

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
7.1 INTRODUCTION	2
7.2 POLICY CONTEXT	9
7.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS	14
7.4 PREDICTING THE IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT	19
7.5 MITIGATION	27
7.6 RESIDUAL IMPACTS	28
7.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	31
7.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	33

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 7.1: Built Heritage Assessment

## **TABLES**

Table 7.1 : Criteria used to determine the sensitivity of assets

Table 7.2 : Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Effects

Table 7.3 : Significance of Effects

Table 7.4 : Designated Heritage assets within 500m of the development site

Table 7.5 : Undesignated Heritage assets within 500m of the development site

Table 7.6 : Likely Constructional effects on designated and undesignated heritage assets assessed as a result of the implementation of Application

Table 7.7 : Likely Operational effects on designated and undesignated heritage assets assessed as a result of the implementation of Application:

Table 7.8 : Summary of Residual Impacts

## 7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 This report has been prepared by Laurie Handcock of CgMs Consulting Ltd in order to provide an assessment of the likely effects of the proposed development on heritage assets within the application site at Teddington Studios, (a full description of which can be found in Part II of the ES) and in its environs. A brief overview of the contents and findings of this chapter can be found within the Non-Technical Summary. This Environmental Statement chapter refers to an application for 217 homes, on land next to the River Thames in the settlement of Teddington, London Borough of Richmond.

7.1.2 The chapter summarises baseline conditions, establishes the significance of heritage assets on and near the site, and considers the potential effects of the developed as proposed within the Description of Development (Part II of the ES). It also presents mitigation measures to avoid, and where this is not possible, reduce those potential effects.

7.1.3 The chapter has been informed by a Built Heritage Assessment, which can be found at Appendix .1. The reader is referred to these Appendices for full details of heritage assets within and in the vicinity of the site.

7.1.4 Heritage assets' are defined by the government in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as:

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

7.1.5 The aims and objectives of this assessment are:

- to describe the archaeological and historic landscape including any buildings of historic or architectural interest that may be affected by the proposals;
- to provide an assessment of their significance;
- to assess the scale of significance of any effects likely to arise from the proposals;
- to outline suitable mitigation measures to avoid, reduce or remedy significant adverse effects; and
- to provide an assessment of any residual effects that may remain after mitigation.

### **Scope of Assessment**

7.1.6 Using professional judgement, it has therefore been concluded that in order to ensure a sufficiently thorough assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment, a heritage baseline of 500m would be appropriate. This ensures that in addition to the heritage asset within the development sites, the key designated and undesignated heritage assets within the visual vicinity of the development can be considered.

### **Data Collection Methodology**

7.1.7 This chapter has been prepared in accordance with the requirements set by EIA regulations, as well as the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) (2012), English Heritage guidance, particularly *Conservation Principles* (English Heritage, 2008), *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (English Heritage, 2011) and *Seeing the History in the View* (English Heritage, 2011).

7.1.8 In addition, this chapter and its accompanying Technical Appendix were prepared in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report for this Planning Application produced in August 2013.

7.1.9 Heritage assets are recorded in national and/or local historic environment databases and, in this instance, assets have been identified from English Heritage's National Heritage List, the Greater London Historic Environment

Record (HER), and the London Borough of Richmond's online Conservation Area mapping. With regards to undesignated heritage assets, reference has been made to both the London Borough of Richmond's Register of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

7.1.10 In addition to the baseline identification described above, the preparation of the baseline assessments included a number of site visits, including internal and external assessments of buildings and structures, along with a map, plan and aerial photographic regression exercise. Additional information was gained from the following sources:

- Conservation Area Statements and Conservation Area Studies relating to the Teddington Lock, High Street (Teddington), Broom Water, and The Grove Conservation Areas.
- Various online resources.

7.1.11 No technical difficulties were encountered accessing the buildings assessed on the site, or sufficient information relating to them. While some information on their former function and operation was difficult to access, the information that was available was considered significant to provide an understanding of their significance. The assets beyond the site boundary were accessible externally, and this level of access was considered sufficient to carry out an assessment of the impact of the development on these assets' settings.

### **Significance Criteria**

7.1.12 Determination of the importance/significance of heritage assets is based on existing statutory designations and, for undesignated archaeological assets, the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria and professional judgement.

