

ELLERAY HALL, ELLERAY ROAD &  
NORTH LANE DEPOT, EAST CAR PARK  
TEDDINGTON

**HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

24 June 2021

GARETH JONES  
HERITAGE PLANNING

## CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	LEGISLATION, POLICY & GUIDANCE	3
3	THE SITE AND ITS HERITAGE CONTEXT	10
4	ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS & CONCLUSIONS	19

# 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Heritage Assessment has been prepared by GJHP in support of the planning application for the redevelopment of the sites at Elleray Hall, Elleray Road & North Lane Depot, East Car Park (the ‘Sites’), Teddington, in the London Borough Richmond upon Thames. GJHP is a consultancy that provides expert advice on heritage and townscape matters.
- 1.2 The Sites do not lie in a conservation area nor do they include any listed buildings or Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTMs). The assessment considers the effect of the proposed development (the ‘Proposed Development’) on the heritage significance of the nearby heritage assets including the Broad Street and Park Lane Conservation Areas, and BTMs along Middle Lane and Park Lane.
- 1.3 The report sets out the following:
- Relevant statutory duties and national and local policy and guidance;
  - A description of the Sites and their heritage context;
  - Statements of significance of the relevant heritage assets; and
  - An assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development and conclusions.

## 2 LEGISLATION, POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 2.1 This section sets out the relevant statutory duties and national and local planning policies and guidance that are relevant to the consideration of heritage matters.

### **Statutory Duties**

#### ***The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990***

##### *Listed buildings*

- 2.2 Section 66 (1) of the Act states, *‘in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.’*

### **National planning policy**

#### ***The National Planning Policy Framework, 2019***

- 2.3 The Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in February 2019. The NPPF sets out planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

##### Heritage

- 2.4 Section 16 of the NPPF deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It applies to plan-making, decision-taking and the heritage-related consent regimes under the 1990 Act.
- 2.5 Heritage assets are defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as a *‘building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).’*
- 2.6 The NPPF notes, at paragraph 184, that heritage assets *‘should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.’*

- 2.7 The NPPF requires an applicant to describe the heritage significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including any contribution made by their setting (para 189). It goes on to say that *'the level of detail should be proportionate to the heritage assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.'*
- 2.8 The NPPF identifies three key factors local authorities should take into account in determining applications:
- 'The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*  
*The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*  
*The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'*
- 2.9 Paragraph 193 states that in assessing impact, the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be given to its conservation. It notes that heritage significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or from development within its setting.
- 2.10 The setting of a heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 as *'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.'*
- 2.11 The NPPF states, at paragraph 195, that where a proposed development would lead to *'substantial harm'* or total loss of heritage significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused, *'...unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss'*, or all of a number of specified criteria apply, including that the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site.
- 2.12 Where a development proposal will lead to *'less than substantial'* harm to the heritage significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (paragraph 196).
- 2.13 Paragraph 197 states the effect of an application on the significance of a non designated heritage asset requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the heritage significance of the heritage asset.

## ***Planning Practice Guidance***

- 2.14 The PPG includes a section called *'Historic environment'* which was updated on 23 July 2019. It explains which bodies are responsible for the designation of HAs and provides information on heritage consent processes.
- 2.15 The PPG considers the factors that should inform decision taking about developments that would affect HAs. It notes that *'HAs may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a HA, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals...'* (18a-007). It goes on to say *'understanding the significance of a heritage asset and its setting from an early stage in the design process can help to inform the development of proposals which avoid or minimise harm'* (18a-008). It states that in assessing proposal, where harm is found, the extent of harm should be *'clearly articulated' as either 'substantial' or 'less than substantial'* (18a-018).
- 2.16 The PPG notes that setting is defined in the NPPF and that *'all heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The setting of a heritage asset and the asset's curtilage may not have the same extent'* (18a-013). It goes on to say, *'the extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to the visual relationship between the asset and the proposed development and associated visual/physical considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each'* (18a-013).

## **Regional planning policy and guidance**

### ***The London Plan 2021***

- 2.17 The London Plan 2021 was adopted in March 2021. It is the *'overall strategic plan for London'* and sets out a *'framework for the development of London over the next 20-25 years'*.
- 2.18 Policy HC1 on *'Heritage conservation and growth'* notes that development proposals that affect heritage assets and their settings should *'conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings'*.

