14 Archaeology and Cultural Heritage

14.1 Introduction

14.1.1 This Chapter reports the assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the Masterplan Development on the Historic Environment. In particular it considers the likely significant effects of the proposed works on any buried and surface archaeological remains, and built heritage assets, within the Site and the wider study area. These include:

- The physical effects of construction activity associated with the Masterplan Development on buried and surface archaeological remains and built heritage assets within the Site (direct effects), including:
  - loss or disturbance of non-designated heritage assets within the Site known from the South Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER), East Berkshire HER, English Heritage National Monuments Record (NMR) and any identified through the preparation of the Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (DBA);
  - conservation and alteration of designated heritage assets within the Site including Glen Island House (Grade II listed building, list entry no. 1392491) and the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area; and
  - loss, or conservation and alteration of non-designated built heritage assets within the site as identified in the Taplow Conservation Area Appraisal and through discussions with South Buckinghamshire District Council.

- The noise and visual effects of the Masterplan Development on the setting of heritage assets in the vicinity of the Masterplan Development during the construction and operational phases (indirect effects), including:
  - changes in the setting of non-designated heritage assets;
  - changes in the setting of the Saxon barrow, church and cemeteries in the old churchyard at Taplow Court (Scheduled Monument, list entry no. 1014781);
  - changes in the setting of the Grade I listed Maidenhead Bridge (list entry no. 1117619);
  - the view into the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area from Maidenhead Bank;
  - the view of the Taplow riverbank, if often dominated by the gasholder;
  - important views within the conservation areas outside the site;
  - views to Taplow Court from the Riverside, and vice versa;
  - views into the site from the Taplow Conservation Area;
  - views to and from the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area.

14.1.2 This Chapter combines archaeology and built heritage in a single treatment, in recognition of the unified national policy context and following the Scoping Opinion response of Buckinghamshire County Council. It has been informed by the following reports, which are included as appendices:

- Built Heritage Consultancy (2014) Mill Lane, Taplow: Heritage Statement (Appendix 14.1);
- WSP (2014) Archaeological Desk Based Assessment Mill Lane, Taplow (Appendix 14.2);
- ARCUS (2006) Archaeological Desk Study Land associated with Taplow Mill and Skindles Hotel, Taplow, Maidenhead, Buckinghamshire (Appendix 14.3);

14.1.3 Heritage Collective (2013) Initial Archaeological Appraisal, Mill Lane, Taplow, Buckinghamshire (Appendix 14.4). This chapter should be read together with the introductory chapters of this ES (Chapters 1 – 5) as well as Chapter 16 ‘Cumulative Effects’.
14.2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Legislation Framework

14.2.1 The applicable legislative framework is summarised as follows:
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (Ref. 14.1);
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Ref. 14.2);
- Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 (Ref. 14.3);
- Hedgerow Regulations (Statutory Instrument No. 1160) 1995 (Ref. 14.4);
- Treasures Act 1996 (Ref. 14.5); and
- Burial Act 1857 (14.6).

14.2.2 Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act provides that listed building consent is required for:
- “any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest …”

14.2.3 Section 16(2) of the Act states that:
- “In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority … 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”

14.2.4 With regard to applications for planning permission affecting the setting of listed buildings, Section 66 of the Act requires that:
- “in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting or whether to grant listed building consent, the local authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”

14.2.5 Conservation area designation introduces a general control over the demolition of unlisted buildings and provides the basis for policies designed to preserve or enhance all the aspects of character or appearance that define an area’s special interest. Section 72 of the Act requires that:
- “in considering whether to grant planning permission with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, the local planning authority shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”

Planning Policy

14.2.6 Planning policy at the national and local level and its relevance to environmental design and assessment is discussed in Chapter 5 ‘Planning Policy Context’ and policies of particular relevance to archaeology and cultural heritage are discussed below.

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2012)

14.2.7 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref 14.7) was published in March 2012, consolidating all of the Government’s previous Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) into one document.

14.2.8 Under the NPPF, there is an overarching presumption in favour of sustainable development that should be the basis of every plan and every decision. The general approach to assessing the historic environment is now embedded within the definition of sustainable development. Para. 7 of the NPPF states that sustainable development should ‘contribute[e] to protecting and enhancing our ... historic environment’. There is also a need for positive inclusion of the historic environment in development design (para. 9).

14.2.9 Annex 2 of the NPPF provides the following definitions of relevance to this chapter:
Heritage asset: 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. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

Historic environment: All aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible, buried or submerged, and landscaped and planted or managed flora.

Setting of a heritage asset: 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.

Significance (for heritage policy): 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.

14.2.10 The historic environment is stated within the NPPF core principles: development should 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations'. There is no distinction here between designated and non-designated heritage assets. As such, all heritage assets need to be judged by this criteria and significance must be assessed in order to achieve this (para. 17).

14.2.11 Section 12 of the NPPF (2012) details the approach to the historic environment specifically. Four core principles are set out (para. 126):

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

14.2.12 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF requires local authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset), and to take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

14.2.13 The NPPF recognises that a balance needs to be struck between the preservation of the significance of a heritage asset and delivering public benefit. Where proposed developments involve effects on non-designated heritage assets, paragraph 135 states that a balanced judgement will be required with regard to the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the asset. At paragraph 139, the NPPF recognises that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interests may be of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument. In such cases, the NPPF directs that such assets are to be considered subject to the policies for designated assets.

14.2.14 With regard to designated assets, paragraph 132 states that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be on its conservation. Distinction is drawn between those assets of highest significance, including scheduled monuments and grade I and II* listed buildings, and those of lesser significance, including grade II listed buildings. Any harm or loss of heritage significance deemed to be substantial requires clear and convincing justification, and should be wholly exceptional with regard to those assets of highest significance.

Local Planning Policy

South Bucks District Council Core Strategy (2011)

14.2.15 The Council's policy on the historic environment is set out in Core Policy 8 of the Core Strategy (Ref 14.8). This states that nationally-designated historic assets and their settings, including
Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Grade I, II* and II listed buildings, will have the highest level of protection. However, it states that locally-important heritage features and their settings also make an important contribution to the creation of distinctive and sustainable places and will also be protected, conserved and enhanced where appropriate.

14.2.16 Core Policy 15 identifies Mill Lane an as Opportunity Site, the regeneration of which must follow a comprehensive, conservation-led approach. Any redevelopment proposals should:

- Be sympathetic to the historic nature of the site and its surroundings, including the Taplow Riverside and Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Areas, and any remains of archaeological importance;
- Preserve, and where possible enhance, the character and appearance of the riverside setting, including views to and from the site and
- Protect, conserve and where possible enhance Maidenhead Bridge and Glen Island House, and their respective settings.


14.2.17 A number of policies within the South Bucks District Plan remain in force. Of relevance to the historic environment are: Policy L4: River Thames Setting; Policy C1: Development within a Conservation Area; and Policy C6: Alterations and extensions to listed buildings.

14.2.18 Policy L4 states that the Council will not permit development which would have an adverse impact on the special character, landscape or amenity of the River Thames.

14.2.19 Policy C1 states that development within a Conservation Area that fails to preserve or enhance its character or appearance will not be permitted. Development will only be permitted where the proposal would preserve or enhance important features which contribute to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (views into or out of it), and would be of a high standard of design sympathetic to the site and the Conservation Area as a whole.

14.2.20 Policy C6 states that consent will not be granted for alterations or extensions which would harm the character or appearance of a listed building or its features of special architectural or historic interest. Consent will only be granted where proposals are of a high standard of design and would not detract from the intrinsic historic and architectural interest, character or appearance of the building, and would not detract from its setting.

Non-Statutory Policies and Guidance

Mill Lane Taplow, Supplementary Planning Document (2013)

14.2.21 The SPD (Ref 14.9) emphasises the importance of the historic landscape in which the Site is located, overlooked by Taplow Court and the Saxon barrow, church and cemeteries in the old churchyard at Taplow Court (Scheduled Monument, list entry no. 1014781), and with several Registered Parks and Gardens nearby. The site is adjacent to the Grade I Listed Maidenhead Bridge, and much of it is within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area, which includes the Grade II Listed Glen Island House. The entire western boundary of the site adjoins the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area. The Taplow Riverside Conservation Area also accommodates a number of significant non-designated heritage assets.

14.2.22 The Site has potential to include assets of archaeological interest because it is within an area known to be rich in archaeological remains of regional and national importance. The Site location between two water courses highlights the potential for exceptional preservation of archaeological remains in waterlogged deposits, including structural remains. There is extensive evidence of Mesolithic to Roman occupation along the River Thames, which could potentially be of national importance.

14.2.23 The SPD re-iterates Core Policy 15, and goes on to state that future redevelopment of the Mill Lane Opportunity Site should be conservation-led, ensuring that:

- Development proposals on the Skindles Hotel respect and enhance the setting of the Grade I listed Maidenhead Bridge and make a positive contribution to Taplow Riverside and Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Areas;
- Mill Island House and Dunloe Lodge are restored, and their settings enhanced;
Driftwood Cottage and the Boathouse on Taplow Investments' land are retained.

The new footbridge over the Thames is sensitively designed, ensuring that it makes a positive contribution to the Taplow Riverside and Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Areas;

Future development on the site preserves and enhances views to and from Maidenhead Bridge, Taplow Riverside Conservation Area, Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area and Taplow Court; and

Archaeological remains are identified and their significance recognised (by public displays) and conserved.

Taplow Riverside Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2007)

14.2.24 The Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Ref 14.10) notes that the Site presents a major opportunity to enhance the northern zone of the Conservation Area whilst preserving its special character. It states that more detailed investigation will be required into the archaeology, history and development of the northern zone and its buildings as part of the planning process for any redevelopment.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2014) Planning Policy Guidance

14.2.25 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (Ref. 14.11) was published on 6th March 2014 and formally revoked over 150 planning guidance documents. The 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment' section of the PPG states that "protecting and enhancing the historic environment is an important component of the National Planning Policy Framework's drive to achieve sustainable development". The appropriate conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance forms one of the 'Core Planning Principles' that underpin the planning system as "Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits".

14.2.26 The PPG also states "Part of the public value of heritage assets is the contribution that they can make to understanding and interpreting our past. So where the complete or partial loss of a heritage is justified, the aim then is to capture and record the evidence of the asset's significance which is to be lost, interpret its contribution to the understanding of our past, and make that publically available".

Institute for Archaeologists Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (2012)

14.2.27 The Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) 'Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-based Assessment' (Ref. 14.12) sets out the methods and practices to establish the effects of development proposals on the significance of the historic environment or to identify the need for further evaluation to do so.

English Heritage 'Setting of Heritage Assets' (2011)

14.2.28 This guidance (Ref. 14.13) states that "the significance of a heritage asset derives not only from its physical presence and historic fabric but also from its setting-the surroundings in which it is experienced". The document sets out a framework to assess the potential changes in setting and provides guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets including archaeological remains and historic buildings, sites, areas and landscapes.

English Heritage 'Seeing History in the View' (2011)

14.2.29 This guidance (Ref. 14.14) outlines a method for understanding and assessing heritage significance within views. It is intended that this method can be applied to any view that is significant in terms of its heritage value. This guidance also explains how the heritage significance of views can be assessed in a systematic and consistent way however these views have come into being.


14.2.30 This guidance document (Ref. 14.15) sets out a method for thinking systematically and consistently about the heritage values that can be ascribed to a place. As people value historic places in many different ways, the document defines four different value categories:

- Evidential: the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity;
Historical: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present - it tends to be illustrative or associative;

Aesthetic: the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place; and

Communal: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

Department for Communities and Local Government PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide

14.2.31 The Practice Guide to PPS5 (Ref. 14.16) remains in force as guidance to support the NPPF policies on the Historic Environment. The guide explains how these policies can be implemented and interpreted in the planning process. As a guide to interpreting how policy should be applied, the practice guidance is also material to individual planning and heritage consent decisions.

14.3 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Scope of the Assessment.

14.3.1 This Chapter considers the likely significant environmental effects of the Masterplan Development on the Historic Environment. The EIA Scoping Report (Appendix 2.1) identified the key issues in respect of archaeology as:

- Disturbance of loss of potential buried/surface archaeological remains within the Site;
- Loss of disturbance of (direct effects) on known non-designated heritage assets within the Site;
- Changes in the setting of (indirect effects) non-designated heritage assets.

14.3.2 In respect of built heritage, the EIA Scoping Report identified the key issues as:

- The importance of the view into the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area from the Maidenhead bank of the Thames;
- The view of the Taplow riverbank, if often dominated by the gasholder;
- Important views within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area;
- The importance of views to Taplow Court from the riverside, and vice versa;
- The importance of the views into the Site from the Taplow Conservation Area; and
- The importance of the views to and from the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area.

14.3.3 In light of comments in the Scoping Opinion (Appendix 2.2) (A response from English Heritage came after the Scoping Opinion, but is also contained within Appendix 2.2), this ES chapter presents an overall qualitative assessment of the heritage assets of the Site and its surroundings. It also addresses the effects of the Masterplan Development on listed buildings within and near the Site, and nearby conservation areas. An assessment of the archaeological potential throughout the Site and Study Area has been undertaken; this has assessed the potential within defined areas (zones) and the importance of archaeological assets in terms of period and value.