7.1.13 Using this approach, the criteria for establishing the importance of assets are described in Table 5.1:

**Table 7.1 Criteria used to determine the sensitivity of assets**

<b>Importance/Significance</b>	<b>Description</b>
International	Archaeological sites or monuments of international importance, including World Heritage Sites. Structures and buildings inscribed as of universal importance as World Heritage Sites. Other buildings or structures of recognised international importance.
National	Ancient Monuments scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, or archaeological sites and remains of comparable quality, assessed with reference to the Secretary of State's non-statutory criteria. Listed Buildings.
Regional/ County	Archaeological sites and remains which, while not of national importance, score well against most of the Secretary of State's criteria Conservation Areas.
Local	Archaeological sites that score less well against the Secretary of State's criteria. Historic buildings on a 'local list'. Undesignated built assets of local significance.
None	Areas in which investigative techniques have produced negligible or only minimal evidence for archaeological remains, or where previous large-scale disturbance or removal of deposits can be demonstrated.

### **Magnitude of Effects**

7.1.14 Determining the magnitude of effects is based on an understanding of how, and to what extent the proposed development would affect heritage assets.

7.1.15 The magnitude of the effect is a product of the extent of development impact on an asset. Effects are rated as High, Medium, Low and Negligible/Neutral. Effects can be direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial. The criteria for assessing the magnitude of effect are set out in Table 5.2:

**Table 7.2 - Criteria for Assessing the Magnitude of Effects**

<b>Magnitude</b>	<b>Direct Effects</b>	<b>Indirect Effects</b>
Major Adverse	Demolition of built heritage assets or within a Conservation Area. Complete removal of an archaeological site	Radical transformation of the setting of an archaeological monument. Substantially harmful change in the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area.
Moderate Adverse	Harmful alteration (but not demolition) of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area. Removal of a major part of an archaeological site and loss of research potential.	Less than substantial harm to the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area. Partial transformation of the setting of an archaeological site e.g. the introduction of significant noise or vibration levels to an archaeological monument leading to changes to amenity, use, accessibility or appreciation of an archaeological site.
Minor Adverse	Alterations to a built heritage asset or to a Conservation Area resulting in minor harm. Removal of an archaeological site where a minor part of its total area is removed but the site retains a significant future research potential	Minor harm to the setting of an archaeological monument or built heritage asset or Conservation Area.
Negligible/ Neutral	Negligible impact from changes in use, amenity or access. Negligible direct impact to the built heritage asset or Conservation Area	Negligible perceptible change to the setting of a built heritage asset, archaeological site or Conservation Area.
Low Beneficial	Alterations to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in minor beneficial impacts Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the protection of archaeological remains	Minor enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area. Decrease in visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a built heritage asset, archaeological site or monument.

Magnitude	Direct Effects	Indirect Effects
Medium Beneficial	Alterations to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in moderate beneficial impacts. Land use change resulting in improved conditions for the protection of archaeological remains plus interpretation measures (heritage trails, etc)	Significant reduction or removal of visual or noise intrusion on the setting of a built heritage asset, archaeological site or monument. Improvement of the wider landscape setting of a built heritage asset, Conservation Area, archaeological site or monument. Improvement of the cultural heritage amenity, access or use of a built heritage asset, archaeological site or monument. Moderate enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset or Conservation Area.
High Beneficial	Arrest of physical damage or decay to a built heritage asset or structure. Alteration to a built heritage asset or Conservation Area resulting in significant beneficial impact	Significant enhancement to the setting of a built heritage asset, Conservation Area or archaeological site, its cultural heritage amenity, access or use.

### Significance of Effects

7.1.16 The significance of the effects of the proposed development on heritage assets is determined by:

- the significance of the asset, and
- the magnitude of to the effect on the asset.

7.1.17 Table 9.3 presents a matrix that demonstrates how the significance of effects has been determined:

**Table 7.3 - Significance of Effects**

Magnitude of Effect	High	Medium	Low	Negligible / Neutral
International Importance	Major	Major	Major	Negligible
National importance	Major	Major/ Moderate	Moderate/ Minor	Negligible
Regional/County importance	Major/Mod-erate	Moderate/ Minor	Minor	Negligible

<b>Local importance</b>	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible
<b>No importance</b>	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible

7.1.18 In summary, following the characterisation of the baseline conditions, the methods used to define the potential effects of the proposed development on archaeology and heritage assets are as follows:

- An evaluation of the significance of heritage assets (based on existing designations and professional judgment where assets have no formal designation);
- Prediction of the magnitude of the likely effects upon the significance of known or potential buried heritage assets;
- Determination of what mitigation measures are required during the design and construction or operational lifetime of the proposed development in order to mitigate any adverse effects;
- Quantification of any residual effects (those that might remain after mitigation) along with any cumulative effects (taking into account other development proposals in the site’s environs).