## Local policy and guidance

### *The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2018)*

- 2.19 The Local Plan was adopted in July 2018. It sets out policies and guidance for the development of the borough over the next 15 years.
- 2.20 **Policy LP 1 ‘Local Character and Design Quality’** requires all development to be of high architectural and urban design quality. Development proposals must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces and the local area.
- 2.21 The policy goes on to set out a number of considerations the Council will consider in assessing proposals. Those relevant to this assessment include:
- ‘ 1. compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain and frontages as well as scale, height, massing, density, landscaping, proportions, form, materials and detailing; and*
- 4. space between buildings, relationship of heights to widths and relationship to the public realm, heritage assets and natural features.’*
- 2.22 All proposals (including extensions, alterations and shopfronts) will be assessed against the advice set out in the relevant Village Planning Guidance and other SPDs relating to character and design.
- 2.23 **Policy LP 2 ‘Building Heights’** requires new buildings, including extensions and redevelopment of existing buildings, to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough’s valued townscapes and landscapes, through appropriate building heights, by a number of means including:
- ‘1.require buildings to make a positive contribution towards the local character, townscape and skyline, generally reflecting the prevailing building heights within the vicinity; proposals that are taller than the surrounding townscape have to be of high architectural design quality and standards, deliver public realm benefits and have a wholly positive impact on the character and quality of the area;*
- 2. preserve and enhance the borough's heritage assets, their significance and their setting;*
- 3. respect the local context, and where possible enhance the character of an area, through appropriate:*
- a. scale*
- b. height*
- c. mass*
- d. urban pattern*

- e. development grain
- f. materials
- g. streetscape
- h. roofscape and
- i. wider townscape and landscape.’

2.24 **Policy LP 3 ‘Designated Heritage Assets’** requires development to conserve and, where possible, take opportunities to make a positive contribution to, the historic environment of the borough. It sets out means by which the significance (including the settings) of the borough's designated heritage assets will be conserved and enhanced. Part B of the policy states the Council will resist substantial demolition in conservation areas and any changes that could harm heritage assets.

2.25 **Policy LP 4 ‘Non-Designated Heritage Assets’** states ‘*the Council will seek to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets*’, and that there will be a presumption against the demolition of Buildings of Townscape Merit.

2.26 **Policy LP 5 ‘Views and Vistas’** states the Council will protect the quality of the views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, all of which contribute significantly to the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local and wider area, by a number of means including:

- ‘6. seek improvements to views within Conservation Areas, which:
  - a. are identified in Conservation Area Statements and Studies and Village Plans;
  - b. are within, into, and out of Conservation Areas;
  - c. are affected by development on sites within the setting of, or adjacent to, Conservation Areas and listed buildings.’

#### ***Broad Street Conservation Area Statement***

2.27 The Conservation Area Statement explains why and when a conservation area was designated and includes a short history and description of the area, as well as a map showing the boundary. This is referred to where relevant in section 3 below.

#### ***Park Road (Teddington) Conservation Area Statement***

2.28 The Conservation Area Statement explains why and when a conservation area was designated and includes a short history and description of the area, as well as a map showing the boundary. This is referred to where relevant in section 3 below.



## Other guidance

### ***Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (March 2015)***

- 2.29 The purpose of this note is to provide information to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties in implementing historic environment policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the related guidance given in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). These include assessing the significance of heritage assets, using appropriate expertise, historic environment records, recording and furthering understanding.
- 2.30 In terms of general advice on decision-taking, it notes at para 4 that, *‘The first step for all applicants is to understand the significance of any affected heritage asset and, if relevant, the contribution of its setting to its significance’*. The guidance goes on to suggest a number of common steps in assessing significance.

### ***The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic England: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) December 2017***

- 2.31 This guidance states that it provides *‘information on good practice to assist local authorities, planning and other consultants, owners, applicants and other interested parties’* and that *‘alternative approaches may be equally acceptable, provided they are demonstrably compliant with legislation, national policies and objectives.’*
- 2.32 At para 9 it states that *‘Setting is not a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, although land comprising a setting may itself be designated .... Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate that significance.’*
- 2.33 At para. 18 the guidance states that the *‘Conserving or enhancing heritage assets by taking their settings into account need not prevent change; indeed change may be positive, for instance where the setting has been compromised by poor development.’* It goes on to say that *‘many places coincide with the setting of a heritage asset and are subject to some degree of change over time’*.

