appears to have remained undeveloped until the early nineteenth century, when Weir House was constructed towards the centre of the site, and the remainder laid out as garden and lawn. The site was used as film studios from the early 1930s onwards, and the site gradually became almost fully developed with associated buildings.
- 5.3.8 In conclusion, the study site can be considered to have a moderate potential for the prehistoric periods, and a generally low potential for the Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post Medieval periods. The site appears to have been developed from the nineteenth century onwards, initially as a house and garden, and subsequently with the film studios which now occupy the bulk of the site. Consequently, post depositional impacts within the study site can be considered to have been severe.

5.3.9 Further detail is provided by the archaeological desk based assessment reproduced at Appendix 5.1.

## 5.4 PREDICTING THE IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT

5.4.1 The archaeological assessment has been carried out in accordance with all relevant standards and guidelines (see paragraph 5.1.5 above). Following the characterisation of the baseline conditions (see section 5.3 above) the following methodology has been adopted for predicting the likely impact of the redevelopment proposals:

1. Evaluating likely significance of potential below ground heritage assets through existing designations and professional judgement;
2. Predicting the magnitude of likely post depositional impacts upon the archaeological resource judged likely to be present;
3. Predicting the magnitude of likely development impacts;
4. Considering appropriate mitigation measures relating to the sites redevelopment;
5. Quantifying the nature of any residual effects;
6. Quantifying the nature of any effects as a result of the completed development.

**Table 5.1: Summary of Impacts**

Topic Area (Archaeology)	Description of Impact	Geographical Importance					Impact	Nature	Significance Before Mitigation
		N	R	S	D	L			
	Demolition and construction impacts upon potential buried archaeological deposits		*	*	*	*	Adverse	Long term	Moderate

**KEY:**

<b>Geographical Level of Importance</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Nature of Impact</b>	<b>Significance</b>
National	Adverse	Long Term	Significant
Regional	Neutral	Short Term	Moderate
Sub-Regional	Beneficial		Low
District			No Effect
Local			

## **5.5 MITIGATION**

### **Construction**

5.5.1 The following mitigation measures are proposed prior to and during the demolition/construction stage of the site's redevelopment:

1. Archaeological monitoring and reporting on relevant site investigation works (test pits only);
2. Appropriate evaluation trenching responding to the results of item 1 and to detailed redevelopment proposals;
3. Further archaeological mitigation measures dependant upon the outcome of item 2.

5.5.2 It is proposed to secure the implementation of the above mitigation strategy through a standard planning condition for archaeology attached to the granting of planning consent for the redevelopment.

### **Completed Development**

5.5.3 Following the implementation of the above mitigation strategy, there will be no further mitigation measures necessary during the completed/operational phase of the development.

## 5.6 RESIDUAL IMPACTS

### Construction and Completed Development

5.6.1 Following implementation of the proposed mitigation strategy (see section 5.5 above), there will be no residual impact arising from the redevelopment of the site on any underlying archaeological remains.

**Table 5.2: Summary of Residual Impacts**

Topic Area (Archaeology)	Description of Impact	Geographical Importance					Impact	Nature	Significance after Mitigation
		N	R	S	D	L			
-	Demolition and construction impacts upon potential buried archaeological deposits		*	*	*	*	Neutral	Long term	Low

**KEY:**

Geographical Level of Importance	Impact	Nature of Impact	Significance
National	Adverse	Long Term	Significant
Regional	Neutral	Short Term	Moderate
Sub-Regional	Beneficial		Low
District			No Effect
Local			

## 5.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

### Construction

5.7.1 The proposed development comprises the following activities which have the potential to impact upon archaeological resources:

5.7.2 In the absence of the mitigation measures proposed (see section 5.5 above) the following activities are considered likely to have an impact on archaeological remains which may be present at the site:

1. Demolition of existing buildings;



2. Grubbing out of foundations and any basements associated with the existing buildings;
3. General landforming;
4. Excavation associated with any proposed below ground areas;
5. Excavation associated with pile probing, pile caps and the insertion of ground beams;
6. Cutting of other foundations and footings;
7. Cutting of services.

### **Completed Development**

5.7.3 As any potential impacts to any archaeological resources present would only be affected during demolition and construction works associated with the redevelopment, once complete the development would not have an archaeological impact.

## **5.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

5.8.1 This chapter of the ES assesses the potential impacts and likely effects of the proposed redevelopment of the Teddington Studios site upon any buried heritage assets (archaeological remains).

5.8.2 The site does not contain any nationally designated heritage assets, or any known undesignated heritage assets. It does not lie within an Area of Archaeological Potential as identified by Richmond Council, although it does lie adjacent to such a designation.

5.8.3 The site has been judged to have a potential for the prehistoric periods, although subsequent impact upon archaeological deposits as a result of subsequent large scale development can be considered likely to have a negative archaeological impact.

5.8.4 In the event that archaeological remains do however survive, a mitigation strategy has been proposed in order to clarify the presence, absence and significance of any archaeological resources present, secured by condition to the granting of planning consent.