### **Assumptions**

7.1.19 The assessment of the scale of effects is based on extensive professional experience, by qualified specialists, gained on other major developments across central and southern England. In particular, potential effects from demolition, excavations for foundations, access, services and landscaping have been considered. With regard to built heritage assets, consideration has been given to potential intervisibility between assets and to pre-application advice from heritage stakeholders. In particular, guidance provided by English Heritage in *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (English Heritage 2011) has been used as the basis for assessment of the likely scale of effects on heritage assets and their settings.

## 7.2 POLICY CONTEXT

7.2.1 This assessment is based on a framework of legislation and policy that seeks to define what elements are valuable within the historic environment, as well as highlighting what is required to ensure its protection and enhancement.

7.2.2 The following planning legislation, planning policy and related guidance forms the framework for this assessment:

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979
- National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

### **National Planning Policy**

7.2.3 The *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) was published in March 2012, and replaces a number of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs), including *Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment* (PPS5), which is now cancelled. The NPPF constitutes the government's policy on dealing with all areas of planning, including the Historic Environment, which is referenced throughout the document, but largely addressed in Section 12, 'Conserving and Enhancing the historic environment'. This section provides a framework for planning authorities, historic environment professionals and property owners to work to when development is proposed. This framework:

- identifies the need to recognise 'designated heritage assets' and 'undesigned heritage assets';
- promotes the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets;
- looks to protect the settings of designated heritage assets;

- seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas;
- looks to focus on 'evidence bases', requiring applicants to provide proportionate information on the heritage assets a development might impact upon, including an assessment of the magnitude of these impacts, and further requiring that local authorities identify and assess the significance of these assets;
- requires applicants who wish to demolish or substantially alter a designated heritage asset to provide a strong evidence-based argument for the permanent loss of such an asset;
- provides that the setting of heritage assets is considered as part of the decision making process, and favours applications that seek to protect, or mitigate against harm to, that setting.

### **Strategic Planning Policy**

#### ***The Adopted London Plan (July, 2011)***

7.2.4 Relevant policies from the adopted London Plan include:

- Policy 7.4 *Local Character* - states that development should contribute positively to the surrounding built environment, responding to and improving the area's existing urban character including its historic environment.
- Policy 7.6 *Architecture* - sets out a series of best practice principles with which development should seek to comply to achieve the highest design quality. These include the preservation of amenity of surrounding land and buildings, inclusive design and enhancement of the local architectural character.
- Policy 7.7 *Location and design of tall and large buildings* - sets out a number of criteria with which proposed tall or large-scale buildings

should comply to contribute positively to the surrounding urban context.

- Policy 7.8 *Heritage assets and archaeology*- seeks that development incorporates measures to identify, record, protect and where appropriate, restore, heritage and archaeological assets.
- Policy 7.10 *World Heritage Sites* – development should not cause adverse impacts on World Heritage Sites and their settings.
- Policy 7.11 *London View Management Framework* and 7.12 *Implementing the London View Management Framework* - set out policy relating to the designation of strategically important views and the ways in which development should seek to preserve these views.

### **Local Planning Policy**

#### ***London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames Core Strategy (Adopted April 2009)***

7.2.5 The Core Strategy is the key strategic policy document within the Local Plan (although it was originally published as part of the Local Development Framework). It outlines the Vision, Spatial Strategy and 20 Core Planning Policies on topics such as climate change, housing, employment and retailing.

7.2.6 It includes one policy which provides the Borough's overriding approach to design and the historic environment, Policy CP7 (Managing and Improving the Local Environment). It states that all new development 'should recognise distinctive local character and contribute to creating places of a high architectural and urban design quality that are well used and valued'; it also states that such developments should be based on an understanding of the Borough and its development.

***London Borough of Richmond Development Management Plan (adopted November 2011)***

7.2.7 The Development Management Plan DPD, adopted in November 2011, provides a series of more detailed policies which act alongside the strategic policies included within the Core Strategy. These include:

- Policy DM HD1 (Conservation Areas -designation, protection and enhancement);
- Policy DM HD2 (Conservation of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments)
- Policy DM DC1 (Design Quality).

7.2.8 In addition to these key Local Policy documents, the London Borough of Richmond has also a number of guidance documents, some of which are relevant to this application. They include the *Design Quality* SPD (2006), which is intended to aid developers in achieving good design within new developments, and which supports the need for a good understanding of local context when designing new developments. It is also important to take into account the Conservation Area Statements and Studies produced by the local authority. In this case, the relevant documents are:

- Teddington Lock and High Street Conservation Area Study;
- The Grove Conservation Area Study;
- Broom Water Conservation Area Study;
- Teddington Lock Conservation Area Statement;
- The Grove, Teddington Conservation Area Statement;
- Broom Water, Teddington Conservation Area Statement;

- High Street, Teddington Conservation Area Statement.