### **Historic England Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets (2019)**

- 2.34 Historic England issued Advice Note 12, Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets in October 2019. The note covers the NPPF requirement that heritage significance is described in order to help local

authorities make decisions on the impact of proposals for change to heritage assets. It states, in paragraph 2 of the introduction, that *'the level of detail in support of applications for planning permission and listed building consent should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision, and that activities to conserve the asset(s) need to be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected and the impact on that significance'*. It describes a statement of heritage significance as *'an objective analysis of significance, an opportunity to describe what matters and why'*.

- 2.35 The advice note states that a staged approach to decision making, where the significance is assessed before the design of the proposal commences, is the best approach. It states in paragraph 29, under 'proportionality', that while *'analysis should be as full as necessary to understand significance, the description provided to the LPA need be no more than sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on significance'*.

### 3 THE SITE AND ITS HERITAGE CONTEXT

#### Location

- 3.1 The Sites (Site 1 & Site 2, see below) lie close to each other, either side of Middle Lane (most of which is a pedestrian route at this point), at its western end. North Lane, connecting Broad Street (A313) a busy local high street, and Park Lane, runs along the western edge of Site 1. Elleray Road, which runs between Middle Lane and Broad Street, heads north from Site 2.
- 3.2 Teddington Railway Station lies some 430m to the east, across Park Road (A309). A number of bus routes run along Broad Street and Park Road.
- 3.3 Neither of the Sites lie within a conservation area or contain any heritage assets. There are two conservation areas, Broad Street and Park Road (Teddington), as well as a number of BTMs in the area around the Site.

#### The Sites

- 3.4 The Sites comprise the North Lane Depot, East Car Park (Site 1) & Elleray Hall, Elleray Road (Site 2).
- 3.5 Site 1 is 0.1ha and comprises an overflow car park and the site of a now demolished depot surrounded by hoardings. It detracts from the townscape quality of the local area today. There is a vehicular access from North Lane and pedestrian access via Middle Lane.



Entrance to car park on Site 1.



View into Site 1 from Middle Lane

- 3.6 The western Site boundary is defined by North Lane, and to the north it shares a boundary with nos. 21 to 17 Long Lane. To the east the Site abuts the rear boundaries of the rear gardens of nos. 16 to 26 (even) Elleray Road. To the south is Middle Lane, all pedestrianised at this point, with a utilitarian concrete post and chain link fence defining the boundary (nos. 21 to 27 Middle Lane, all BTMs, lie on the opposite side; see below).



Boundary of Site 1 with Middle Lane



Site 1 frontage to North Lane

3.7 Site 2 is 0.13ha and comprises Elleray Hall which provides day care and activities for the elderly, and associated car parking. To the north it fronts Middle Lane, the hall building terminating the view south along Elleray Road. To the east and west it shares a boundary with nos. 15 and 21 Middle Lane respectively (both BTMs, see below). To the rear the Site shares its boundary with nos. 49 to 53 North Lane, and nos. 22 to 30 Park Place (BTMs, see below). The boundary to Middle Lane is open to the east, and comprises a concrete post and chain link fence to the west)



Elleray Hall beyond nos. 13 & 15 Middle Lane



Elleray Hall - the existing community building



Elleray Hall and the end terrace on the west side of Elleray Road



Boundary of Site 2 to Middle Lane

3.8 Elleray Hall was constructed in 1911 and has been extended to the north, west and south-west since. The hall was initially a parish hall connected with St. Peter and St. Paul's Church and has been a well-used community centre since the 1950s

(Elleray Hall Social Centre); further details are given in the archaeological report. It provides poor quality out-dated facilities today, both internally and in respect of the external space. The Council have stated in preapplication advice that *'there is no objection to the loss of the existing building, which does not positively contribute to the local area'* (going on to say that *'any development must be a high standard of design that preserves the setting and significance of the adjacent BTMs'*; this is considered in section 4).

