

Built Heritage Review and Advice (Revised Scheme)

No.5 Kingdom Street, Paddington Central, City
of Westminster

WCC Application Reference: 19/03673/FULL

GLA Application Reference: 4925

August 2020

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Revised Application Scheme and Assessment of Built Heritage Impacts	5
Appendix 1: Built Heritage Review and Advice (Application Scheme) dated June 2020		10

Client
The Mayor /
Greater London Authority (GLA)

August 2020

1. Introduction

Purpose and Background

1.1 This Built Heritage Review and Advice (Revised Scheme) report has been prepared by Turley Heritage on behalf of The Mayor / Greater London Authority (GLA) (our 'Client'), in their role as local planning authority, in order to provide proportionate information and advice with regard to the likely built heritage impacts in relation to proposed development at No.5 Kingdom Street, Paddington Central (the 'Site') within the City of Westminster (WCC). Our role is to provide independent and objective built heritage advice to the GLA as local planning authority for the determination of an application for full Planning Permission for this proposed development.

1.2 As background, the 'Applicant' submitted an application for full Planning Permission to WCC for the following proposed development on this Site on 14 May 2019:

“Erection of a mixed-use development comprising ground floor (at Kingdom Street level), plus 18 storeys to provide offices (B1a) plus ancillary plant and amenity areas. Three floors below Kingdom Street delivered in phases to provide a flexible mix of business B1(A), retail (A1), leisure, community and cultural uses (D1) within the former 'Crossrail box'. New outdoor terraces adjacent to railway at basement level; creation of a new pedestrian and cycle link between Harrow Road and Kingdom Street including internal and external garden and landscaping; and associated works.” (WCC application reference number: 19/03673/FULL)

1.3 It is on the basis of this original application scheme that Turley Heritage undertook a full review of the Applicant's submission material (also in light of WCC's resolution to refuse planning permission prior to the call-in by the Deputy Mayor). Accordingly, we issued our advice in full as our Built Heritage Review and Advice report dated June 2020. This previous report of our advice is included in full at **Appendix 1** to this new report.

1.4 On 31 July 2020 the Applicant submitted a revised full application for Planning Permission for the development of this Site, which has been prepared by their design team to respond to some recent changes made to the scheme proposals. From our further review of the revised application material we understand that these changes focus principally on a re-design / reorganising of elements at the top and also base of the new building, which would further increase the quantum of net lettable office space on Site. It is following review of this revised scheme that our advice to the Mayor has been further updated; as set out in this report.

Structure and Content

- 1.5 This report is set out in two sections. This introductory **Section 1** again outlines the remit for our instruction and provision of advice to The Mayor / Greater London Authority in relation to the indirect built heritage impacts resulting from the proposed development on Site.
- 1.6 Importantly, this further iteration of our advice and this report should be read in conjunction with **Appendix 1**, which is a full copy of our previous Built Heritage Review and Advice that was prepared in June 2020 on the basis of the (original) application scheme as submitted in May 2019. It is within this previous report that we have established the baseline conditions of the Site and its surrounding area in relation to built heritage assets. In particular identifying the heritage assets that have the potential to be affected by the proposed development on Site; through change to their settings and views, and also preparing proportionate descriptions of the significance (and any contribution of setting) for each of these assets.
- 1.7 **Section 2** of this new report provides an update to our previous assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development on Site on the described baseline conditions, i.e. the degree and nature of change to the particular significance of each of the built heritage assets (or defined heritage asset groups). Again this should be read in conjunction with our previous findings as set out in Section 3 of the June 2020 report (**Appendix 1**). This includes a review of these heritage impacts resulting from the revised scheme in the light of the overarching legislation of the Planning Act 1990, the Framework and also relevant local planning policy and guidance for change within the historic environment.