## 7.3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

### **Heritage Assets: Site History**

- 7.3.1 Teddington appeared as a settlement in the Anglo-Saxon Period (its name is certainly Anglo-Saxon in origin) in a strategically important position at the highest point of the Thames subject to tides. Nonetheless, it did not appear as a specific entry in the Domesday Book, and appears to have been considered as an outlying part of Hampton for much of its early history, emerging as an independent settlement in around 1100. Teddington probably grew up around the village's original parish church, near where the High Street meets Twickenham Road, and close to the present site of Teddington Studios. Thereafter, throughout the medieval period, the village grew inland, which scattered dwellings appearing along the High Street, largely away from the river.
- 7.3.2 Throughout the medieval period, the settlement fell under the lordship of the Abbot of Westminster; by the fourteenth century, the parish's population was around 150. Teddington's position at the head of the tidal Thames was already significant; as early as 1345, there was a weir on the Thames here, which survived into the sixteenth century. The area in which Teddington was situated, close to the Thames and in an area of rolling, open countryside, began to gain recognition through the arrival of royal patronage. From the sixteenth century onwards, the area to the south became dominated by the presence of royal parks and mansions. Hampton Court Palace was started by Cardinal Wolsey in 1514, with its gardens laid out in 1500, while Bushy House, closer to Teddington itself, was started in 1663.
- 7.3.3 Throughout this period, the historic presence of the Royal household, an attractive riverside location, the proximity of fashionable Twickenham and Richmond, and the ability to access London by boat (it is around 24km by river from Teddington to Westminster), ensured that it would become popular with the gentry. As such, a number of villas, illustrating various different styles and levels of grandeur, were built between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries in this area.

- 7.3.4 By 1800 Teddington was a small village of 800 people, based on a largely agrarian economy. Its population grew dramatically in the second half of the nineteenth century as a result of the arrival of the railway. Teddington station, linked to London via a line through Twickenham and onwards to Waterloo, was opened in 1863 and by 1901, the population was 14,000; the village of the mid-nineteenth century had been replaced by a small and burgeoning town.
- 7.3.5 The nineteenth century also saw a redevelopment of the village's Thameside landscape, as locks, and a weir, were reintroduced. A new lock, and a connecting weir were opened in 1811, but had to be rebuilt between 1857 and 1858. Proposals for reconstruction had been put forward as early as 1854, as the removal, in 1848, of Old London Bridge had caused a drop in the water level of around 2' 6" (a demonstration of the extent to which the bridge restricted the flow of water along the river), and a series of groundings had resulted. Subsequently, Teddington saw the construction of a new set of footbridges, still extant, in 1889, and the replacement of the nineteenth century locks in 1904.
- 7.3.6 By the late nineteenth century the area of riverside to the east of the new locks and weirs along Broom Road was occupied by a series of large villas in extensive grounds. One of these villas was 'The Weir', redeveloped in the 1880s as 'Weir House' by one Henry Chinnery. Three other houses, Dunbar House and Weir Bank, which sat between Weir House and Broom Water were redeveloped in the 1930s by Shell, to form the Lensbury Club. Chinnery kept hold of Weir House, however, and remained in residence for a long period. He is reported to have had a strong interest in the new art of cinematography, and by the 1910s, the extensive greenhouses within the grounds were being used for filming. In the days before artificial lighting, purpose-built film studios were provided with substantial skylights, and glasshouses such as these formed natural ready-made replacement. By 1912, the glasshouse space was being rented out on a more permanent basis, and a film company called Ec-Ko Films.
- 7.3.7 Purpose-built studio buildings began to appear on the site from 1916, when the site was rented out by Master Films; it is not clear whether Henry Chinnery still lived in the house at this point, but certainly by the 1920s the house was no longer in permanent residential use. Master Films, using its newly built 'sound

stage' remained in residence until 1925, when the company folded, and a short period of disuse followed, exacerbated by a major fire in 1929. Shortly after, Teddington Film Studios Ltd was established, and by 1931, the site had been entirely redeveloped; Weir House remained in office use, while two sound stages and other ancillary buildings were constructed.

7.3.8 The site was then leased by Warner Brothers, until 1934 when they bought the site outright. They made little of note, using the Studios to produce 'quota quickies', cheap, poorly made films designed to meet the requirement that 20% of films shown in British cinemas should be made in Britain; making 'quota quickies' allowed Warner Brothers to continue to distribute better, more profitable US pictures. Despite the limited quality of Teddington's creative output during this era, Warner Brothers invested heavily in its buildings. They constructed a new, brick Administrative Block and Boiler House facing onto Broom Road, as well as Studio 1, a large and modern studio space for the time, and other workshop spaces. Teddington Studios remained in operation during the Second World War, and a number of patriotic propaganda films were made on the site until 5 June 1944, when it suffered a direct hit from a V1 bomb. Three people were killed, while Studio 1 was almost entirely destroyed and the Admin Block and Boiler House also suffered extensive damage.