- 3.9 Elleray Hall appears tired today and together with the poor quality boundary to the street detracts from the local area. Any value it has locally relates to its community use, and as noted above the building does not offer accommodation of a suitable quality to provide community facilities for the elderly. It is surrounded by BTMs, as described below; the most recent additions to the Council's list on Middle Lane added in 2017, at which time it was not included.

### **Historic development of the area**

- 3.10 The Council's Park Road (Teddington) Conservation Area Statement provides a useful summary of the history of the area noting, *'The development of this area began in the 18<sup>th</sup> century with the building of large villas on the west side of Park Road, along this important route between the village of Teddington and Bushy Park. With the arrival of the railways in 1863 development of the area intensified with the laying out of new residential roads on the east side of Park Road around the Teddington Station. Suburban housing was developed between the station area and Bushy Park from the turn of the century onwards. Post war significant infill development has occurred along Park Road.'*
- 3.11 The Broad Street Conservation Area Statement provides a more detailed account which is summarised below:

*'Historic OS maps show that Broad Street and the Causeway (formerly Wolsey Road) existed during the mid 19th century and were largely undeveloped except for the prominent junction of The Causeway, Broad Street and Church Road.'* It goes on to say *'Larger dwellings did also exist along Broad Street, such as Elleray House and its formal gardens fronting Broad Street, which were demolished in the late 19th century, with Elleray Road being the former main access to the house. By the early 20th century the Causeway and Broad Street were developed, predominately by three storey purpose built smaller individual shops';* and that *'a number of dwellings were completed on streets off Broad Street, predominantly terraced properties such as along Elleray Road and Church Road.'*

*During the mid to late 20th century the area saw a significant amount of regeneration and redevelopment. A former department store was demolished, to be replaced with a large supermarket with brutalist inspired design, and apartment buildings constructed*

*along Broad Street which have eroded the historic streetscape, and hence why the entire Broad Street is not considered to be of equal historic and architectural significance.'*

- 3.12 Further information on the Sites and historic maps of the area can be found in the archaeological report by AOC Archaeology Group.

#### **Site context**

- 3.13 The Sites lie either side of Middle Lane towards its western end, the northern one (Site 1) with a frontage to North Lane and Middle Lane; the southern one (Site 2) with only a frontage to Middle Lane and terminating the southern end of Elleray Road. They are surrounded by 2 storey residential development, principally from the mid C19th onwards, comprising terraces, semidetached pairs and single dwelling houses.

- 3.14 To the east of Site 1, defining the west side of Elleray Road, is a terrace of yellow stock brick cottages with red brick detailing. Nos. 16 to 22, backing onto the Site, are double frontage with central entrances and some have ground floor bay windows. They have timber picket fences to the street. Elleray Road is a pleasant tree lined street at the northern of which is Broad Street and the Broad Street Conservation Area, see below.

- 3.15 On the south side of Middle Lane, overlooking Site 1 and either side of Site 2, are a run of mid C19th semidetached cottages which have been designated as BTMs by the Council, see below. Further east, the remainder of Middle Lane comprises a mixture of 2 storeys high houses that are varied in respect of their age and style. A number of them, towards Park Road, have been identified as BTMs.



Views from the east along Middle Lane

- 3.16 West of Site 1 is North Lane, a wider route than Middle Lane, which has a more varied character along its length. On the east side, immediately north of Site 1 are a semidetached pair of yellow brick cottages, each one window wide (with modern replacement windows), and with modest red brick detailing. Beyond is a terrace of cottages with ground floor bay windows, some rendered, and all painted different colours, many with replacement windows.

- 3.17 Opposite Site 1 is the North Lane West Car Park occupying a large plot at the junction with North Place. Defining the northern edge of this are the backs of the buildings that front Broad Street, including the large post-war Tesco store, which are of a piecemeal appearance. Nos. 30 to 34 Broad Street, at the junction, are in the Broad Street Conservation Area, see below.