2. Revised Application Scheme and Assessment of Built Heritage Impacts

Revised Scheme

- 2.1 The revised scheme now at application is described in the full design material submitted by the Applicant on 31 July 2020, and accordingly Turley Heritage have undertaken a full review this new submission (alongside the original application material), including in particular the Design and Access Statement (DAS), prepared accurate visualisations, and the relevant chapters of the ES in relation to built heritage effects (and also townscape and visual effects).
- 2.2 In terms of the physical manifestation of built form proposed for the Site; as would affect the character and appearance of the setting (and also shared views) of the identified heritage assets, key changes relate to the proposed re-design / reorganising of elements at the top and also base of the new building. Accordingly, the newly updated accurate visualisations set out in the Environmental Statement Addendum: Volume III: Townscape, Heritage & Visual Impact Assessment Addendum (July 2020) indicate that the proposed alterations to the top of this building could be observable within local views. Our review of the new DAS indicates that the penultimate storey of the proposed development has been redesigned as a fully enclosed office level; continuing the elevational treatment of the levels below. The top level of the building would include an external terrace and also service / plant elements, which would be enclosed by a metal “contoured screen” that spirals inwards to create a slightly higher dome-like form; as seen in some local and longer views. Changes are also proposed at the base of the building, but would in our view have a much more limited, and overall very little, visual effect on the character or appearance of the nearby conservation areas or setting of other heritage assets.
- 2.3 The Applicant’s assessment set out in Volume III: Townscape, Heritage & Visual Impact Assessment Addendum (July 2020) describes the revised design, and also highlights the effects of such change on the built heritage, townscape and visual context of the Site. Section 6 (Assessment pre-mitigation – including updated Verified Views) states that with regard to the more distant views:

“... The proposed amendments would not affect the extent of the building’s visibility or the overall character of the architecture. The effects on the distant views would remain the same as those reported in the THVIA in April 2019. (paragraph 6.5)”

- 2.4 For closer views, particularly from the north around Little Venice, it is set out that:

“... However, the amendments are considered to be very minor. The height and mass of the proposed development appears essentially the same in all of the verified views and the amendments to the upper storeys are consistent with the design and architectural character of the proposed development submitted in April 2019. Consequently the effects report in the April 2019 THVIA would remain valid. (paragraph 6.6)”

2.5 Also that:

“The amendments to the lower levels are barely discernible in the verified views and would only be noticed when in close proximity of the building. There would be no effect to townscape character, views or the settings of heritage assets as a result of these changes to the lower levels of the proposed development. (paragraph 6.7)

There would be no change to the effects on views, townscape character and heritage asset settings reported in the April 2019 THVIA. (paragraph 6.8)”

2.6 It is our own assessment that the revised scheme would indeed have an effect on the character and appearance of the setting and also views in context with a number of the identified heritage assets within the surrounding area of the Site; particularly with regard to the proposed fine change to the overall proportions and design of the crown of the new taller building. However, we would agree with the updated assessment of the Applicant that such change would be very minor, and accordingly there would be no overall change to our previous assessment of the built heritage impacts of the development proposals as set out in our report dated June 2020.

Scheme Impacts

2.7 Our previous Built Heritage Review and Advice report (June 2020) identified the relevant built heritage considerations for the determination of this application (now revised) for proposed development at this Site, which relate to indirect impacts on the particular significance of identified designated heritage assets through change to the character and appearance of a part of their settings and also shared views. This report is set out in full at **Appendix 1** for ease of use, and also includes our proportionate assessment of the baseline conditions in relation to the significance (and setting) of the heritage assets as relevant.

2.8 Our assessment of the impacts of the now further revised scheme on the significance of each of the identified heritage assets is set out in each of the following tables: **Table 4.1** in relation to listed buildings (or their groups), **Table 4.2** for conservation areas, and **Table 4.3** for registered parks and gardens. This identifies the ‘type’ of such impacts may be beneficial in heritage terms; such as change that could enhance or better reveal heritage significance, may have an overall neutral effect on the understanding and appreciation of heritage significance, or may result in harm to significance (and setting); which is also gauged with regard to the degree or ‘magnitude’ of any such heritage harm be in each case within the guidelines set out by the Framework and also NPPG.