7.3.9 Rebuilding took place in 1946, and the Studios were reopened in 1948, but a decline in UK film-making led to their closure in 1951; for a period the site acted as storage for the nearby Hawker Aircraft factory. The collapse of the film industry was mitigated, however, by a growth in the television industry. By 1958, Teddington had been bought by the Associated British Corporation (ABC), a television production company, who built the Technical Block and canteen building, as well as buying Weir Cottage, a nineteenth century arts and crafts cottage to the west of the site, in order to use its former driveway and gardens as the main access to the Studios. Shortly after, the multi-storey car park and other buildings were constructed, completing the site's development. The Studios have remained in televisual use ever since, with the site passing from ABC to Thames Television, via a merger, and then on to Pinewood Studios.

### **Identification of Heritage Assets**

7.3.10 The built heritage baseline assessed has been based on a professional assessment of the site's setting, and its interaction with its surrounding townscape. With this in mind, CgMs consider that a 500m radius from the site boundary will be more than sufficient for assessing the potential impact of the proposed scheme on the historic environment. Designated heritage assets on the application site and within 500m of the site boundary have therefore been considered in the Technical Appendices and are assessed here as appropriate.

7.3.11 Within the 500m assessment radius, a number of designated and undesignated heritage assets have been identified:

- 6 Listed Buildings (2x Grade II\*, 4x Grade II);
- 4 Conservation Areas
- 4 Undesignated Heritage Asset

All of these assets have been assessed (see tables 5.4 and 5.5) for both direct and indirect impacts.

7.3.12 It should be noted that the identification of undesignated heritage assets has been undertaken through a combination of an assessment of the interest buildings on site, and through an evaluation of Richmond's Register of Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTMs). While a large number of BTMs sit within 500m of the development site, it was not considered necessary to undertake a detailed evaluation of every one of these assets, given that a large number of them sit within Conservation Areas, and can therefore be considered as part of the assessment of these Designated Heritage Assets. A number of other BTMs do not sit within a Conservation Area, but are clearly sufficiently distant, and well-concealed from the site, to render further assessment unnecessary. Nonetheless, a small number of these assets have been identified as requiring further assessment, and are therefore included within Table 5.5.

**Table 7.4: Designated Heritage assets within 500m of the development site**

Heritage Asset Ref. (See figures 10.1 and 10.2)	Description	Designation	Importance
DHA 1	Teddington Footbridge	Grade II Listed	National
DHA 2	The Boathouse, 27 Ferry Road	Grade II Listed	National
DHA 3	Church Of St Alban	Grade II* Listed	National
DHA 4	Church Of St Mary	Grade II* Listed	National
DHA 5	Peg Woffington's Cottage	Grade II Listed	National
DHA 6	Oak Cottage	Grade II Listed	National
DHA 7	Teddington Lock	Conservation Area	Regional
DHA 8	High Street (Teddington)	Conservation Area	Regional
DHA 9	Broom Water	Conservation Area	Regional
DHA 10	The Grove	Conservation Area	Regional

**Table 7.5: Undesignated Heritage assets within 500m of the development site**

Heritage Asset Ref. (See figures 10.1 and 10.2)	Description	Designation	Importance
UDHA 1	Weir Cottage	Building identified as having local merit through site assessment	Local
UDHA 2	The Angler's Public House	Building of Townscape Merit	Local
UDHA 3	The Lensbury Club	Building of Townscape Merit	Local
UDHA 4	1-9 Kingston Road and 4-10 Broom Road	Building of Townscape Merit	Local

## 7.4 PREDICTING THE IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT

### Identification and Evaluation of Likely Effects

7.4.1 Potential effects during construction on the heritage assets identified in Table 9.7 have been assessed in accordance with the methodology described in Section 9.2.1 – 9.2.15.