Relevant Elements of the Masterplan Development

14.3.4 The following components of the Masterplan Development are relevant to the historic environment assessment:

- The conversion of the Grade II listed Glen Island House;
- The conversion of the former Glen Island House Stable Block;
- The conversion of the former Power House;
- The conversion of Mill Island House;
- The conversion of Mill Island Cottage;
- The reconstruction of Dunloe Lodge;
The conversion of No. 5 Mill Lane;

- The replacement of Skindles with a new restaurant and residential dwellings; and

- More generally, much of the Masterplan Development would be located within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area, and thus all new build and landscaping aspects of the scheme – including the proposed bridge at the northern end of the Site and new build elements beyond the conservation area boundary, including Skindles Senior Living and the Jubilee Relief Riverside Houses – are assessed in terms of their effects on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as well as their effect on the settings of the relevant designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Extent of the Study Area

14.3.5 The following search areas have been used to establish the presence of known designated and non-designated heritage assets within, and in the vicinity of, the Site:

- 1km radius from the Site centre for World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields; and

- 0.5km from the Site boundary for Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.

14.3.6 The extent of the study area was determined – on the basis of site visits, documentary study and professional judgement – as being the maximum extent of the area in which in heritage assets were likely to be significantly affected.

14.3.7 The desk study, discussed below, addressed the same study area.

Consultation

14.3.8 Table 14.1 provides a summary of the consultation activities undertaken in addition to the EIA Scoping Report in support of the preparation of this Chapter.

Table 14.1: Summary of consultation undertaken to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Individual(s) at Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Meeting Dates and Other Forms of Consultation</th>
<th>Summary of Outcome of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire County Council</td>
<td>Sarah Jane Farr</td>
<td>6 April</td>
<td>▪ Awaiting collation of archaeological baseline information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Richard Peats</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>▪ Loss of Skindles accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identified the setting of the Maidenhead Bridge as a key issue. Suggested that scheme had lots of potential, but indicated that destailing and materials would be critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identified that preserving character of existing outlook from Maidenhead riverbank is crucial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identified that the setting of Glen Island House to the east was an issue, as it would not entirely befit a gentlemens’ residence. There is potential to make a better space here which terminates in the stables and is flanked by the house and new apartment block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identified that the increase in the height of the new flat blocks was an issue, but welcomed the reduction in footprint from previous design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bucks District Council</td>
<td>John Brushe</td>
<td>18 June</td>
<td>▪ Expressed desire for Dunloe Lodge chimneystacks to be retained rather than</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method of Baseline Data Collation

Desk Study

14.3.9 The baseline assessment was carried out in accordance with the published Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment and Code of Conduct (Ref. 14.17) of the Institute for Archaeologists. The assessment methodology has also followed national guidance as defined by English Heritage, with particular reference to Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment: The Setting of Heritage Assets and the Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment. In summary the work has involved:

- The identification of key data sources;
- The collation of data held by the National Heritage List (NMR), the Berkshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER);
- The collection of data held by Buckinghamshire Archives and Maidenhead Library Local Studies Collection;
- The assessment and review of documentary and historic map sources;
- A visual assessment of the archaeological and built heritage assets identified;
- The presentation of key heritage assets in map form; and
- The interpretation of results.

14.3.10 The heritage baseline information informs the determination of the significance of the assets. It also provides the evidence base to support the determination of the application for the Proposed Development.

Site Visit / Other Assessment

14.3.11 Site walkovers and visual appraisals of the Site and study area were undertaken in February, April, June and August 2014. The main considerations of the site walkovers were:

- To identify known and previously unrecorded heritage assets;
- To assess how current and former land use may have affected the archaeological potential of the Site;
To record current land use, ground conditions and any constraints or factors to assist in preparing the baseline section of this Chapter;

To assess landform, key views and potential setting impacts on heritage assets both designated and non-designated; and

To assess how changes over time to the fabric of above-ground heritage assets may have affected their sensitivity, to allow assessment of how the Proposed Development might affect that sensitivity.

Archaeological Evaluation

14.3.12 The Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Appendix 14.2) recommends archaeological evaluation to be conditioned in order to inform the extent, date and integrity of below ground archaeological deposits and or features. The potential for both the Prehistoric and Early Medieval archaeology suggest that evaluation would inform mitigation concerning the Masterplan Development. This will be augmented with a review of current geo-technical data as part of the production of a geoarchaeological deposits model of the Site.

Identification of Sensitive Receptors

14.3.13 There are two broad categories of historic environment receptors:

- Buried heritage assets (archaeological remains). These may either be known assets, or possible unrecorded archaeological remains, whether designated or not. The assessment considers the likely nature, date, extent, survival and significance of such assets.

- Above ground heritage assets. These largely comprise standing buildings of historic interest, including statutorily- and locally-listed buildings and their settings, and conservation areas and their character and settings. Within the site these include Glen Island House (Grade II listed building, list entry no. 1392491). Outside the site are the Saxon barrow, church and cemeteries in the old churchyard at Taplow Court (Scheduled Monument, list entry no. 1014781), and Maidenhead Bridge (Grade I listed, list entry no. 1117619). Above ground heritage assets also include built heritage that has not been formally designated but which has been identified during the course of the assessment as having heritage interest.

14.3.14 The determination of receptor sensitivity of known and potential heritage assets is based on statutory designation or in the absence of designation, professional judgement against four ‘heritage values’ set out in English Heritage’s Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment:

- Evidential value: relating to the potential of physical remains to yield evidence of past human activity;

- Historical value: which derives from the ways in which the past can be connected through heritage assets to the present, either through illustrating aspects of the past, or by association with noteworthy people, movements or events;

- Aesthetic value: which can derive from the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from the design of an asset, or perhaps from changes in the fortuitous way a place has evolved over time; and

- Communal value: relating to what a place means for people, whether it is the commemoratively or symbolic values of a place that people derive part of their identity from or have particular memories of, or the social value that accrues to a place which performs a community role through its distinctiveness or function as a place of interaction, or the spiritual value such as can be found in places of worship.

14.3.15 These values encompass the criteria, including special architectural or historic interest, or archaeological interest, that English Heritage is obliged to consider when statutorily designating heritage assets.

14.3.16 Table 14.2 below defines receptor sensitivity of designated and non-designated, above ground and buried heritage assets.
### Table 14.2: Matrix for Determining the Sensitivity of Historic Environment Receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very High | World Heritage Sites and their setting  
           | Assets of acknowledged international value  
           | Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged international research objectives  
           | Historic landscapes of international value, whether designated or not  
           | Extremely well preserved historic landscapes, with exceptional coherence, time-depth or other critical factor (s)                                                                                   |
| High      | Scheduled Monuments and their setting  
           | Grade I and Grade II* Listed buildings and their setting  
           | Grade I and Grade II* Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and their setting  
           | Conservation Areas containing very important buildings  
           | Non-designated assets of schedulable quality and value  
           | Assets that can contribute significantly to acknowledged national research objectives  
           | Designated and non-designated historic landscapes of outstanding interest or of high quality and importance and of demonstrable national value  
           | Well preserved historic landscapes, exhibiting considerable coherence, time-depth and other critical factor (s)                                                                                   |
| Medium    | Grade II listed buildings and their setting  
           | Grade II Registered Parks and Gardens and their setting  
           | Registered battlefields and their setting  
           | Conservation areas containing buildings that contribute significantly to its historic character and their setting  
           | Designated or non-designated assets that contribute to regional research objectives  
           | Designated or non-designated historic landscapes that would justify special historic landscape designation or landscapes that would be considered to be of regional value  
           | Hedgerows defined as ‘important’ under the criteria set out in the Hedgerow Regulations (1997)  
           | Non-designated archaeological sites of moderate significance (regional)  
           | Moderately well preserved historic landscapes with reasonable coherence, time-depth and other critical factor (s)                                                                                   |
| Low       | Locally-listed structures and their setting  
           | Designated or non-designated assets of limited value, but with the potential to contribute to local research objectives  
           | Robust undisignated historic landscapes or those or those with importance to local interest groups  
           | Historic landscapes whose value is limited by poor preservation and/or poor survival of con-textual associations                                                                                     |
| Negligible| Sites or features with no significant historic or archaeological value or interest  
           | Buildings of an intrusive character  
           | Landscapes with little or no significant historical interest                                                                                                                                 |

14.3.17 In relation to buried heritage assets, professional judgement has been used to predict the likely sensitivity of these assets based on likely nature, date, extent, survival, condition, rarity, group value, and the four heritage value criteria above. These criteria have also been used to determine the sensitivity of non-designated above ground structures. There is no single defining criteria that dictates overall sensitivity; each asset has to be evaluated against the range of criteria listed above on a case-by-case basis.
14.3.18 In relation to above ground heritage assets, and known buried heritage assets of high sensitivity, the assessment takes into account the contribution made to their importance by their setting. There is no single defining set of criteria for quantifying the contribution made by setting; professional judgement has therefore been used in relation to each identified asset on a case-by-case basis to arrive at a qualitative judgement on the aspects of each asset’s setting that contributes to its sensitivity. This process takes into account the historic context of each asset, architectural and design purpose and the intended and/or incidental views to and from each asset.

14.3.19 The criteria used to ascertain the magnitude of effect is outlined in Table 14.3. This has been established through professional judgement.

Table 14.3: Matrix for Determining the Magnitude of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude of Change</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Change to most or all of the key elements of the asset so that it is totally altered; Comprehensive changes to key aspects of setting that affect the significance or character of the asset; Changes to most or all of the key historic landscape elements resulting in total change to historic landscape character unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Changes to many key elements of the asset so that it is clearly modified; Considerable changes to key aspects of the setting of the asset that affect the significance or character of the asset; Changes to many key historic landscape elements resulting in moderate changes to historic landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Changes to key elements such that the asset is slightly altered; Slight changes to key aspects of the setting of the asset that affect the significance or character of the asset; Changes to few key historic landscape elements resulting in limited changes to historic landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Very minor/barely noticeable changes to key elements or setting or historic landscape character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No change to elements, setting or historic landscape character</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Criteria

14.3.20 The assessment of potential effects resulting from the Masterplan Development has taken into account both the construction and operational phases. The significance level attributed to each effect has been assessed based on the magnitude of effect due to the Masterplan Development and the importance of the affected receptor/receiving environment to change. Magnitude of effect and the importance of the affected receptor/receiving environment are both assessed on a scale of high, medium, low and negligible (as detailed in Chapter 2 ‘Approach to Assessment’).

14.3.21 Table 14.4 has been used to calculate the significance of the effects identified. However, it is not prescriptive and professional judgement has been applied where appropriate.

Table 14.4: Matrix for Determining the Significance of Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Receptor/Receiving Environment to Change/Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.3.22 The overall significance of an effect will distinguish between temporary and permanent effects based on the following timescale:

- **Short-term**: The effects would be of short duration and would not last more than 1 year from the commencement of the works;
- **Medium-term**: The effects would take 1 to 10 years to be mitigated; and
- **Long-term**: The effects would be reasonably mitigated over a long period of time (10 years or more) and includes permanent effects.

**Effect Significance**

14.3.23 The following terms have been used to define the significance of the effects identified:

- **Major effect**: where the Masterplan Development could be expected to result in a significant effect (either positive or negative) on designated or non-designated heritage assets. Positive effects may result from the recovery of new archaeological evidence, enhancements to the importance of heritage assets, or substantial improvements in the general historic environment, which greatly improve the way in which members of the public may experience historic or archaeological assets. This may extend to the removal of modern structures which have impaired the integrity of the historic environment, and the restoration of historic landscape features. In terms of negative effects, this could constitute effects upon archaeological sites or elements of the historic or built environment of international/national value without adequate record or mitigation, or alterations to historic landscape features that significantly change the visibility, height and/or overall form of the feature.

- **Moderate effect**: where the Masterplan Development could be expected to have a noticeable effect (either positive or negative) on designated or non-designated heritage assets. Positive effects may result from the recovery of new archaeological evidence, moderate enhancements to the importance of heritage assets, or moderate improvements in the general historic environment, which moderately improve the way in which members of the public may experience heritage assets. This may extend to the removal of modern structures which have impaired the integrity of the historic environment. In terms of negative effects, these could constitute change to an area of locally-important archaeological remains or their settings, or alterations to historic landscape features that do not affect the visibility, height and/or overall form of the feature, landscaping or ecological planting on an area where archaeological features have been identified, and change to elements of the historic built environment following the implementation of an appropriate scheme of preservation by record.

- **Minor effect**: where the Masterplan Development could be expected to result in a small, barely-noticeable effect (either positive or negative) on designated or non-designated heritage assets. Positive effects may result from the recovery of new archaeological evidence, minor enhancements to the importance of heritage assets, or minor improvements in the general historic environment, which improve the way in which members of the public may experience heritage assets. In terms of negative effects, these could constitute alterations to historic landscape features that change the visibility, height and/or overall form of the feature, or of a regionally-important archaeological site or elements of the historic or built environment without appropriate mitigation.

- **Negligible**: where no discernible effect is expected as a result of the Masterplan Development on the condition or setting of archaeological features, or elements of the historic or built environment.
Limitations and Assumptions

14.3.24 This assessment has relied upon data held by the National Heritage List and the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER) and Berkshire Historic Environment Record (HER). Any inaccuracies in this data may give rise to inaccuracies in the assessment. The assessment has also relied upon archive material held by Buckinghamshire Archives and Maidenhead Library Local Studies Collection. There are inevitably ‘gaps’ in the coverage of any archive in respect of the historical development of a large and complex site such as this one.