Nos 19 & 21 North Lane, north of Site 1



North Lane West Car Park with the Tesco store beyond



View towards Site 1 from the North Lane West Car Park



North Lane and North Place junction

- 3.18 Along North Place, and to the south along North Lane, are terraces of 2 storeys high town houses with dormers in large mansard roofs dating from the 1960s/70s. To the east, on North Lane is a detached stock brick house and two pairs of large modern 2 storey semidetached houses with dormers in the pitched roofs.
- 3.19 South of Site 2, along Park Lane, are 2 storeys high detached, semidetached and terraced houses and flats, varied in style, and ranging in date from the C18th throughout the C20th. Nos 22 to 30, which back onto Site 2 are all BTMS, see below. The block of flats on the west side of the junction with North Lane rises to 3 storeys high.

### **Heritage context and statements of significance**

- 3.20 Neither of the Sites lie within a conservation area nor do they include any listed buildings or BTMs. There are two conservation areas (Broad Street and Park Road

(Teddington)) and a number of BTMs within the surrounding area. The Council's comprehensive BTM register lists the following as BTMs:

- Nos. 2 and 10 to 24 (even) & 13, 15 and 21 to 27 (odd) Middle Lane
- Nos. 22 to 30 (even) Park Lane

3.21 The nearest statutory listed buildings are nos. 14 & 16 Park Road.

3.22 A statement of significance for each of these heritage assets is provided below. The conservation areas and listed buildings (designated heritage assets), are considered first.

3.23 The National Planning Policy Framework defines heritage significance at 'Annex 2: Glossary' as:

*'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.'*

3.24 The assessments of significance below are based on an on-site visual inspection and the Council's SPGs. They are proportionate both to the importance of the asset and to the nature and extent of the application proposals. They are sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposals on heritage interest.

### ***Broad Street Conservation Area***

3.25 The Broad Street Conservation Area was designated on 20 February 2019. It is predominantly located along Broad Street and The Causeway, and the associated rear laneways.



View north along Elleray Road in to the Broad Street Conservation Area



- 3.26 The Council's Conservation Area Statement notes in respect of significance that it *'represents a Victorian and Edwardian High Street which developed along a historic thoroughfare leading into the settlement of Teddington that developed on the opposite side of the railway tracks. Although there was early development along Broad Street, such as St. Peters and St. Pauls Church (1864) and a group of boarding houses (called the American houses) now both demolished, the current commercial street was developed as a separate entity to the Teddington High Street.'* It goes on to state that buildings are predominately 3 storeys tall.
- 3.27 Reference is made to Middle Lane and the views that it affords to the rear of buildings along Broad Street, *'Middle Lane is a rear lane behind Broad Street and is interesting as glimpses of the rear of properties can be gained. Historically the lane accessed workshops to the rear of properties, with one such workshop still in existence, now utilised as a vehicle repair business which is an interesting survivor of the area.'* No reference is made of views towards the Sites.

### ***Park Road (Teddington) Conservation Area***

- 3.28 The Park Road (Teddington) Conservation Area was designated on 10 December 1974 and extended on 20 September 1988 and on 7 November 2005. It is located just to the south of the centre of Teddington, and is contained by the railway line to the east and Bushy Park to the south.



Eastern end of Middle Lane in the Park Lane Conservation Area with nos. 14 & 16 Park Road to the left (facing; see below).

- 3.29 In respect of its significance the Council's Conservation Area Statement states, *'Park Road (Teddington) conservation area can be divided into a number of distinct character areas, illustrating the phased development of the area. However the whole conservation area is united by its relationship to Park Road and the railway'*. It goes on to note in respect of Park Road, *'The oldest part of the conservation area is defined by the straight and wide vista along the treed avenue of Park Road. The road is lined on the west side by substantial detached 18<sup>th</sup> century houses set in generous mature*

*grounds with trees. These are impressive villas of two to three storeys of brick or render with shallow hipped slate roofs. Other large but more modern buildings, such as the grand Park Lodge Hotel, complete the scene. These buildings present important continuous front boundary walls to the road with important spaces between.'*

- 3.30 No reference is made of views towards the Sites.

### **Listed Buildings**

- 3.31 Nos. 14 & 16 Park Road (see above) are listed grade II. These are a pair of early to mid C19th semi-detached houses of different build. No. 14 may be a remodelling of an earlier house of 1728. No. 16 is thought to have been built in 1835. There will be no effect on the setting of these heritage assets, and they are not considered further in this assessment.