**Table 7.6: Likely Constructional effects on designated and undesignated heritage assets assessed as a result of the implementation of Application:**

Heritage Asset Ref.	Description	Significance of Heritage Assets	Magnitude & Nature of Effect	Explanation of Effect	Significance of Effect
DHA 1	Teddington Footbridge	National	Low Adverse	Demolition and construction in vicinity of asset will have a minor adverse effect on the setting of the heritage asset in terms of noise, dust and visual effects. The potential introduction of landing point for dry means of escape would result in minor direct intrusion into the bridge's railings, but this will be limited, and associated with modern fabric.	Moderate/ Minor Adverse
DHA 2	The Boathouse, 27 Ferry Road	National	Low Adverse	Demolition and construction in vicinity of asset will	Moderate/ Minor Adverse

				have a minor adverse effect on the setting of the heritage asset in terms of noise, dust and visual effects.	
DHA 3	Church Of St Alban	National	Neutral	Demolition and redevelopment suitably distance as to avoid any negative impacts. Well screened immediate setting of asset prevents harm to significance of heritage asset.	Negligible
DHA 4	Church Of St Mary	National	Neutral	Demolition and redevelopment suitably distance as to avoid any negative impacts. Well screened immediate setting of asset prevents harm to significance of heritage asset.	Negligible
DHA 5	Peg Woffington's Cottage	National	Neutral	Asset completely screened from development by intervening development. Suitably distant to avoid impacts in terms of traffic or	Negligible

				noise.	
DHA 6	Oak Cottage	National	Neutral	Asset completely screened from development by intervening development. Suitably distant to avoid impacts in terms of traffic or noise.	Negligible
DHA 7	Teddington Lock CA	Regional	Low Adverse	Demolition and construction in vicinity of Conservation Area will have a minor adverse effect on its setting in terms of noise, dust and visual effects.	Minor Adverse
DHA 8	High Street (Teddington) CA	Regional	Neutral	Conservation Area completely screened from development by intervening development. Suitably distant to avoid impacts in terms of traffic or noise.	Negligible
DHA 9	Broom Water CA	Regional	Neutral	Conservation Area sufficiently screened from development by intervening development to avoid visual and	Negligible

				noise impacts. Traffic impacts considered to be insufficient to cause harm to the asset.	
DHA 10	The Grove CA	Regional	Neutral	Conservation Area completely screened from development by intervening development. Suitably distant to avoid impacts in terms of traffic or noise.	Negligible
UDHA 1	Weir Cottage	Local	Low Adverse	Significant Setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact. On-going conservation works, as part of redevelopment of the property as a residential dwelling, will serve to mitigate against the adverse impacts on the asset's setting.	Negligible
UDHA 2	The Angler's Public House	Local	Low Adverse	Adverse setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact.	Negligible

UDHA 3	The Lensbury Club	Local	Neutral	Screened from any adverse setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact by modern buildings within the Lensbury site between the Clubhouse and the development site.	Negligible
UDHA 4	1-9 Kingston Road and 4-10 Broom Road	Local	Low Adverse	Adverse setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact.	Negligible

**Table 7.7: Likely Operational effects on designated and undesignated heritage assets assessed as a result of the implementation of Application:**

Heritage Asset Ref.	Description	Significance of Heritage Assets	Magnitude & Nature of Effect	Explanation of Effect	Significance of Effect
DHA 1	Teddington Footbridge	National	Medium Beneficial	Replacement of dense, utilitarian built forms on site with more appropriate, landscaped structures, leading to significant enhancement to overall setting. Visually, and in terms of its integrity, the footbridge, will remain much as it was before, and it is not considered it will suffer from any harmful affects.	Major/Moderate Beneficial

DHA 2	The Boathouse, 27 Ferry Road	National	Medium Beneficial	Replacement of dense, utilitarian built forms on site with more appropriate, landscaped structures, and better elevation treatment to rear of Tide End Cottage PH beer garden leads to significant enhancement to overall setting.	Major/Moderate Beneficial
DHA 3	Church Of St Alban	National	Low Beneficial	More appropriate treatment for site's elevation to Broom Road, in addition to landscaping and planting, will improve views south from the asset, and improve its wider setting.	Minor/Moderate Beneficial
DHA 4	Church Of St Mary	National	Low Beneficial	More appropriate treatment for site's elevation to Broom Road, in addition to landscaping and planting, will improve views south from the asset, and improve its wider setting.	Minor/Moderate Beneficial
DHA 5	Peg Woffington's Cottage	National	Neutral	No intervisibility between site and asset; changes to traffic considered unlikely to impact upon asset's significance or setting.	Neutral
DHA 6	Oak Cottage	National	Neutral	No intervisibility between site and asset; changes to traffic considered	Neutral