14.3.25 It is not possible to see inside some of the buildings on the Site because of their dilapidated condition, specifically Skindles and No. 5 Mill Lane. On this basis, the extent of survival of historic fabric could not be fully established.

14.3.26 This assessment has relied upon data provided by local and national authorities and within the previous archaeological and historical reports regarding known archaeological sites within or in the locality of the Site. The results of the desk-based works and archaeological fieldwork have provided an archaeological and historic environment baseline for the Site, although as is always the case with buried archaeological assets, there is still the potential for hitherto unexpected remains to be discovered at the Site. The proposed mitigation measures seek to address the potential for the presence of unknown archaeological remains. Grading of value therefore may be revised for known archaeological sites follow further assessment and evaluation.

14.3.27 There are several limitations to the data set retrieved as outlined below:

- Where the known archaeological data relates to chance find-spots, the full extent, date and nature of these sites is often uncertain; and
- A number of records, in particular older records such as antiquarian finds, excavations or observations often fail to accurately locate sites.

14.3.28 A site walkover is limited as archaeological remains can survive below-ground with no indication of their presence above-ground. Furthermore, a walkover can be influenced by ground and weather conditions as well as the state of vegetation. Interpretation of sites identified from surface evidence is often only preliminary as many sites are not diagnosed from earthwork evidence alone.

14.3.29 Due to the limitations identified above, it is possible that previously unrecorded archaeological sites will have survived within the area of the Site. Therefore, there is an element of uncertainty over the nature, frequency and extent of the archaeological resource. Additionally, due to the buried and invisible nature of below-ground archaeological assets, there is an element of uncertainty regarding the survival, condition, nature and extent of the known sites identified within the Site. Grading of value therefore may be revised for known archaeological sites following further assessment and evaluation.

Baseline Conditions

Designated Heritage Assets

14.3.30 Much of the Site is within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area. The character of the conservation area derives primarily from the period when the area was a fashionable riverside resort, and its most important buildings are the large, detached late-Victorian and Edwardian villas with mature planting, which serve as built reminders of the golden age of the Thames. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. The wider setting of the conservation area, in particular the views eastwards from the Maidenhead riverbank makes a secondary contribution to its sensitivity.

14.3.31 There is one statutorily-listed building within the Site boundary. Glen Island House (Table 14.5), listed at Grade II (list entry no. 1392491), was built in 1869 for Lt. Gen. Sir Roger William Henry Palmer, a survivor of the Charge of the Light Brigade, whose main seat was at Kenure Park, County Dublin. Its architect is not known. The house was extended in a similar style in 1884. The garden front of the house faces south, while it has views west across the Thames to the Maidenhead side. Arranged over two storeys and with an irregular plan, it is constructed of yellow brick with Bath stone dressings and red clay tiled roofs. Its many gables with fretted bargeboards, ridge crests, tall chimneys and turrets are features typical of the exuberant style of Victorian/Edwardian architecture which prevails in the conservation area. For many years, Glen Island House was used as offices in connection with the paper mill. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium. The sensitivity of Glen Island House relates primarily to its fabric, particularly the
architectural quality of its external envelope and the character of the principal rooms, as well as its historical associations. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is of secondary importance, and relates predominantly to those parts of its historic setting which remain to the south and west, and to a lesser degree to the north west, as well as the stables to the north east; these are however all somewhat degraded from their late 19th century character. The house’s original context would have comprised ornamental gardens and lawns, and specimen trees, together with the drive around to the entrance front to the north past the lost lodge and the extant stable block. To the east were cottages that formed part of the mill complex. In the present day the Portacabins immediately to the north, the huge industrial mill structures that replaced the mill cottages in the second half of the 20th century, and the large area of hard standing, notably detract.

14.3.32 There are several designated heritage assets within the wider study area that are judged to be potentially susceptible to effects from the Masterplan Development. These include shown in Table 14.5:

- **Maidenhead Bridge** (Grade I, list entry no. 1117619). Maidenhead Bridge was designed by Sir Robert Taylor (1714-1788) and built by John Townsend of Oxford. It opened to traffic in 1777, and replaced a timber bridge a few yards to the south that had been present in one form or another since the 13th century. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Maidenhead Bridge is high. That sensitivity derives from the high quality of its design and execution, but also from the fact that it carries a historically and strategically important highway (and former coaching route), and, in terms of its setting, that it can be appreciated for a considerable distance from both the north and the south, and from the public gardens on the Maidenhead riverbank to the north. The historically important view of the bridge from Cliveden some way to the north, published in the 1820s, can no longer be appreciated due to tree growth.

- **Saxon barrow, church and cemeteries in the old churchyard at Taplow Court (Scheduled Monument, list entry no. 1014781).** In accordance with Table 14.2, the value given to the Scheduled Monument is high. This large burial mound was excavated during the 19th century and revealed the richest burial known in England at the time. The burial contained the remains of a high status man, probably a chieftain, who had been elaborately dressed for burial, with fragments of gold braiding including gold buckles, drinking vessels and decorative weapons. The burial had been dated to c.625 (Banks & Stanley 1990). The Scheduled Monument is set within grounds of the former churchyard which is now located in the grounds of Taplow Court. The mound itself is situated 250m to the east of the Site, on the east bank of the Jubilee Relief River. The site of the mound it situated high on a cliff promontory, however it is completely screened by many large trees and is now set in secluded grounds just to the south west of the central building at Taplow Court.

- **Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area.** The entire Western boundary of the Site adjoins the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. The Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area Appraisal (Ref. 14.18) identifies five components that make up its special interest, or sensitivity. Like the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area, the Thames is the area’s most significant feature, providing unique views in and out, and encouraging its continued use. Like the opposite bank, it also retains a largely turn-of-the-century character associated with the period when the area was a fashionable resort and an important river crossing; however a large proportion of the buildings along the river directly opposite the Site are modern. The area includes the most significant surviving group of grand 18th century mansion houses within Maidenhead and also reflects a significant period of building in Maidenhead within the late 19th century and early 20th century. The area is extremely green, with large numbers of mature trees and bushes, and a number of important tree screens. Finally, there is the importance of the transport links that forged its development. The setting of the conservation area makes an important contribution to its sensitivity, which is derived most of all from the Thames views on its eastern side.

- **Taplow Conservation Area (Table 14.5).** Parts of the Site adjoin or lie close to the western boundary of the Taplow Conservation Area. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. That sensitivity derives from the area’s high level of architectural and historic interest, reflected in the relatively large proportion of statutorily listed buildings, as well as the feeling of enclosure and seclusion created by the sloping site, and narrow and winding streets, the closeness of buildings to the roads and the prevalence of boundary walls, hedges and trees. The conservation area’s setting of rural fields and the river plays an important supporting role in its sensitivity. Taplow’s wooded hillside location makes a significant
contribution to the character of the conservation area; while the terrain affects the views in, out and across the conservation area, and affords many properties a feeling of privacy and seclusion.

- **Taplow Court** (Grade II, list entry no. 1165286). There has been a manor house on this site since before the Norman Conquest, but the present house is the product of rebuilding by the Grenfell family in 1855 to designs by William Burn. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Taplow Court is medium. That sensitivity relates primarily to its fabric, but its setting – on a plateau high above the Thames, and set amongst the wider context of its extensive wooded grounds – makes a considerable contribution to that significance. The Site contributes little to the significance of Taplow Court, inasmuch as the steep escarpment and mature trees to the west of the house mean that the Site is largely invisible from the plateau on which the house stands.

- **Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000607). The Registered Park and Garden comprises early 18th century pleasure grounds and 19th century formal gardens surrounding the mid-19th century house. It is bounded to the west by the Jubilee Relief River, to the north by Cliveden, to the east by Cliveden Road, and to the south largely by Mill Lane. Much of the park lies on the plateau high above the Thames, with the western edge running along the steep scarp and cliffs above the river, down to the water itself, and the southern edge descending less steeply to Mill Lane. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden is medium. That sensitivity derives from its aesthetic and historical value as an early 18th century pleasure ground with 19th century formal gardens. It derives some significance from its setting, high on a plateau above the Thames to the west of Taplow Village, with Maidenhead prominent in the views to the west and south west, and in consequence of lying towards the southern end of a series of designed landscapes, including Hedsor House, Cliveden and Berry Hill. Much of the park comprises the plateau on which stands Taplow Court, but it also extends westwards along the steep escarpment and cliffs above the Jubilee Relief River, down to the water itself. The topography and mature tree cover along the park’s western boundary mean that the Site is largely invisible from most of the park, but there are direct views of the Site from the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River (which does not have a visual relationship with the rest of the asset). The existing mill buildings detract notably from these views.

- **Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000135). The Registered Park and Garden comprises the former pleasure grounds and park laid out around a modest country house, by Robert Marnock (1800-1889), one of the outstanding English horticulturalists and garden designers of the 19th century, for John Noble, the heir to a successful paint and varnish manufactory. Extensive artificial rockwork, in places over 4m high, was created by James Pulham (1820-1898), a member of the eminent family of landscape designers who pioneered artificial rockwork, and secured the patronage of a royal and aristocratic clientele. In the late 1940s, the house was converted into a hotel and country club. It was destroyed by fire in the 1970s, and a block of flats was erected in its place. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Registered Park and Garden is medium. That sensitivity derives essentially from its aesthetic and historical value as an embodiment of the ‘English or natural style of garden design’, and the interest of its extensive artificial rockwork, some of it expressly constructed to hide the view of the gasworks to the west. It is of considerable associative historical value in consequence of the involvement of Marnock and Pulham. The park derives some sensitivity from its setting – open meadow to the west and agricultural to the east, with the village of Taplow to the north and Maidenhead prominent in the views down to the west and south-west – as well as in consequence of lying at the southern end of a series of designed landscapes, including Taplow Court, Cliveden and Hedsor House. Much of the park’s western boundary is planted with mature trees, ensuring limited intervisibility with that part of the Site to the west of the Jubilee Relief River.

**Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

14.3.33 **The Taplow Riverside Conservation Area Character Appraisal** (Ref. 14.10) identifies a number of unlisted buildings within the Site boundary that are considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. They might also be considered to be non-designated heritage assets. These comprise:

- **The former Glen Island House Stable Bloc**. Erected by Sir Roger Palmer in 1880, the building comprises a U-shaped stable block, open to the south east around a stable yard and constructed
of stock brick with timber-framed gables and plain-tiled roofs. The former stables are more altered than Glen Island House, but some tethering rings and tiled walls survive. The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium. The sensitivity of the Stable Block relates primarily to its fabric, particularly the architectural quality of its external envelope, as well as its historical associations. The building undoubtedly derives some significance from the historical interest of its functional and spatial relationship with Glen Island House, but the contribution made by its setting to its sensitivity is otherwise low. The temporary shed and tank immediately to the north, and the huge 20th century industrial structures to the south, notably detract. 20th century alterations to the building, including demolition of part of the south east wing, also detract.

- **Power House.** The paper mill’s former Power House was erected between 1931 and 1955, probably in the 1930s, and has an ‘industrial classical’ appearance with pilasters, a prominent rendered cornice and a hipped copper-clad roof. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Power House is low. That sensitivity relates primarily to the architectural interest of its external envelope, presumably the product of its proximity to Glen Island House. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is low, since while the building’s role as part of the mill complex has important historical value, the appearance of the mill buildings is in large part the product of late 20th century alterations including cladding to the upper parts, which detract from its setting.

- **Mill Island House.** An early 19th century house, extended in 1869 for Charles Venables, the then owner of Taplow Mills and other paper mills in the area. Arranged over two storeys, and constructed of stock brick with a slate roof, Mill Island House was, for many years, used as offices in connection with the paper mill. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Mill Island House is low. That sensitivity relates primarily to the architectural interest of its external envelope, the original entrance and staircase, and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of this part of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is derived primarily from its riverine context, and as one of a number of extant gentlemen’s villas erected along this stretch of the Thames.

- **Mill Island Cottage.** A building appears to have existed on the site of Mill Island Cottage as early as 1838, and perhaps even 1779, and, by 1868, the building on the site was described as a ‘manager’s house’. However, the present cottage has a datestone, ‘1876’, with Charles Venables’ initials; this, together with its classic mid-Victorian appearance, suggests that the cottage was rebuilt or very substantially remodelled at this time. Between 1931 and 1955, the rear of the cottage appears to have been straightened up, and, sometime after 1965, its eastern end was taken down and rebuilt to provide more clearance for vehicular access. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low. That sensitivity relates primarily to the architectural interest of the historic parts of its external envelope and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of this part of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area. The interiors have little heritage value. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is derived primarily from the historical value of its relationship with the mill complex to the east and Mill Island House to the south west, but the late 20th century alterations made to the former, including cladding to the upper parts, detract notably.

- **Dunloe Lodge.** A large riverside house, dated 1896, and built for J W Benson, Esq. by the Maidenhead practice of Davy & Salter. By 1911, the house was occupied by George Palmer, who was a Brigadier General by 1924. Originally known as ‘Millstream’, its present name derives from its connection with the Earl of Clancarty (formerly Viscount Dunlo [sic]), who died here in 1929. Dunloe Lodge exhibits many of the elaborate features typical of the Victorian/Edwardian architecture which characterises the conservation area, including tile-hung elevations, ornamental painted bay windows, oriels, dormers, verandahs and prominent brick chimneystacks. Since a fire in 2007, the house has been open to the sky, and is in a rapidly-deteriorating condition. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies its condition as ‘at risk’. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low. That sensitivity relates primarily to the architectural interest of its external envelope and the contribution that makes to the character and appearance of this part of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area as one of the gentlemen’s villas erected along this stretch of the Thames. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is derived primarily from its riverine context, since the grounds are now heavily overgrown and difficult to appreciate.