### **Buildings of Townscape Merit**

- 3.32 Nos. 13 & 15, and 21 to 27 (odd) Middle Lane were designated BTMs on 5 September 1983. These buildings all lie at the western end of Middle Lane next to the two Sites. These are mid C19th semidetached 2 storeys high cottages built of stock brick with hipped slate roofs and single storey side wings with pitched roofs. The pairs are of similar designs. They have all been extended to various degrees to the rear and side, and have various replacement windows.
- 3.33 The fragmented townscapes of the Sites, comprising surface car parks, chain link fences and a utilitarian hall structure, provide a poor quality setting for these BTMs today.



Nos. 13 & 15 (left facing)



Nos. 21 to 27 – behind the trees



Nos. 10 to 24 Middle Lane

- 3.34 Nos. 2 and 10 to 24 even Middle Lane were designated BTMs on 1 February 2017. They comprise a terrace of 2 storeys high cottages in yellow stock brick, some painted, and a semidetached pair of houses. They lie towards the eastern end of the street. The Proposed Development will not affect any element of setting that contributes to their significance.
- 3.35 Nos. 22 to 30 Park Lane were designated BTMs on 24 March 2005. This group range in date from the C18 (no. 22) to mid to late C19th, nos. 30 and 26 to 28 respectively. They are brick faced or rendered and all have been painted and are set back from the street edge with a varied building line, behind generous front gardens. They do not lie within a conservation area and sit on a road of a residential character and varied townscape quality, with houses and flats that are varied in age and style.

## 4 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS & CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 This section assesses the effects of the Proposed Development on heritage significance. It assesses the Proposed Development as relevant to the consideration of effects on heritage significance and goes on to assess the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of the Broad Street and Park Lane Conservation Areas and the settings of nearby BTMs (statements of significance of all these heritage assets are set out in section 3).
- 4.2 Reference should be made to the DAS, scheme drawings, and planning statement accompanying the application, which set out in detail the Proposed Development.

### **The Proposed Development**

- 4.3 The Proposed Development comprises the redevelopment of both Sites. A new community hall is built on Site 1. It comprises two principal volumes stepped in plan that present gables to the street and hipped roofs to the rear. They are both single storey with pitched roofs, the taller southern wing with accommodation in the pitched roof. The entrance lobby fronts North Lane, and is set behind an area of hard standing for vehicular drop offs and parking. There is a garden space for the use of the community centre to the rear.
- 4.4 The elevations are in a deep brown brick with red brick detailing, and the roofs are clad in a dark grey standing seam metal. There is a tall full height window in the street gable of the community hall, and a feature square window in the gable end of the south wing.
- 4.5 The new homes on Site 2 are provided in an apartment block comprising two attached wings. The wing fronting the street is expressed as two houses with pitched hipped roofs that are connected by a glazed link with an entrance to the upper floors. There is a separate central entrance each side serving the 2 ground floor flats. There is a curved wing of a more plain design to the rear (which is largely screened in street views), and has a flat roof. Both wings have punched openings in brick facades, that are ordered and align vertically. The elevations are principally in a yellow stock brick with red brick detailing.

### **Assessment**

- 4.6 The Proposed Development is well considered and modest in respect of both height and scale. The redevelopment of these 2 Sites, which currently detract from the local townscape and setting of nearby heritage assets, with new buildings of a high quality of architectural design, will enhance the street edge to North Lane and

Middle Lane as well as the local townscape, including the views south along Elleray Road.