				unlikely to impact upon asset's significance or setting.	
DHA 7	Teddington Lock CA	Regional	Low Beneficial	Replacement of dense, utilitarian built forms on site with more appropriate, landscaped structures, leading to moderate/minor enhancement to overall setting.	Moderate/Minor Beneficial
DHA 8	High Street (Teddington) CA	Regional	Neutral	No intervisibility between site and asset; changes to traffic considered unlikely to impact upon asset's significance or setting.	Negligible
DHA 9	Broom Water CA	Regional	Neutral	No intervisibility between site and asset; changes to traffic considered unlikely to impact upon asset's significance or setting.	Negligible
DHA 10	The Grove CA	Regional	Neutral	No intervisibility between site and asset; traffic impacts avoided by distance from site, and position away from major thoroughfares.	Negligible
UDHA 1	Weir Cottage	Local	Medium Beneficial	Returned to optimum viable use as a single family dwelling, subject to works of repair and refurbishment. Setting enhanced by construction of more appropriate,	Major Beneficial

				residential development.	
UDHA 2	The Angler's Public House	Local	Low Beneficial	Significant improvements to the setting of the asset as a result of more appropriate, attractive development within its setting, including landscaping and planting.	Major Beneficial
UDHA 3	The Lensbury Club	Local	Neutral	Some softening of the eastern boundary of the development site, but insufficient to materially effect the setting of the asset.	Minor/Moderate Beneficial
UDHA 4	1-9 Kingston Road and 4-10 Broom Road	Local	Low Beneficial	Setting enhanced by construction of more appropriate, residential development along Broom Road, and loss of large, utilitarian structures from views to the east.	Negligible

## **7.5 MITIGATION**

### **Construction**

- 7.5.1 During the construction phase, it is considered that impact will be difficult to mitigate against. Schemes to prevent construction traffic using Teddington High Street will ensure that potential adverse affects on the High Street (Teddington) and Teddington Lock Conservation Areas are mitigated against.

### **Completed Development**

- 7.5.2 Once completed, it is considered that the residential, urban and suburban feel of the scheme will generate improvements to the settings of heritage assets in the vicinity. The existing buildings are of a utilitarian, almost industrial, form densely arranged within the site. Landscaping is rather minimal, giving the Studios a rather 'hard' appearance from both the River Thames and Broom Road. The overall visual impact of Teddington Studios on the historic environment is, therefore negative. The proposed development has been designed with the character of the surrounding area, and the setting of its heritage assets, firmly in mind. The proposed development, having a form that focuses on the provision of pavilions set within landscaped grounds, with low-rise townhouses and flats to the more suburban environment of Broom Road, will generally serve to create a minor enhancement to the setting of heritage assets which possess direct intervisibility with the site.
- 7.5.3 Given that no adverse effects have been identified at the operational stage of the development, it is therefore concluded that no mitigation measures are therefore required. In addition, it should be noted that the proposed scheme will involve conservation works to Weir Cottage, as well as its use as its proposed residential use. While there will be some unavoidable adverse effects on its setting at the constructional stage, it is considered that the proposed development will have beneficial direct and indirect effects on this asset, and that no mitigation is therefore required to address this on-site asset.

## 7.6 RESIDUAL IMPACTS

### Construction

7.6.1 Therefore, as identified above, there will, at constructional stage, be some minor adverse impacts on a small number of assets that possess direct intervisibility with the development site. These are particularly focused around the Teddington Lock Conservation Area, listed buildings, and buildings of townscape merit buildings that sit within it or close to the site.

7.6.2 In addition, as a result of onsite works, Weir Cottage will experience direct and indirect low adverse effects as a result of conservation work to the property, and construction within its immediate setting. These works will, however, lead to beneficial direct and indirect effects at the operational stage, by ensuring the asset's return to its optimum viable use, improving its fabric, and making improvements to its immediate setting including securing its flood free future.

### Completed Development

7.6.3 In terms of the completed development, it is considered that the proposed development will, as identified above, have a major/moderate beneficial effect on heritage assets within the site itself and its vicinity, and that no specific mitigation is therefore required. The residual operational effects of the development are, therefore, as identified in table 5.7 above.

7.6.4 The remaining adverse residual impacts of the proposed development are identified in table 5.8 below:

**Table 7.8: Summary of Residual Impacts**

Heritage Asset Ref.	Description of Impact	Significance of Heritage Assets	Magnitude & Nature of Effect	Significance of Effect
DHA 1 Teddington Footbridge	During Construction	National	<b>Low Adverse</b> Demolition and construction in vicinity of asset will have a minor	Moderate/ Minor Adverse