- **Skindles Hotel.** The Taplow Riverside Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Ref. 14.10) suggests that the present Skindles building may have had its origins in mid-19th century riverside
By 1865, the Brigade of Guards Boating Club (BGBC) had been established on the site (either in adapted existing villas or new accommodation), and, it subsequently extended the buildings northwards, as evidenced by the inscription ‘BGBC 1883’ on the two-storey element just to the north of the tall central block, and Ordnance Survey mapping. In 1904, the BGBC moved across the river to a larger site between the road and rail bridges, and the Orkney Arms, by this time under the proprietorship of one James Hodgson, expanded into its Mill Lane premises. ‘Skindles Hotel’, as both parts (on each side of the road) were subsequently known, became the most fashionable hotel on the Thames. The buildings on the original Orkney Arms site, on the eastern side of Mill Lane, were demolished in 1971. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Skindles is low. That sensitivity relates primarily to its historical interest; its architectural value has been much compromised by modern alterations and accretions, as well as considerable physical deterioration and partial collapse following decades of abandonment. The secondary contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is derived primarily from its value as part of a group of historic buildings in this part of the conservation area, including No. 5 Mill Lane to the north.

No. 5 Mill Lane. The site of No. 5 Mill Lane appears to have first been developed between 1838 and 1875 with a terrace known as ‘Crossway Cottages’. The southern end of the terrace appears to have been reconfigured, or more likely rebuilt, by 1899. Certainly, the appearance of the present No. 5 Mill Lane accords with a construction date of between 1875 and 1899. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of No. 5 Mill Lane is low. This sensitivity relates primarily to the architectural interest of its external envelope and the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of this part of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area. The modest interiors have been considerably altered in the past and are now derelict. The contribution made to its sensitivity by its setting is derived primarily from its value as part of a group of historic buildings in this part of the conservation area, including Skindles to the south and Mallard’s Reach to the north.

Archaeology

14.3.34 An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment has been undertaken by WSP in accordance with the Institute for Archaeologists Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment (2012) (Appendix 14.2), and all other guidance under current best practice. The study also comprised of a site walk-over survey by an appropriately qualified archaeologist and observations were made noting ground conditions, surface features or above ground signatures of potential archaeological interest and any potential constraints on further archaeological works.

14.3.35 There are no World Heritage Sites or sites included on the Tentative List of Future Nominations for World Heritage Sites (January 2012) situated within the proposed development site or the study area. Nor are there any scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields within the Site boundary. There is, however, one scheduled monument within the study area; the Saxon Barrow, Church and Cemeteries in the Old Churchyard at Taplow Court c.150m east of the Site (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 1014781); and also three registered parks and gardens; Grade I listed Cliveden, c.300m to the north, Grade II listed Berry Hill, c.120m to the east and Grade II listed Taplow Court, c.50m to the east (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 1000323, 1000135, 1000607).

14.3.36 There is one grade II listed building, Glen Island House, within the Site boundary (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 1392491). Elsewhere within the study area there are two Grade I listed buildings; Maidenhead Bridge and Maidenhead Railway Bridge (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 1117619, 1125201); and, two Grade II* listed buildings; Smythes Almshouses and Oldfield Lodge (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 1136053, 1117620). There are also a total of 42 Grade II listed buildings, the majority of which lie to the east of the Site.

14.3.37 There are three conservation areas, Taplow Conservation Area and Taplow Riverside Conservation Area and Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area within the study area. Much of the western half of the proposed Site does lies within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area and the Taplow Conservation Area is located immediately to the north east of the proposed Site. The Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area lies just to the west of the Site. There are also two archaeological notification areas fully within the Site boundary. One at the northern end (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 0548000000) where quantities of Iron Age artefacts have been recovered and one in the central area of the Site where extensive Bronze Age remains as well as evidence of Iron Age industrial activity were recorded (Appendix 14.2 Figures 2, 3 & 4; 0009500000). There are
thirteen other archaeological notification areas to the east of the Site and to its south comprising the following: areas where Prehistoric artefacts have been recorded, dating from the Palaeolithic to the Iron Age; Roman period remains including a possible Roman villa site; cropmark complexes including two Bronze Age ring ditches and an Iron Age settlement site; an undated human burial; the Iron Age Hillfort and Saxon burial mound at Taplow Court (part of which is also a scheduled monument, noted above); two Post-Medieval parks (Cliveden and Berry Hill, both registered parks and gardens); the line of the Great Western Railway and the Medieval – Post-Medieval Maidenhead Bridge is located within the study area but just outside the area of the proposed Site.

Summary of non-designated or potential heritage assets
14.3.38 Within the Site boundary there is quite extensive evidence of activity dating to the Prehistoric period. This comprises the following: several Neolithic flint axes recovered from the River Thames at Taplow Mills; Bronze Age metal finds also at Taplow Mills; a possible metalworking site with either origins in the Bronze Age or more probably the Iron Age or Roman period (ANA 0009500000); extensive finds of Iron Age pottery and animal bone (ANA 0548000000); and, an undated cropmark site which could represent the remains of a henge. Historic periods are represented by a bed or floor of mortar which may represent the remains of a grange, perhaps of Roman or later origin, and a single spear head of medieval date dredged from the Thames.

14.3.39 Outside the boundary of the Site in the wider study area there is a range of known and potential earthworks and buried archaeological remains which date predominantly to the Prehistoric period, but others also to the Roman and Early Medieval (Saxon) period, through to the Modern period. These are described in more detail below by period and are recorded on Appendix 14.2 Figures 2 to 7, and in the gazetteer Appendix B within Appendix 14.2.

14.3.40 There have also been a number of archaeological assessments, field surveys and investigations within the study area. None of which have been undertaken within the proposed Site boundary. Others in the wider study area include the following: a series of investigations to the east of the Site including a geophysical survey and parchmark survey at St Nicholas’s Graveyard and Bapsey’s Meadow; geophysical survey, test-pitting and trial trenching at Taplow Court; an area excavation at the Iron Age Hillfort just north of Taplow Court; and, geophysical survey, archaeological recording, trial trenching and excavation in association with the Maidenhead, Windsor and Eton Flood Alleviation Scheme to the east and south-east of the Site. To the west of the River Thames an archaeological evaluation (ERM1509) was carried out at the former Chef Peking, Maidenhead in compliance with a planning condition attached. The site lies within the archaeological rich Thames Valley, which is known to have been exploited from the Palaeolithic Period onwards. The evaluation undertaken in 2013 revealed little in the way of archaeology. Although the site had potential for archaeological remains, in particular prehistoric archaeology, no archaeological features were revealed during the evaluation. The site was affected by the large scale truncation caused by late 19th early 20th century development, and the earliest finds were of post medieval date. These are summarised in full below in Appendix 14.2 Table 14.4 and are described in the gazetteer Appendix B within Appendix 14.2.

Prehistoric period (c.700,000 BC – AD 43)
14.3.41 Numerous sites of Prehistoric origin are recorded along the Thames Valley, including a large number of unstratified artefacts recovered from the river itself. Many such artefacts and find spots are recorded along the stretch of the River Thames adjacent to the Site itself and within the wider study area. The sites range in date from finds of Palaeolithic origin, chiefly hand-axes, to extensive and numerous Iron Age artefacts.

Roman period (AD 43 – 410)
14.3.42 A number of sites of Romano-British origin have been identified. Roman pottery was found in the excavations at Taplow Court (sites 36 & 38) suggesting that there may have been continued occupation on or near the hill fort site during the Romano-British Period. A probable Romano-British farmstead is located to the east of the site, just outside the study area (HER 4551, SU 912817). Evidence for continued and sustained Romano-British settlement is limited, nevertheless, it appears that Romano-British activity can also be found following on in places from Iron Age occupation represented in cropmark features shown on aerial photographs.
Early Medieval (Anglo-Saxon) period (AD 410 – 1066 AD)

14.3.43 The Early Medieval Period is highlighted by the Scheduled Monument at Taplow, the prominent large burial mound located in the former churchyard just to the south west of Taplow Court, was excavated in the 19th century. The excavation revealed the richest burial known in England at the time. The burial was believed to have been a chieftain, a man who had been elaborately dressed for burial with gold dressed jewellery, and numerous richly decorated vessels and weapons. The burial has been dated to c. 625 AD (Banks & Stanley, 1990, 69). Other Early Medieval finds suggest permanent occupation and wide spread activity within the area which would allude to occupation throughout this immediate area including the proposed Site.

Medieval period (1066 AD – 1539)

14.3.44 The Medieval Period is represented within the ecclesiastical remains of the church at Taplow, the remains of medieval fisheries located along the eyots and the river bank and the possible remains of medieval mill located on the island Appendix 14.2 Figure 10. Taplow was recorded in the Domesday Survey of 1086 when the manor was held by M. Roger, for the Bishop of Bayeux. The fact that settlement was recorded at Taplow in 1086 indicates that the area was settled by an Anglo-Saxon hegemonic culture prior to the Norman invasion of 1066. Thereafter the area was exploited by the Normans evident with the creation and expansion of settlements, agricultural systems and transportation routes (including a lock system) along the River Thames, throughout the area and the wider region along the Thames Valley.

Post-Medieval period (1539 AD – 1899)

14.3.45 The Post Medieval Period is highlighted by some of the extant remains of the Paper Mill and the large residential houses situated along the western side of the Site. The 1637 Plan of the river shows only one mill site, however it was portrayed for legal and of economic reasons and the other mill was not referenced; there was however two mills recorded in the area during this period and a corn mill a little further to the south. John Roque’s Map pf 1754 shows also the possible outline of the Orkney Arms Hotel to the south west of the site, the Maidenhead Bridge, pre enclosure field system, ridge and furrow and a ferry crossing. However, Jeffery’s 1770 Map portrays little in the way of detail other than Maidenhead Bridge. Greater detail of the mill complex is clearly shown in the 1868 Plan of the Taplow Paper Mills, Appendix 14.2 Figure 18, including the two inlets (mill leats) feeding two mills. The 1875 map Appendix 14.2 Figure 10 shows clearly the mill infrastructure on Glen Island comprising of the extended buildings of the Paper Mill strung along the island and the Corn Mill located just to the south east of the Paper Mill with the sluice or mill race following south for approximately 400m then turning west towards the Thames, coming out north of the Boat House further north of the Gas Works close to the eastern side of Dunloe Lodge. The remains of the mill stream can be traced on the 1900 map Appendix 14.2 Figure 12. Today the remains of the mill stream can be located to the west of the Mill House including a tail race heading underneath the former Paper Mill buildings within a double brick barrel vaulted culvert heading east immediately south of the 20th century structure, the Power House, the culvert is a 19th century structure, Appendix 14.2 Figure 14.

Modern period (1900 AD – Present Day)

14.3.46 The Modern Period is representative of 20th century industrial and residential property within the Site, the growth and expansion of the Paper Mill complex to the north east of the site and the Gas Holder and storage sheds to the centre of the site is indicative of industrial expansion associated with the incremental urbanisation of many towns within the South Bucks District. To the south west of the site properties constructed during the 20th century are aligned along the west side of Mill lane. The Paper Works was in operation until quite recently, c. 2006, when it closed for economic reasons and thus remained empty. The Gas Works can be traced back to the late 19th century and was located just west of Mill Lane and north of the Skindles Hotel Appendix 14.2 Figures 11, 12 &13.

Built Heritage

14.3.47 The earliest record of a mill at Taplow is in 1194. Other early references are to two mills in 1197 and to a fulling mill in 1281. By 1304, there were apparently three mills. It is thought that the earliest mill was on the site of the present Taplow Paper Mill, although, without maps, we cannot know its exact position. Taplow mills are shown on maps from 1637. It was common for mills to
change their use over the years between grinding corn, fulling cloth and making paper. In 1803, a lease shows that one of the mills was being used as a cotton manufactory. The Taplow paper mill business was probably started by the Venables family in the late 18th century. The corn mill closed down in 1864 but paper making continued on the site until 2006.

14.3.48 Historically, the course of the Thames was wider than it is today, with many streams flowing through meadows, marches and around islands, or eyots, in the floodplain. A timber bridge linking Taplow with Maidenhead was present by the 13th century. It was replaced with the present stone bridge in 1777, and the Old Bath Road became an important coaching route. Businesses such as the Orkney Arms (on the site of the present Windrush Volkswagen garage on the Taplow side of the river), probably built in about 1700 and named in honour of Lord George Hamilton, the 1st Earl of Orkney, provided food and lodging for coach passengers.

14.3.49 The Thames of course continued to be an important thoroughfare. Due to this the Maidenhead Gas Works were erected on the Taplow bank in 1834, where coal could be unloaded from barges and heated to produce gas.

14.3.50 The arrival of the railways in the mid-19th century put an end to the coaching business that had sustained the Orkney Arms, but it was ultimately to make both Maidenhead and Taplow very attractive to middle-class commuters, and the settlements steadily grew. The river became fashionable as a place to have fun and mess about in boats, particularly on Ascot Sunday and regatta days, a scene epitomised by Edward John Gregory’s famous painting ‘Boulters Lock: Sunday afternoon’ (1882-97). Boat yards for building and storing boats were established on the riverbank, and new and better hotels were constructed to cater for the needs of tourists.