- 4.7 The new community hall, has a clear civic character and a welcoming frontage to North Lane. Its stepped plan and height articulate its massing well, and it rises to the same height as the terrace along Elleray Road to the east, and is lower than the neighbouring nos. 19 and 21 North Lane to the north. The pitched roof form provides a recessive form along the south (Middle Lane) and north Site edges. It is well detailed and the use of brick complements the prevailing material in the area. Hedge planting will enhance the street edges.
- 4.8 The new residential block comprises two attached wings. The wing fronting the street complementing both the character and form of the of the neighbouring BTMs on Middle Lane and the terraced cottage on Elleray Road, with 2 double fronted elements with central entrances and hipped pitched roofs. To the rear the curved wing with a flat roof is of a more subservient mews like character. The street boundary is enhanced with hedge planting and a gated entrance to the rear wing.
- 4.9 The Proposed Development is wholly in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area, including the nearby BTMs and conservation areas. The scale, massing and detailed design of all elements are sympathetic to their context and complement the scale and materials of the nearby BTMs. The scheme represents a sensitive approach to providing new homes and enhanced community facilities, as encouraged by national planning policy.
- 4.10 The Proposed Development whilst clearly of a design of its own time adopts appropriate traditional elements, such as pitched and hipped roof forms, and materials such as brick and natural slate, to respond to its context in a positive way. The design of the new hall has been skilfully handled to respond to its residential context whilst also appear as a community building; and the frontage wing of the apartment block continues the pattern and rhythm of semidetached houses seen along Middle Lane. The scheme will provide new buildings of a characterful appearance that clearly reflect their use.
- 4.11 Notwithstanding our assessment that the Proposed Development will cause no harm to the setting of any heritage asset, should others disagree this could only be said to be minor, and in the case of the conservation areas, at the very low end of '*less than substantial*'. The provision of a new community hall and housing will deliver significant public benefits which would outweigh this limited '*less than substantial*' harm to a very large degree in line with paras 196 of the NPPF. Similarly, any harm to the settings of the BTMs could only be said to be low and would be outweighed to a very large degree by the public benefit the scheme will deliver in line with paras 197 of the NPPF.

## Council policy and guidance

- 4.12 In line with **Policy LP 1 ‘Local Character and Design Quality’** the Proposed Development is of high architectural and urban design quality, based on a thorough understanding of the Site and its context, and the potential to enhance both these Sites that currently detract from the wider area with areas of open car park surrounded by chain link fence. It is compatible with the local character including the existing townscape and nearby BTMs, in respect of scale, height, massing, proportions, form, materials and detailing; as clearly set out in the DAS accompanying the application.
- 4.13 In line with **Policy LP 2 ‘Building Heights’** the Proposed Development on both Sites simply follows the prevailing height of 2 storey buildings with pitched roofs found in the immediate area around the Site. To the north there are buildings of 3 storeys or more. The modest scale of development is wholly appropriate for the Sites and will enhance the local townscape.
- 4.14 In line with **Policy LP 3 ‘Designated Heritage Asset’** the Proposed Development, which will have a very minimal visual effect on the wider area and is of an appropriate design, as set out above, will cause no harm to any element of setting that contributes to the significance of the Broad Street and Park Lane (Teddington) Conservation Areas. When seen in views from these conservation areas, or towards them, it will appear as a positive addition to the local townscape that will enhance the appearance of the Sites. There will be no effect on the setting of any statutory listed building.
- 4.15 In line with **Policy LP 4 ‘Non Designated Heritage Assets’** the design has been mindful of the neighbouring BTMS to both Sites and this has influenced not only the height and massing of the Proposed Development but also the approach to the roof forms, detailing and materials. The new housing block will complete the built frontage of residential buildings with hipped roofs to Middle Lane (with a modest curved rear block set away from the Site edges); and the brick elevations and pitched roofs of the hall ensure it sits comfortably with, and complements the appearance of, its neighbours.
- 4.16 In line with **Policy LP 5 ‘Views and Vistas’** there is no effect on any view identified by the Council. The Proposed Development will have a minimal effect on views beyond the streets that define the Sites’ edges. The new hall will enhance views along North Lane returning a positive built edge in place of the existing fragmented townscape. The new residential block will provide a positive termination in views south along Elleray Road, completing the terraced cottage along this street as well as the semidetached cottages with hipped slate roofs on Middle Lane.

## Conclusions

- 4.17 The Proposed Development is an intelligent and carefully considered response to the Sites and their heritage context. In respect of the design considered in its own right, and the relationship between the Proposed Development and its heritage context, the proposals are entirely sensitive and appropriate, and the effects are all positive. There are no harmful effects to the settings of any heritage asset.
- 4.18 The Proposed Development is in line with relevant legislation, the policies and guidance on heritage set out in the NPPF and PPG; London Plan policies; Local Plan policies LP1 to 5; relevant SPDs; and HE guidance.

Gareth Jones Heritage Planning

24 June 2021