			adverse effect on the setting of the heritage asset in terms of noise, dust and visual effects. Minor intrusion into modern elements of the building's fabric, by introducing a landing point for the dry means of escape.	
DHA 2 The Boathouse, 27 Ferry Road	During Construction	National	<b>Low Adverse</b> Demolition and construction in vicinity of asset will have a minor adverse effect on the setting of the heritage asset in terms of noise, dust and visual effects.	Moderate/ Minor Adverse
DHA 7 Teddington Lock CA	During Construction	Regional	<b>Low Adverse</b> Demolition and construction in vicinity of Conservation Area will have a minor adverse effect on its setting in terms of noise, dust and visual effects.	Moderate/ Minor Adverse
UDHA 1 Weir Cottage	During Construction	Local	<b>Low Adverse</b> Significant Setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact. On-going conservation works, as part of redevelopment of the property as a residential dwelling, will serve to mitigate against the adverse impacts on the asset's setting.	Negligible
UDHA 2 The Angler's Public House	During Construction	Local	<b>Low Adverse</b> Setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions	Negligible

			and visual impact	
UDHA 4 1-9 Kingston Road and 4-10 Broom Road	During Construction	Local	<b>Low Adverse</b> Setting impacts, in terms of noise, traffic, emissions and visual impact	Negligible

## 7.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

### **Construction and Operation**

- 7.7.1 The only notable scheme which may produce cumulative impacts on the historic environment is the 'Ham Hydro' project, which seeks to utilise the existing weir at Teddington to generate hydro-electricity. A formal application, 11/3908/FUL, for *Demolition of section of weir; installation of 3 reverse engineered archimedean screw turbines to generate hydro electricity. New fish pass, sluice gate, cable routes to substation. Adapt maintenance access to that section of weir; plant room to be constructed on walkway; canopy above screws*, is currently pending a committee level decision.
- 7.7.2 It is not currently known when the Ham Hydro scheme is likely to be under construction.
- 7.7.3 The proposal would have a minor impact on the Teddington Lock Conservation Area, within which the proposed development will sit. The nature of the proposed development will fit with the rather industrial feel of Teddington Locks and its associated weirs; in essence, this part of the river is already dominated by structures of a similar form to those proposed, while the actual site of the development is characterised by the presence of a large roller sluice gate. The only effective addition proposed will, therefore, be a transformer building on the river bank of a rather heavy form, adjacent to the Lensbury Club.
- 7.7.4 The Ham Hydro scheme will only have an effect on the Teddington Lock Conservation Area, being sufficiently well removed from other assets to avoid any harm. While it will be directly visible from the Grade II listed Teddington Footbridge, it is considered that given the existing views of utilitarian weir, lock and sluice structures in this direction, the fundamental character of this asset's setting will be preserved.
- 7.7.5 Given that, at the operational stage, the proposed redevelopment of the Teddington Studios site has been identified as having a minor beneficial impact on the Teddington Lock Conservation Area, it is considered that the minor

adverse impact of the Ham Hydro scheme will be offset. It is certainly clear that, in cumulative terms, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved.

## **7.8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

- 7.8.1 Ultimately, it is concluded that within 500m of the site, there are a relatively small number of designated and undesignated heritage assets, including six listed buildings, four conservation areas, and four undesignated heritage assets. Of these, only one, the undesignated heritage asset of Weir Cottage, stands actually within the site, and will experience any direct effects. Otherwise, impacts can be identified as indirect, relating to setting.
- 7.8.2 It has been identified that some of the heritage assets within the identified baseline assessment area are relatively distant, and well-screened from the site, and will experience no effects through the development process. These assets are the listed buildings of Oak Cottage and 163-167 Teddington High Street (Peg Woffington's Cottage) (both Grade II), and The Grove and Teddington High Street Conservation Areas. In addition, a further heritage asset, the Broom Water Conservation Area, has some intervisibility with the development site, but to such a limited extent that the asset's setting will not be affected.
- 7.8.3 Otherwise, it has been generally concluded that the proposed development will lead to a Major/moderate beneficial effect on the historic environment. The development site, sitting close and a small part within the Teddington Lock Conservation Area, and with direct intervisibility with the Grade II listed buildings of Teddington Footbridge and the Boathouse, Ferry House, and more distant with the Grade II\* listed buildings of St Alban's Church and St Mary's Church, does have the potential to make some contribution to the setting of heritage assets. It is, however, rather dense and utilitarian in its form, out of character with the suburban nature of most of the surrounding land. The proposed development, sitting within the general building envelope of the existing buildings, will serve to decrease the visual prominence of the site, and the settings of nearby assets will also benefit from proposed landscaping and planting schemes.
- 7.8.4 It is therefore concluded that the proposed development, being of a more appropriate form than the existing, and incorporating extensive landscaping

and tree-planting, will not generate any significant harmful affects on the historic environment and will, indeed, generate significant beneficial affects on those assets most related to the site.