14.3.51 By 1900, the east side of the Thames north of Maidenhead Bridge had attained its present level of development. Glen Island House was built in 1869 for Lt Gen Sir Roger William Henry Palmer, a survivor of the Charge of the Light Brigade and a keen steam-launch enthusiast. He added the stables in 1880. A little to the south, Mill Island House appears to have been present by the early 19th century, but it was greatly extended in 1869 for Charles Venables, the then owner of Taplow mills and other paper mills in the area. Its lodge, Mill Island Cottage, was built in 1876. Further south still, Dunloe Lodge (originally known as ‘Millstream’), and its lodge (now ‘Driftwood Cottage’) were built in 1896.

14.3.52 By 1865, the Brigade of Guards Boating Club (BGBC) occupied land between Mill Lane and the riverbank (either in adapted existing villas or new accommodation), and, it subsequently extended the buildings northwards, as evidenced by the inscription ‘BGBC 1883’ on the two-storey element just to the north of the tall central block, and Ordnance Survey mapping. In 1904, the BGBC moved across the river to a larger site between the road and rail bridges, and the Orkney Arms, by this time under the proprietorship of one James Hodgson, expanded into its Mill Lane premises. ‘Skindles Hotel’, as both parts (on each side of the road) were subsequently known, became the most fashionable hotel on the Thames. The buildings on the original Orkney Arms site, on the eastern side of Mill Lane, were demolished in 1971.

14.3.53 Meanwhile, the paper mill continued to grow. There was a serious fire on Coronation Day in 1902, which prompted some reconstruction, and there was a further bout of rebuilding following the launch of the Taplow Paper Mill business in 1933. One extant building, which can probably be dated to the 1930s, is the former Power House. Constructed in stock brick with a hipped, copper-clad roof, it has a distinctive classical appearance with pilasters and a prominent rendered cornice.

Future Baseline
14.3.54 In the absence of the Masterplan Development proceeding, the future baseline would remain essentially the same as the current baseline, including the presence of the gas-holder. That said, the condition of the unoccupied buildings would continue to deteriorate, putting them further at risk.

14.4 Assessments of Effects, Mitigation and Residual Effects

Construction Phase
Loss or disturbance (direct effects) of designated and non-designated heritage assets
14.4.1 The activities during the construction phase of the Masterplan Development have potential direct effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets. The assets selected for further assessment are outlined below.

14.4.2 The significance of effect is best discussed on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: During the construction phase, the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area would undergo some change through the demolition of a number of structures and the erection of the proposed new buildings. The character of the conservation area derives primarily from the period when the area was a fashionable riverside resort, and its most important buildings are the large, detached late-Victorian and Edwardian villas with mature planting, which serve as built reminders of the golden age of the Thames. As discussed below, the renovation/rebuilding of these villas would affect their appearance inasmuch as they would be behind site hoardings/scaffolding as required during the works. These construction activities would all have a temporary negative effect. Most of the buildings to be demolished, however – the mill buildings, the temporary shed and tank adjacent to the stables, and the small office building adjacent to the site entrance, together with the large areas of hard standing across the Site – detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area, and thus their removal would have a permanent beneficial effect.

Dunloe Lodge makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and thus its demolition would have a negative effect. However, as the demolition would facilitate the rebuilding of the house in facsimile, that effect is considered to be temporary.

Skindles makes a positive contribution to the conservation area in respect of its historical interest, but its condition precludes its use and means that in some respects it detracts. The effect of its removal is considered temporary inasmuch as its site would be developed. At the height of the construction phase, various elements would be hidden behind site hoardings and/or scaffolding. Heavy plant and cranes would be highly visible, particularly in respect of the Jubilee Apartments, and the area would experience the noise and dust associated with construction activity. These are regarded as temporary negative effects. The conservation area as a whole is large, and its nature is such that it is viewed as a series of interrelated elements rather than one unity. The construction effects discussed above should therefore be regarded as a series of localised, mostly temporary, impacts. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. On balance, the magnitude of change to the Conservation Area as a whole during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, would be medium and there would therefore be a direct, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II listed): The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of Glen Island House into four dwellings. The works themselves would involve the removal of several later additions which detract from the listed building and from the character and appearance of the wider conservation area, including the single-storey link range to the south, the single-storey, late 20th century extension to the east, and the Portacabins to the north. They would also entail the insertion of several new doors and windows, together with some internal subdivision and the closing up of some openings to facilitate the division of the building into four discrete dwellings. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on Glen Island House are likely to include the erection of site hoardings/scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. As a Grade II listed structure, the sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium. The magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, would be medium and there would therefore be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Glen Island House of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block**: The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of the former Stable Block into four residential units. The works themselves would involve the extension southwards of the east range (which has at some point in the past been truncated), some minor reconfiguration of the openings to the north and on the stable yard elevations, and the insertion of new door and window openings to the west, together with some internal subdivision and the creation of a new mezzanine level in the west range. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on the Stable Block are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium. The magnitude of change during the construction...
phase, prior to mitigation, would be medium and there would therefore be a direct, temporary short-term effect on the Stable Block of **moderate negative** significance.

**Power House:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of the Power House into four residential apartments. The works themselves would involve the partial reconfiguration of the existing openings to the south, including the insertion of glazing, together with new door and window openings to the north, west and east, as well as internal subdivision. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on the Power House are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of the Power House and its setting is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on the Power House of **minor negative** significance.

**Mill Island House:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion and extension of Mill Island House to provide three three-bedroom residences. The works themselves would involve the removal of the single-storey post-war buildings to the north, the removal of the existing winter garden to the south east, the extension and raising of the southern end of the building, the provision of a sun room at the northern end, the insertion of a number of new door and window openings, and the reconfiguration/replacement of many of the existing and largely modern windows, together with some internal subdivision and the closing up of a number of openings. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on Mill Island House are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Mill Island House of **minor negative** significance.

**Mill Island Cottage:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of Mill Island Cottage into a single three-bedroom residence. The works themselves would involve the partial rebuilding and extension eastwards of the eastern side of the house (which was rebuilt in the late 20th century), the replacement of the narrow staircase/corridor element to the rear with a new north-south aligned projecting range, some opening up of the rear elevation to facilitate connection with the new rear projection, and some subdivision of the original house to provide an en-suite bathroom at first-floor level. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on Mill Island House are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Mill Island Cottage of **minor negative** significance.

**Dunloe Lodge:** The Masterplan Development would result in the rebuilding of Dunloe Lodge, essentially in facsimile externally but with some minor changes, to provide a single family residence. The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be high inasmuch as the existing building would be demolished. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary medium-term effect on Dunloe Lodge of **moderate negative** significance.

**5 Mill Lane:** The Masterplan Development would result in the restoration of 5 Mill Lane as a 4-bedroom single family dwelling. The works themselves would involve the addition of a balcony to the riverside elevation (west), together with the unblocking of door and window openings and some minor reconfiguration of the plan. During the height of the construction phase, the direct effects on 5 Mill Lane are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on 5 Mill Lane of **minor negative** significance.

**Skindles Hotel:** The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the present Skindles building, and its replacement with a new restaurant to the south with a residential range of seven houses to the north. A further residential building to the east would mirror the restaurant, reinterpreting the historical arrangement of Skindles on both sides of Mill Lane. The sensitivity of the Skindles building is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be high inasmuch as the existing building would be demolished. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Skindles of **moderate negative** significance.
Mitigation

14.4.3 Throughout the design process, consideration has been given to minimising any potentially adverse effects on the historic environment. No further mitigation measures are considered appropriate or proportionate to meaningfully reduce the magnitude of change and therefore the significance of effects during the construction phase.

14.4.4 The Recording of Skindles to an appropriate level would be undertaken following agreement with the Local Authority.

Residual Effects

14.4.5 The significance of the direct residual effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets during the construction phase is best summarised on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II listed): The sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Glen Island House of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block**: The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on the Stable Block of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Power House**: The sensitivity of the Power House is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on the Power House of **minor negative** significance.

- **Mill Island House**: The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Mill Island House of **minor negative** significance.

- **Mill Island Cottage**: The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on Mill Island Cottage of **minor negative** significance.

- **Dunloe Lodge**: The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of change would be high. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary medium-term effect on Dunloe Lodge of **moderate negative** significance.

- **5 Mill Lane**: The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, temporary short-term effect on 5 Mill Lane of **minor negative** significance.

- **Skindles Hotel**: The sensitivity of the Skindles building is low and the magnitude of change would be high. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Skindles of **moderate negative** significance.

Changes to the settings (indirect effects) of designated and non-designated heritage assets

14.4.6 The activities during the construction phase of the Masterplan Development would have potential indirect effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets.

14.4.7 The significance of the indirect effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets during the construction phase is best discussed on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: During the construction phase, the setting of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area would undergo some change. During the height of the construction phase, the indirect effects on the conservation area are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, the presence of plant and cranes, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. Construction activity associated with the erection of the proposed new buildings to the east of the conservation area boundary – Skindles Senior Living and the houses of Jubilee Riverside South, as well as the bridge to the north west – would affect views into and out of the conservation area. The appearance of these areas during the construction phase would diminish slightly the setting of the conservation area as a whole. In
accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium, to which its setting makes a secondary contribution, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, is regarded as low. There would therefore be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of minor negative significance.

- **Taplow Conservation Area**: The topography and mature trees along the western side of the Taplow Conservation Area effectively screen the buildings within the conservation area (including Taplow Court) from the Site. The Proposed Development is thus very unlikely to be visible from within the conservation area, with the exception of viewpoints on the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River, glimpses through small gaps in tree cover, and views of the upper parts of taller cranes. Construction activity associated with the erection of the Proposed Development, particularly the use of cranes, would thus have an impact on the setting of the conservation area. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Taplow Conservation Area is medium, to which its setting makes a secondary contribution, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, would be low. There would consequently be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of minor negative significance.

- **Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000607). The topography and mature tree cover along the park’s western boundary mean that the Site is largely invisible from most of the park, but there are direct views of the Site from the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River, the park’s western boundary (which does not have a visual relationship with the rest of the asset). Whilst the apartments of Jubilee Riverside North and the houses of Jubilee Riverside South would be highly visible from here, they unquestionably represent a considerable improvement over the existing mill buildings, which notably detract. Their high quality design and landscaped spaces would raise the character of the riverside in contrast to the industrial sheds and silos. They would also offer views through to the gardens beyond, which would expand and enhance the setting of the east bank of the river. The setting of the Registered Park and Garden accounts for only a proportion of the significance of the area as a whole; the park is an extensive asset, and, whilst the Jubilee Riverside would deliver significant localised change to the asset’s setting, the magnitude of change to its setting as a whole would be low. Thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, would be low. There would consequently be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Registered Park and Garden of minor negative significance.

- **Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000135). The area of the Site immediately to the west of Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden would be kept as open meadow, retaining its historic character and providing a buffer to development to the west. Its wider setting to the west, beyond the Jubilee Relief River, has since at least 1970 comprised the hard landscaping and unsympathetic modern warehouses of the Severnside paper recycling operation; this area detracts. The Proposed Development would result in the development of this part of the Site – Jubilee Riverside South – with houses inspired by the traditional riverside architecture of boathouses that are typical of the character of the wider area, together with further open meadow to the south. The setting of the Registered Park and Garden to the west would thus be improved. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden is medium, to which the setting makes a moderate contribution, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, might be regarded as low. There would therefore be an indirect, temporary effect on the Registered Park and Garden of minor negative significance.

- **Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area**: The views eastwards from the Maidenhead riverbank are regarded as an important aspect of this conservation area’s sensitivity. The mature woodland gives the impression that much of the land has remained largely undeveloped. Verified visualisations show that the tallest elements of the Proposed Development, the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments, would be effectively screened by existing mature trees in views from the Maidenhead riverbank. During the summer months, the three apartment blocks would probably not be visible at all, whilst during the winter months only the very tops of the blocks would be visible, and even then they would be partially screened, and backed by, mature trees. Construction activity associated with the erection of the Proposed Development, particularly the use of cranes, would have an impact on the setting of the conservation area. However, it is a large conservation area with an extensive river frontage, and the works would affect only a part of its setting. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area is medium, to which the setting makes a moderate contribution, and thus the
magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, might be regarded as low. There would therefore be an indirect, temporary effect on the conservation area of **minor negative** significance.

- **Maidenhead Bridge** (Grade I listed): During the height of the construction phase, the indirect effects on Maidenhead Bridge are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, particularly in respect of the demolition of Skindles and the erection of the new restaurant and residential buildings, the use of heavy plant and cranes, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. The sensitivity of the bridge is high, to which its setting makes a notable contribution. The magnitude of change to its setting, prior to mitigation, would be medium and therefore there would be an indirect, temporary effect on the bridge of **moderate negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II listed): The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the existing mill buildings to the east of Glen Island House, and their replacement with three six-storey residential blocks (Jubilee Riverside North) arranged at an angle to the Jubilee Relief River. The Portacabins to the north of the house would also be removed. During the height of the construction phase, the indirect effects on Glen Island House are likely to include the erection of site hoardings and/or scaffolding, the presence of plant and cranes, particularly in respect of the construction of the new Jubilee Riverside North Apartments, and the noise and dust associated with construction activity. As a Grade II listed structure, the sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium, to which the setting makes an important though secondary contribution, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, is regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Glen Island House of **minor negative** significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block**: The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the existing mill buildings to the south of the former Stables, and their replacement with three six-storey residential blocks (Jubilee Riverside North) arranged at an angle to the Jubilee Relief River. This demolition activity, together with the construction of the new Jubilee Riverside North Apartments involving cranes, plant, scaffolding and hoardings, would temporarily affect the setting of the Stable Block. The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium, to which its setting makes a generally low contribution except for its spatial relationship to Glen Island House. The magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, is therefore regarded as low. Consequently there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Stable Block of **minor negative** significance.

- **Power House**: The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the existing mill buildings to the east of the Power House, and their replacement with three six-storey residential blocks (Jubilee Riverside North) arranged at an angle to the Jubilee Relief River. This demolition activity, together with the construction of the new Jubilee Riverside North Apartments involving cranes, plant, scaffolding and site hoardings, would temporarily affect the setting of the Power House. The sensitivity of the Power House is low. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Power House of **minor negative** significance.

- **Mill Island House**: The Masterplan Development would result in the removal of the single-storey post-war buildings to the north of Mill Island House, as well as the existing mill buildings to the east, together with the replacement of the latter with the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments. This demolition and construction activity would involve the use of cranes and other plant, and the erection of scaffolding and hoardings, temporarily affecting the setting of Mill Island House. The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low, and the contribution of its setting relates mainly to its riverine location. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Mill Island House of **minor negative** significance.

- **Mill Island Cottage**: The Masterplan Development would result in the removal of the existing mill buildings to the east of Mill Island Cottage, together with the construction of the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments. This demolition and construction activity would temporarily affect the setting of Mill Island Cottage, through the use of cranes and other plant, and the erection of scaffolding and hoardings. The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low, to which its setting makes a secondary contribution relating mainly to its spatial relationship to Mill Island House. The
magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Mill Island Cottage of minor negative significance.

- **Dunloe Lodge**: As detailed above, the Masterplan Development would result in the rebuilding of Dunloe Lodge, essentially in facsimile externally but with some minor changes, to provide a single family residence. The importance of the building's setting derives primarily from its riverine location, being one of the few existing buildings on the Site that is visible through the trees from the Maidenhead riverbank. This aspect of the building's setting would remain intact throughout the construction phase, whilst new landscaping in place of the present overgrown woodland around the house would reinstate its character as a gentleman's residence. The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of indirect (rather than direct) change, prior to mitigation, would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term indirect effect on Dunloe Lodge of minor negative significance.

- **5 Mill Lane**: The Masterplan Development would result in the replacement of Skindles with a new restaurant and residential building, and the erection of a further building along the Bath Road and the Senior Living blocks to the east. The cranes, plant, scaffolding and hoardings used in the demolition and construction activity would temporarily affect the setting of 5 Mill Lane in views from the east and wider views from the north and south, both from the landward and the river sides. The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane and its setting is low, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, is regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on 5 Mill Lane of minor negative significance.

- **Scheduled Monument; Saxon Barrow, Church and Cemeteries in the Old Churchyard at Taplow Court**: The monument includes a large Saxon burial mound, the buried remains of an Early Anglo-Saxon and later Medieval church, and part of the pagan and Christian cemeteries thought to have surrounded these features within the old churchyard immediately to the south west of Taplow Court. The Proposed Development is thus very unlikely to be visible from the designated area, with the exception of from the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River which does not have a visual relationship with the rest of the asset. Whilst the proposed Jubilee Apartments and Jubilee Relief Riverside houses would be highly visible from here, they represent a considerable improvement over the existing mill buildings. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Scheduled Monument is high. The setting of the SM situated within the grounds of Taplow Court is screened by trees to the west; however, the inter-visibility between other assets, RPG for example, will not be affected by the proposed development. The magnitude of change to its setting as a whole during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, would be low. Therefore, there would consequently be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Scheduled Monument of minor negative significance.

**Mitigation**

14.4.8 Throughout the design process, consideration has been given to minimising any potentially adverse effects on the historic environment. No further mitigation measures are considered appropriate or proportionate to meaningfully reduce the magnitude of change and therefore the significance of effects.

**Residual Effects**

14.4.9 The significance of the indirect residual effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets is best summarised on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of minor negative significance.

- **Taplow Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would therefore be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of minor negative significance.

- **Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II). The sensitivity of the RPG is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the RPG of minor negative significance.
Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden (Grade II) The sensitivity of the RPG is medium, but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the RPG of minor negative significance.

Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would therefore be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the conservation area of minor negative significance.

Maidenhead Bridge (Grade I listed): The sensitivity of the bridge is high and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary effect on the bridge of moderate negative significance.

Glen Island House (Grade II listed): The sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Glen Island House of minor negative significance.

Glen Island House Stable Block: The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium but its setting accounts for only a proportion of that sensitivity and thus the magnitude of change to it might be regarded as low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Stable Block of minor negative significance.

Power House: The sensitivity of the Power House is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on the Power House of minor negative significance.

Mill Island House: The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Mill Island House of minor negative significance.

Mill Island Cottage: The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Mill Island Cottage of minor negative significance.

Dunloe Lodge: The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on Dunloe Lodge of minor negative significance.

5 Mill Lane: The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, temporary medium-term effect on 5 Mill Lane of minor negative significance.

Truncation or loss of potential buried/surface archaeological remains

14.4.10 The ground clearance and excavation activities during the site preparation, ground works and construction phase of the Masterplan Development as outlined in Chapter 4 'The Masterplan Development' have the potential to truncate or cause the loss of buried or surface archaeological remains that might be present at the Site. It has been assumed that ground excavations will occur to a maximum depth of 1.5m across the areas of the Site that are to be developed and that all proposed development areas within the Site boundary will be subject to topsoil stripping and subsequent ground works.

14.4.11 Based on a review of the baseline evidence there is the potential for currently unknown archaeological remains to exist from both the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods within the Site. Within the Site boundary there is quite extensive evidence of activity dating to the Prehistoric period. This comprises the following:

a) Several Neolithic flint axes recovered from the River Thames at Taplow Mills; Bronze Age metal finds also at Taplow Mills; a possible metalworking site with either origins in the Bronze Age or more probably the Iron Age or Roman period (ANA 009500000); extensive finds of Iron Age pottery and animal bone (ANA 054800000); and, an undated cropmark site which could represent the remains of a henge. Historic periods are represented by a bed or floor of mortar which may represent the remains of a grange, perhaps of Roman or later origin, and a single spear head of medieval date dredged from the Thames.
b) A number of assets from the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods are recorded near to the Site comprising the Saxon burial mound and the Iron Age earthworks to the east of the Site. The potential features and artefactual and ecofactual remains associated with these features are likely to provide more information on the nature and extent of occupation and activity within the landscape during these periods, contributing towards national and regional research goals.

c) The value of buried archaeological assets from the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods is considered to be high due to the contribution any assets found are likely to make towards national and regional research goals in accordance with the criteria set out in Table 14.2. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, is considered to be high given the potential change to all of the key elements of the assets in accordance with the criteria in Table 14.3. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term effect on potential buried archaeological remains from Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods of moderate to major negative significance prior to the implementation of mitigation measures.

d) Archaeological remains from the Medieval and Post-Medieval periods may also exist within the Site, although the proposed archaeological fieldwork to be undertaken is yet to begin at the time of writing and may reveal significant remains from these periods. A number of assets, including medieval and post medieval agricultural activity including field boundaries are known within and around the vicinity of the Site. These may be located to north and south of the redundant Gas Holder. The available evidence suggests that the Site itself has been subject to agricultural cultivation, with ridge and furrow remains noted within the Site and wider study area. Such remains identified which are associated with the known agricultural cultivation may potentially provide more information on the nature of activity within the landscape.

e) The value of potential buried archaeological remains from the Early Medieval/Anglo-Saxon, Medieval, Post-Medieval periods is considered to be medium low and high given the limited contribution the anticipated archaeological remains would make to local/regional research goals in accordance with the criteria set out in Table 14.2. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, is high due to the potential for change to all of the key elements of the assets in accordance with the criteria in Table 14.3. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term effect on potential buried archaeological remains from the Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval period of moderate negative significance prior to the implementation of mitigation measures.

Mitigation

14.4.12 It is expected that SBDC and BCC will impose a planning condition requesting a programme of further archaeological works to further investigate the potential buried/surface archaeological remains within the Site. Such works would include trial trench evaluation and the production of a geoarchaeological deposit model of the area. All works will be completed in accordance with current Institute for Archaeologists guidance for field practice, as well as being formally agreed through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

Residual Effects

14.4.13 Archaeological recording will ensure that any archaeology that does survive is either preserved 'in situ' or more likely preserved 'by record' and will add further to our knowledge of the history and development of this area of Buckinghamshire. This will in part reduce the overall magnitude of change. However, as a result of the potential loss of archaeological remains in situ, the effect for all time periods is considered to be negative.

14.4.14 The value of potential buried archaeological remains from the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods is high and medium and the magnitude of change, following mitigation, is low. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term residual effect on potential buried archaeological remains from Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods of minor negative significance following the implementation of mitigation measures.

14.4.15 The value of potential buried archaeological remains from the Medieval, Post-Medieval is low and high and the magnitude of change, following mitigation, is medium. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term residual effect on potential buried archaeological remains from the Medieval and Post-Medieval period of minor negative significance following the implementation of mitigation measures.
Operational Phase

Loss or disturbance (direct effects) of designated and non-designated heritage assets

14.4.16 The activities during the operational phase of the Masterplan Development have potential direct effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets.

14.4.17 The significance of effect is best discussed on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: The Masterplan Development would affect the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area through the removal of a number of existing structures and the construction of several new buildings, together with associated landscaping works. The character of the conservation area derives primarily from the period when the area was a fashionable riverside resort, and its most important buildings are the large, detached late-Victorian and Edwardian villas with mature planting, which serve as built reminders of the golden age of the Thames. The Masterplan Development would leave this most important aspect of the conservation area’s sensitivity intact; indeed, as discussed below on a building-by-building basis, the area’s character would be enhanced by returning the vacant villas back to their original residential use, and by putting their conservation on a proper footing, ensuring their survival and long-term future.

The mill buildings proposed to be demolished are of no inherent architectural interest, and their appearance detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area, as well as the settings of Glen Island House and its former Stables, the Power House and Mill Island Cottage. Their removal would thus cause no harm to the conservation area. The proposed new residential blocks that would be erected in their place, Jubilee Riverside North, would introduce a new architectural language to this part of the conservation area, but their design has been carefully considered so as to complement the area in an appropriate modern manner, reflecting the historically-different character of the mill in contrast to the rest of the conservation area. Their design was developed through an iterative process which tested various design options which led to the scheme for which permission is now sought. The design of the blocks enables car parking to be provided in an unobtrusive manner within the undercroft, and would thereby ensure that the area’s character is not compromised by large areas of surface parking. The layout of the blocks would create space around the buildings, allow new views through the Site to be opened up, and contribute to the openness of the green belt, as well as creating a much more attractive space beside the Jubilee Relief River.

The Skindles building it is proposed to demolish is discussed in more detail below. Whilst the existing building is considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area, that contribution is largely in respect of its historical interest; its architectural value has been much compromised by modern alterations and accretions, and its condition precludes its use, and thus in some respects it detracts. In respect of the proposed replacement buildings, the approach has been to adopt a restrained, astylar form for the restaurant building and loggia which draws on neo-classical influences. This is intended to allow the Grade I listed bridge to remain the star in river views, while being a polite neighbour to it (as well as to the diverse other styles and forms nearby). The similar building on the other side of Mill Lane would re-establish the historic duality of the Old Skindles Hotel, which occupied buildings on both sides of the road. The riverside houses would have ‘open’ gables to allude to the boathouse aesthetic, and they also draw upon the projecting bays and balconies common to older riverside properties. They would be faced in a traditional light coloured render (rather than a harsh modern finish), with pale brick to match the restaurant building. The design has evolved during the course of the project, and it was decided that, given the suburban and varied nature of the surroundings, the most suitable approach was to create quiet variety along the riverbank and let the bridge remain the main element in views.

In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. The overall magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium and there would therefore be a direct, permanent effect on the conservation area of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II listed): The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of Glen Island House into four dwellings. Externally, the works would involve the removal of the single-storey link range to the south, the removal of the single-storey, late 20th century extension to the east, the removal of the Portacabins to the north, and the insertion of several new doors and windows. Internally, the works would involve some subdivision and the
closing up of some openings to facilitate the division of the building into four discrete dwellings. The creation of bathrooms would involve further limited subdivision. As a Grade II listed structure, the sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium. That sensitivity relates primarily to its fabric, particularly the architectural quality of its external envelope and the character of the principal rooms, as well as its historical associations. The external envelope would be enhanced by the works. Internally, most of the change would be concentrated in areas of low sensitivity that are most able to accommodate them. Where change to more sensitive areas is required, such as the subdivision of the entrance hall necessary to facilitate the separate entrances to the dwellings, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, specifically the benefits of bringing the house back into use and securing its optimum viable use.

The alterations to the more significant parts of the building have been designed in a way which would allow the historic fabric and plan-form to retain their legibility, and would also allow them to be reversed in the future. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would thus be medium. Therefore, in view of the notable benefits detailed above there would be a direct, permanent effect on Glen Island House of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of the former Stable Block into four residential units. Externally, the works would involve the extension southwards of the range to the east (which has been significantly altered at some point in the 20th century), some minor reconfiguration of the openings to the north and on the stable yard elevations, and the insertion of new door and window openings to the west. Internally, the works would involve subdivision of the building into four discrete units, including the creation of a new mezzanine level in the range to the west. The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium. That sensitivity relates primarily to its fabric, particularly the architectural quality of its external envelope, as well as its historical associations. Changes would be detailed appropriately and concentrated as much as possible in areas of low sensitivity. Where change to more sensitive areas is required, such as the insertion of new openings in the external envelope, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, specifically the benefits of bringing the building back into use and securing its optimum viable use. The alterations have been designed in a way which would allow the historic fabric, main interior spaces and plan-form to remain legible. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on the Stable Block of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Power House:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of the Power House into four residential apartments. Externally, the works would involve the partial reconfiguration of the existing openings to the south, including the insertion of glazing, together with new door and window openings to the north, west and east. Internally, the works would involve subdivision of the space into four separate units, together with the insertion of a mezzanine level accommodating gallery bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms and dressing rooms. The existing green faience dado tiling would be retained where practicable. The sensitivity of the Power House is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium inasmuch as the historic form of the external envelope would remain legible although clearly modified, and the internal features of interest, i.e. the faience tiling, would remain in situ and partly visible. Therefore, and in light of the building being put to a long-term viable use, there would be a direct, permanent effect on the Power House of minor beneficial significance.

- **Mill Island House:** The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion and extension of Mill Island House to provide three three-bedroom residences. Externally, the works would involve the extension and raising of the southern end of the building, the removal of the single-storey post-war buildings to the north, the provision of a sun room at the northern end, the insertion of a number of new door and window openings, and the reconfiguration/replacement of many of the largely modern existing windows. Internally, the works would involve the closing up of a number of openings to create three discrete dwellings, together with some subdivision mainly concerned with the creation of new bathrooms. The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be high. Whilst there would be considerable change to the building’s external envelope, the building is a simple and workmanlike design in stock brick and the alterations have been designed to accord with its existing character and retain the more important interior elements. The harm caused to existing fabric should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, specifically the
benefits of bringing the building back into its optimal residential use. On balance, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Mill Island House of **moderate beneficial** significance.

- **Mill Island Cottage**: The Masterplan Development would result in the conversion of Mill Island Cottage into a single three-bedroom residence. Externally, the works would involve the partial rebuilding and extension eastwards of the eastern side of the house (which was rebuilt in the late 20th century), and the replacement of the narrow staircase/corridor element to the rear with a new northern range. Internally, the works would involve some opening up of the rear elevation to facilitate connection with the new rear projection, and some subdivision of the original house to provide an en-suite bathroom at first-floor level. The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium, inasmuch as the historic form of the more important areas of the external envelope would remain legible although clearly modified. The alterations would ensure that the historic character of the cottage is retained, whilst providing a more coherent, pleasing and appropriate dwelling than at present. Therefore, and in light of the building being put back into its optimum viable use, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Mill Island Cottage of **minor beneficial** significance.

- **Dunloe Lodge**: The Masterplan Development would result in the rebuilding of Dunloe Lodge, essentially in facsimile externally but with some minor changes, to provide a single family residence. The existing building is beyond repair from fire damage and neglect. It has been exposed to the weather for many years and is now too dangerous to inspect. The proposed reconstruction would require the rebuilding of all elements including the chimneystacks, as it is impossible to guarantee the structural integrity of the existing remains; if incorporated into the new building with its different foundations and structure, differential settlement and long-term structural problems would occur. The scheme would result in the general reinstatement of its historic appearance and visual role along the riverfront, as well as re-establishing its original single family residential use. The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low, and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium as the historic form of the external envelope would be largely reinstated. Therefore, and in light of the site being returned to its optimum viable use, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Dunloe Lodge of **minor beneficial** significance.

- **5 Mill Lane**: The Masterplan Development would result in the restoration of 5 Mill Lane as a 4-bedroom single family dwelling. Externally, the works would involve the addition of a balcony to the riverside elevation (west), together with the unblocking of door and window openings. Internally, the works would involve some minor reconfiguration of the plan, which would in some areas (such as the first floor) return the layout closer to its original form. The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium inasmuch as the historic form of the building would be largely conserved and in some areas enhanced. The proposals would result in the building’s restoration and return to its optimum viable use. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on 5 Mill Lane of **minor beneficial** significance.

- **Skindles Hotel**: The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the present Skindles building, which is extremely dilapidated and dangerous to enter, and its replacement with a new restaurant to the south with a residential range extending to the north of it. A further residential building to the east would mirror the restaurant, reinterpreting the historical arrangement of Skindles on both sides of Mill Lane. The sensitivity of the Skindles building is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be high. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Skindles of **moderate negative** significance.

**Mitigation**

14.4.18 The Recording of the Skindles Hotel to an appropriate level, historic buildings record, would be undertaken following agreement with Buckinghamshire County Council.

**Residual Effects**

14.4.19 The significance of the direct residual effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets is best summarised on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on the conservation area of **moderate beneficial** significance.
Glen Island House (Grade II): The sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Glen Island House of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Glen Island House Stable Block: The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on the Stable Block of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Power House: The sensitivity of the Power House is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on the Power House of minor beneficial significance.

Mill Island House: The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Mill Island House of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Mill Island Cottage: The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Mill Island Cottage of **minor beneficial** significance.

Dunloe Lodge: The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Dunloe Lodge of **minor beneficial** significance.

5 Mill Lane: The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change would be medium. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on 5 Mill Lane of **minor beneficial** significance.

Skindles Hotel: The sensitivity of the Skindles building is low and the magnitude of change would be high. Therefore, there would be a direct, permanent effect on Skindles of **moderate negative** significance.

**Changes to the settings (indirect effects) of designated and non-designated heritage assets**

14.4.20 When completed, there is potential for the Masterplan Development to affect the settings of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The assets selected for further assessment are outlined in Table 14.5.

14.4.21 The significance of the indirect effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets is best discussed on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area:** As detailed above, the Proposed Development would have a direct, permanent effect on the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area of moderate beneficial significance. In terms of its wider setting, new development to the east of the conservation area boundary – the Senior Living complex and the houses of Jubilee Riverside South – would affect views into and out of the conservation area. However, neither of these areas at present contribute positively to the conservation area’s importance, the former comprising scrubland and the latter brownfield land associated with the gasworks and the Severnside paper recycling operation. The Proposed Development would improve the appearance of these areas, and thus the setting of the conservation area from the east. The high-quality design of the Senior Living blocks draws upon the brick vernacular buildings of the area including many of the houses in Taplow, as well as echoing the Salters’ Almshouses in Maidenhead, and would accord well with the wider local character; meanwhile, the design and layout of the houses of Jubilee Riverside South and the landscaping of the open space to the south would enhance views into and out of the conservation area. Views from the eastern side of the Jubilee Relief River towards the northern part of the site are currently compromised by the existing mill buildings. The replacement of these with the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments would unquestionably improve these views. The proposed bridge to the north would improve access to this part of the conservation area, better revealing its importance. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium. The setting of the conservation area makes only a subsidiary contribution to its overall sensitivity, and on balance the magnitude of change during the operational phase, prior to mitigation, might be regarded as low. There would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of **minor beneficial** significance.
- **Taplow Conservation Area**: The topography and mature trees along the western side of the Taplow Conservation Area effectively screen the buildings within the conservation area (including Taplow Court) from the Site. The Proposed Development is thus very unlikely to be visible from within the conservation area, with the exception of glimpses through small gaps in tree cover towards the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments; these blocks represent a considerable improvement over the existing mill buildings. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Taplow Conservation Area is medium, while the setting of the conservation area is an important component of its sensitivity. Consequently the magnitude of change to the setting of the conservation area as a whole, prior to mitigation, would be low. There would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of minor beneficial significance.

- **Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000607). The topography and mature trees along the western side of the Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden effectively screen the buildings within it (including Taplow Court) from the Site. The Proposed Development is thus very unlikely to be visible from within the RPG, with the exception of from the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River which does not have a visual relationship with the rest of the asset. Whilst the proposed Jubilee Apartments and Jubilee Riverside houses would be highly visible from here, they represent a considerable improvement over the existing mill buildings. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the RPG is medium. The setting of the RPG accounts for only a proportion of the sensitivity of the area as a whole. The RPG is an extensive asset and the magnitude of change to its setting as a whole, prior to mitigation, would be low. Consequently there would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the RPG of minor beneficial significance.

- **Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II, list entry no. 1000135). The area of the Site immediately to the west of Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden would be kept as open meadow, retaining its historic character and providing a buffer to development to the west. Its wider setting to the west, beyond the Jubilee Relief River, has since at least 1970 comprised the hard landscaping and unsympathetic modern warehouses of the Severnside paper recycling operation; this area detracts. The Proposed Development would result in the development of this part of the Site – Jubilee Riverside South – with houses inspired by the traditional riverside architecture of boathouses that are typical of the character of the wider area, together with further open meadow to the south. The setting of the Registered Park and Garden to the west would thus be improved. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden is medium, to which the setting makes a moderate contribution, and thus the magnitude of change during the construction phase, prior to mitigation, might be regarded as low. There would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the Registered Park and Garden of minor beneficial significance.

- **Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area**: The views eastwards from the Maidenhead riverbank are an important aspect of this conservation area’s special interest. The mature woodland essentially gives the impression that the land has remained largely undeveloped. Verified visualisations show that the tallest elements of the Proposed Development, the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments, would be effectively screened by existing mature trees in views from the Maidenhead riverbank. During the summer months, the three apartment blocks would probably not be visible at all, whilst during the winter months only the very tops of the blocks would be visible, and even then they would be partially screened, and backed by mature trees. The proposed new offices and parking would be screened by an existing eyot. The present Skindles Hotel building is visible from the Maidenhead Bank, and from Maidenhead Bridge, but much of its most prominent parts are essentially the product of post-war expansion and do not possess visual interest. On balance, given the poor architectural quality of these accretions and the dilapidated condition of the whole, the hotel at present is felt to detract from the visual setting of the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area. The architectural language of the proposed new restaurant and residential buildings has been conceived to be sympathetic to the historic character of the Taplow riverbank, bringing this part of the Site back into use, and restoring vitality to the riverside. The approach has been to adopt a restrained, astylar form for the restaurant building and loggia which draws on neo-classical influences. This is intended to allow the Grade I listed bridge to remain the star in river views, while being a polite neighbour to it (as well as to the diverse other styles and forms nearby). The similar building on the other side of Mill Lane would re-establish the historic duality of the Old Skindles Hotel, which occupied buildings on both sides of the road. The riverside houses would have ‘open’ gables to allude to the boathouse aesthetic, and they also draw upon the projecting bays and balconies common to
older riverside properties. They would be faced in a traditional light coloured render (rather than a harsh modern finish), with pale brick to match the restaurant building. The design has evolved during the course of the project to take account of the suburban and varied nature of development along both sides of the river, and the design approach is to create quiet variety along the riverbank and let the bridge remain the main element in views. The other new elements of the Proposed Development would not be visible from the Maidenhead bank. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the conservation area is medium, to which its setting makes an important contribution. The magnitude of change to the setting of the conservation area (which is an extensive and varied asset) as a whole, prior to mitigation, would be low and there would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of minor beneficial significance.

- **Maidenhead Bridge** (Grade I listed): The Masterplan Development would affect the setting of the Grade I listed Maidenhead Bridge. The bridge’s present setting to the north east includes the existing Skindles Hotel building, parts of which date from the mid-19th century. However, much of the hotel as visible in views of the bridge is essentially the product of late 20th century expansion. On balance, given the poor architectural quality of these accretions and the dilapidated condition of the whole, the hotel building is felt to detract from the visual setting of Maidenhead Bridge. The architectural language and materiality of the proposed new restaurant and residential buildings on the Skindles site, and the residential building on the other side of Mill Lane, has been conceived to be sympathetic to the historic uses and character of the Taplow riverbank and the bridge, bringing this part of the Site back into use, and restoring vitality to the river itself. At the same time, the buildings are intended to provide an appropriate marker for the Site and for this important bridging point without diminishing the prominence of the bridge. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of Maidenhead Bridge is high. That sensitivity derives from the high quality of its design and its historical importance, and its setting also makes an important contribution. The magnitude of change to its setting, prior to mitigation, would be medium and there would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the bridge of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II listed): The Masterplan Development would result in the demolition of the existing mill buildings to the east of Glen Island House, and their replacement with three six-storey residential blocks (the Jubilee Riverside North Apartments) arranged diagonally beside the Jubilee Relief River. The Portacabins to the north of the house would also be removed. The existing mill buildings and the Portacabins greatly detract from the setting of Glen Island House and their removal would be beneficial. The Jubilee Riverside North Apartments, whilst of a different design to the present buildings on the site, have been conceived to accord greater respect to the domestic nature and materiality of the house than the present mill buildings, while a more appropriate landscaped space would be created between them. Meanwhile the landscaping on the other sides of the listed house would be enhanced, including by the planting of suitable new trees and the better presentation of the lawns and flower beds. As a Grade II listed structure, the sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium, to which the building’s setting makes a secondary contribution. The magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, and in light of the Proposed Development representing a significant improvement to the present setting of the house, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Glen Island House of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block**: As noted above, the appearance of the existing mill buildings greatly detracts from the setting of the former Stables. Their removal would thus cause no harm. The Jubilee Riverside North Apartments, whilst of a different design to the present buildings on the site, have been conceived to accord greater respect to the domestic nature and materiality of Glen Island House and its former Stables than the present mill buildings, while a more appropriate landscaped space would be created alongside the Jubilee Relief River. The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, and in light of the Proposed Development representing a significant improvement to the present setting of the Stables, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the Stable Block of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Power House**: Although the Power House originally formed part of the mill complex, the appearance of the mill buildings is in large part the product of later 20th century alterations including cladding to the upper parts, and they consequently detract from the setting of the Power House. In addition the Power House has long since lost its functional relationship with the
The Jubilee Apartments, whilst of a different design to the buildings that would have existed in the 1930s when the Power House was erected, and to the present mill buildings, have been conceived to respect the asset’s setting to a greater degree than the present buildings. The sensitivity of the Power House is low, and the building’s setting plays a minor role within this. Consequently the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. In light of the Proposed Development representing a significant improvement to the Power House’s present setting, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the Power House of minor beneficial significance.

**Mill Island House:** The Masterplan Development would result in the removal of the single-storey post-war buildings to the north, as well as the existing mill buildings. Both detract from the setting of Mill Island House, which makes a subsidiary contribution to its overall sensitivity, and thus their removal would thus cause no harm. The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, and in light of the Masterplan Development representing a significant improvement to the setting of Mill Island House, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Mill Island House of minor beneficial significance.

**Mill Island Cottage:** The visual character of the existing mill buildings means that they greatly detract from the setting of Mill Island Cottage, and their removal would thus cause no harm. The Jubilee Apartments, whilst of a different design to the present buildings on the Site, have been conceived to respect the domestic nature of the cottage, and a more appropriate landscaped space would be created between them. The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and its present setting makes only a relatively minor contribution to that. Consequently the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be low. Therefore, and in light of the Proposed Development representing a significant improvement to the setting of the cottage, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Mill Island Cottage of minor beneficial significance.

**Dunloe Lodge:** As detailed above, the Masterplan Development would result in the rebuilding of Dunloe Lodge, essentially in facsimile externally but with some minor changes, including a larger ancillary block to the south, to provide a single family residence. The importance of the building’s setting derives primarily from its riverine location, being one of the few existing buildings on the Site that is visible through the trees from the Maidenhead riverbank. This aspect of the building’s setting would remain intact, whilst new landscaping in place of the present overgrown woodland around the house would greatly help to reinstate its character as a gentleman’s residence in spacious grounds. The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Dunloe Lodge of minor beneficial significance.

**5 Mill Lane:** The Masterplan Development, specifically the replacement of Skindles with a new restaurant and residential building, would affect the setting of 5 Mill Lane. Although parts of Skindles date from the 19th century, the poor architectural quality of its late 20th century accretions and the dilapidated condition of the whole detracts from the setting of 5 Mill Lane. Its removal would thus cause no harm. The architectural language of the proposed new residences has been conceived to be sympathetic to the historic character of Mill Lane. The part-brownfield land opposite 5 Mill Lane does not at present contribute to its setting, and the architectural language of the proposed Senior Living accommodation has been conceived to add a new feature of interest and high design quality to the area. The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on 5 Mill Lane of minor beneficial significance.

**Scheduled Monument; Saxon Barrow, Church and Cemeteries in the Old Churchyard at Taplow Court:** The monument includes a large Saxon burial mound, the buried remains of an Early Anglo-Saxon and later Medieval church, and part of the pagan and Christian cemeteries thought to have surrounded these features within the old churchyard immediately to the south west of Taplow Court. The Proposed Development is thus very unlikely to be visible from the designated area, with the exception of from the eastern bank of the Jubilee Relief River which does not have a visual relationship with the rest of the asset. Whilst the proposed Jubilee Apartments and Jubilee Relief Riverside houses would be highly visible from here, they represent a considerable improvement over the existing mill buildings. In accordance with Table 14.2, the sensitivity of the Scheduled Monument is high. The setting of the SM situated within the grounds of Taplow Court is screened by trees to the west; however, the inter-visibility between other assets, RPG for example, will not be affected by the proposed development. The
magnitude of change to its setting as a whole, prior to mitigation, would be low. Consequently there would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the SM of minor beneficial significance.

Mitigation

14.4.22 Throughout the design process, consideration has been given to minimising any potentially adverse effects on the historic environment and ensuring that the positive effects of the proposals more than outweigh them. No further mitigation measures are considered appropriate.

Residual Effects

14.4.23 The significance of the indirect residual effects upon designated and non-designated heritage assets is best summarised on an asset-by-asset basis as follows:

- **Taplow Riverside Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the conservation area is medium and the magnitude of change to the setting of the conservation area as a whole would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of minor beneficial significance.

- **Taplow Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the Taplow Conservation Area is medium and the magnitude of change to the setting of the conservation area as a whole would be low. Therefore, there would therefore be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of minor beneficial significance.

- **Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden**: The sensitivity of the RPG is medium and the magnitude of change to the setting of the RPG as a whole would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the RPG of minor beneficial significance.

- **Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden** (Grade II). The sensitivity of the RPG is medium and the magnitude of change to the setting of the RPG as a whole would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the RPG of minor beneficial significance.

- **Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area**: The sensitivity of the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area is medium and the magnitude of change to its setting would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the conservation area of minor beneficial significance.

- **Maidenhead Bridge**: The sensitivity of the bridge is high and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the bridge of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House** (Grade II): The sensitivity of Glen Island House is medium and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Glen Island House of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Glen Island House Stable Block**: The sensitivity of the Stable Block is medium and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the Stable Block of moderate beneficial significance.

- **Power House**: The sensitivity of the Power House is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the Power House of minor beneficial significance.

- **Mill Island House**: The sensitivity of Mill Island House is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Mill Island House of minor beneficial significance.

- **Mill Island Cottage**: The sensitivity of Mill Island Cottage is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Mill Island Cottage of minor beneficial significance.

- **Dunloe Lodge**: The sensitivity of Dunloe Lodge is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on Dunloe Lodge of minor beneficial significance.
5 Mill Lane: The sensitivity of 5 Mill Lane is low and the magnitude of change to its setting would be medium. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on 5 Mill Lane of minor beneficial significance.

Scheduled Monument: The sensitivity of the Scheduled Monument is high and the magnitude of change to its setting would be low. Therefore, there would be an indirect, permanent effect on the Scheduled Monument of minor beneficial significance.

Truncation or loss of potential buried/surface archaeological remains

14.4.24 Mitigation solutions adopted in the Construction Phase would be permanent and no further mitigation would be required, as no new potential effects have been identified.

14.5 Summary

14.5.1 A comprehensive desk-based review of existing information was undertaken, including a review of planning policy and guidance, HER and NMR data and historic ordnance survey maps. This assessment is supported by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment completed by WSP in 2014 (Appendix 14.2). This document provides an evaluation of previous land use and archaeological potential utilising archaeological asset data from the HER and the NMR, aerial photography, cartographic information and other background material (including various internet sources such as the Victoria County History). Archaeological evaluation is to be undertaken in 2014 and a programme of trial trenching is to begin this month.

14.5.2 In terms of archaeological baseline, whilst there is evidence of Prehistoric, Early Medieval/Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval activity within the Site and there are number of assets associated with the Medieval/Post-Medieval periods these suggest limited activity within the Site and Study Area during these periods other than the industrial activity centred in around the Taplow Mill site. There is evidence for significant occupation and activity during the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods, with a Saxon funerary monument (Scheduled Monument 1014781) and the non-designated Iron Age/Bronze Age enclosure noted within the wider Study Area.

14.5.3 A Heritage Statement has been produced to support the planning application (Built Heritage Consultancy), which is included as (Appendix 14.1). The Heritage Statement was undertaken to select the designated and non-designated heritage assets for inclusion within that assessment. This exercise has informed the identification of the sensitive receptors considered further within the assessment.

14.5.4 There are no World Heritage Sites within the 1km Study Area from the Site boundary. There are no Scheduled Monuments or Registered Battlefields within the Site. There is one Scheduled Monument, the burial mound at Taplow Court, and Registered Historic Park and Garden located within 1km of the Site; the Grade II Taplow Court, situated approximately 250m to the east of the Site.

14.5.5 In relation to historic landscape character, there are no designated heritage landscapes within the Site or within 1km study area around the Site. The River Thames given the regularity of the field shapes present within the Site, it is anticipated that the existing pattern of fields was established through the enclosure of former open fields followed by piecemeal amalgamation of the fields during the modern period, it is anticipated that the historic landscape character at the Site would considered to be 19th Enclosure and Modern Fragmented Fields.

14.5.6 During the site preparation, earthworks and construction phase, the assessment considered that the residual effects on any potential buried/surface archaeological deposits are likely to be of negligible to minor negative significance for the Medieval and Post-Medieval periods and moderate negative significance of the Prehistoric and Early Medieval periods following the implementation of mitigation measures. Such mitigation measures include further archaeological works to be agreed with BCC through a WSI.

14.5.7 Whilst mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the effects on the majority of the non-designated heritage assets Therefore, the residual effects are considered to range from negligible to moderate negative significance depending on the asset affected.

14.5.8 An assessment of the historic landscape character and setting was undertaken. The assessment concluded that a residual effect of negative/neutral significance was considered likely as a result of the area to be developed and the change in character, i.e., from Industrial semi-rural 19th
Century Enclosure and Fragmented Modern Enclosure to a new residential scheme set in a semi-rural landscape.
Table 14.5: Summary of Historic Environment Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Likely Significant Effects</th>
<th>Significance of Effects</th>
<th>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</th>
<th>Significance of Residual Effects</th>
<th>Relevant Policy</th>
<th>Relevant Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible)</td>
<td>Positive / Negative</td>
<td>(P/T)</td>
<td>(D/I)</td>
<td>ST/MT/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Taplow Conservation Area</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Berry Hill Registered Park and</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>Significance of Effects</td>
<td>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</td>
<td>Significance of Residual Effects</td>
<td>Relevant Policy</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Maidenhead Bridge</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Glen Island House</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>T D ST</td>
<td>Historic Building Recording</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Glen Island House</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Glen Island House Stable Block</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>T D ST</td>
<td>Historic Building Recording</td>
<td>Moderate Negative</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Glen Island House Stable</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>T I MT</td>
<td>Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>Significance of Effects</td>
<td>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</td>
<td>Significance of Residual Effects</td>
<td>Relevant Policy</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>(Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible)</td>
<td>Positive / Negative</td>
<td>(P/T)</td>
<td>(D/I)</td>
<td>ST/MT/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of the Power House</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Power House</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Mill Island House</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Mill Island Cottage</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Description of Likely Significant Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Likely Significant Effects</th>
<th>Significance of Effects</th>
<th>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</th>
<th>Significance of Residual Effects</th>
<th>Relevant Policy</th>
<th>Relevant Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Dunloe Lodge</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Dunloe Lodge</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of 5 Mill Lane</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of 5 Mill Lane</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Skindles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the scheduled monument; Saxon barrow</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>Significance of Effects</td>
<td>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</td>
<td>Significance of Residual Effects</td>
<td>Relevant Policy</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to prehistoric and Early Medieval buried archaeological remains</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-medieval buried archaeological remains</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operation**

<p>| Changes to the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area | Moderate | Positive | P | D | LT | - | Moderate | Positive | P | D | LT | Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 | Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 |
| Changes to the setting of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area | Minor | Positive | P | I | LT | - | Minor | Positive | P | I | LT | Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 | Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 |
| Changes to the setting of the Taplow Conservation | Minor | Positive | P | I | LT | - | Minor | Positive | P | I | LT | Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 | Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Likely Significant Effects</th>
<th>Significance of Effects</th>
<th>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</th>
<th>Significance of Residual Effects</th>
<th>Relevant Policy</th>
<th>Relevant Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>(Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible)</td>
<td>Positive / Negative (P/T)</td>
<td>(D/I)</td>
<td>ST/MT/LT</td>
<td>(Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Taplow Court Registered Park and Garden</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Berry Hill Registered Park and Garden</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Maidenhead Riverside Conservation Area</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Maidenhead Bridge</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Glen Island House</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Glen Island</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>Significance of Effects</td>
<td>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</td>
<td>Significance of Residual Effects</td>
<td>Relevant Policy</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Glen Island House Stable Block</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Glen Island House Stable Block</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of the Power House</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the Power House</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Mill Island House</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Mill Island</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>Significance of Effects</td>
<td>Summary of Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</td>
<td>Significance of Residual Effects</td>
<td>Relevant Policy</td>
<td>Relevant Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>(Major, Moderate, Minor, Negligible)</td>
<td>Positive / Negative</td>
<td>(P/T)</td>
<td>(D/I)</td>
<td>ST/MT/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Mill Island Cottage</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Mill Island Cottage</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Dunloe Lodge</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of Dunloe Lodge</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of 5 Mill Lane</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of 5 Mill Lane</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy C6 Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
### Description of Likely Significant Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the fabric of Skindles</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Historic Building Recording</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to the setting of the scheduled monument; Saxon barrow</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Core Policy 8; Saved Policy C6</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework 2012: 12.128</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to prehistoric and Early Medieval buried archaeological remains</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Post-medieval buried archaeological remains</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- P/T = Permanent or Temporary, D/I = Direct or Indirect, ST/MT/LT = Short Term, Medium Term or Long Term
- N/A = Not Applicable
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