Table 2.1: Listed Buildings or Groups

Name	Address	Grade	Impact	
			Type	Magnitude
Westbourne Bridge		II	Benefit	N/A
140	Westbourne Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
Orsett House	Orsett Street			

3-33 & 18-42	Orsett Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
163 & 165-169	Porchester Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
1-8 & 9-31	Porchester Square			
Porchester Centre	Porchester Road	II*	Neutral	N/A
14-16, 22-24 & 26-28	Westbourne Park Road	II	Neutral	N/A
36-38 & 40-62	Gloucester Gardens	II	Neutral	N/A
Hallfield Estate (14 blocks)	Bishops Bridge Road	II	Neutral	N/A
Hallfield Estate School	Inverness Terrace	II*		
46-88, 90-132, 134-168, 105-123 & 125-167	Gloucester Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
21-27, 24-32 & Cleveland Arms Tavern PH	Chilworth Street			
1-7, 12-14, 15-22 & 23-31	Cleveland Square	II	Neutral	N/A
1-8, 25-29	Cleveland Gardens			
33-77, 79-119, 121-141 (Dorland Hotel), 34-68 (Royal Eagle Hotel), 70-106 & 108-136	Westbourne Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
21-23	Bishops Bridge Road			
1, 3-5 (Clifton Court)	Cleveland Terrace			
Paddington Station	Praed Street	I	Neutral	N/A
Paddington British Rail Maintenance Depot, East & West Blocks	Harrow Road	II*	Neutral	N/A
British Waterway Board Canal Office	Delamere Terrace	II	Neutral	N/A
Junction House	Blomfield Road	II	Neutral	N/A
Warwick Avenue Bridge		II	Neutral	N/A
1-6, 7-12, 14-20, 21-26 & The Bridge House PH	Westbourne Terrace Road	II	Harm	LTS ¹ & Low (14-20 & 21-26 only)
2	Warwick Crescent	II	Neutral	N/A
19-33 & 34-56	Blomfield Road	II	Harm	LTS & Low (34-45 only)
1-12	Clifton Villas		Neutral	N/A
7-31 odds	Warwick Avenue		Neutral	N/A

¹ LTS refers to 'less than substantial' harm as set out in the Framework (paragraph 196)

1-5 & Warwick Castle PH	Warwick Place	II	Neutral	N/A
20-42 evens	Warwick Avenue	II	Neutral	N/A
33-63 odds	Warwick Avenue	II	Neutral	N/A
1-20	Randolph Road	II	Neutral	N/A
1-49, 2 & 4-36	Warrington Crescent	II	Neutral	N/A
22-23, 24-31	Maida Avenue	II	Neutral	N/A
1-6, 12-19	Park Place Villas		Neutral	N/A
2-20	Howley Place		Neutral	N/A
2-16 evens	Warwick Avenue		Harm	LTS & Very Low
Catholic Apostolic Church and Church House	Maida Avenue	I	Neutral	N/A
Church of St Mary Magdalene	Rowington Close	I	Neutral	N/A
Church of St Mary	Paddington Green	II*	Neutral	N/A

Table 2.2: Conservation Areas

Name	Grade	Impact	
		Type	Magnitude
Maida Vale	N/A	Harm	LTS & Low
Paddington Green	N/A	Neutral	N/A
Bayswater	N/A	Harm	LTS & Very Low
Hallfield Estate	N/A	Neutral	N/A
Queensway	N/A	Neutral	N/A
Westbourne	N/A	Neutral	N/A
Pembridge	N/A	Neutral	N/A
Royal Parks	N/A	Harm	LTS & Very Low

Table 2.3: Registered Parks and Gardens

Name	Grade	Impact	
		Type	Magnitude
Hyde Park	I	Harm	LTS & Low
Kensington Gardens	I	Harm	LTS & Low

- 2.9 It is to be noted again that it is our assessment that proposed changes to the scheme design and mix of uses as part of the July 2020 revised application would be very minor in terms of wider visual effects. Accordingly there would be no overall change to our previous findings as regard to built heritage impacts undertaken in June 2020.
- 2.10 In summary, we have identified that the proposed development (as revised) would cause a minor degree of harm to the understanding and or appreciation of the significance of a number of designated heritage assets within the surrounding area of the Site. Such impacts would not be direct, but would affect the character and appearance of part of the setting or shared views of these particular heritage assets. Any such harm to heritage significance would be assessed to be 'less than substantial' in magnitude for the purposes of the Framework, and also at lower or lowest end within that scale in each case.
- 2.11 In overall terms any such minor and 'less than substantial' harm caused to the significance of designated heritage assets should be considered and weighed against the public benefits delivered by the application scheme as a whole, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 194 and 196 of the Framework and when read as a whole, and also in light of the relevant overarching statutory duty of the Planning Act 1990.
- 2.12 As part of this balance we have also identified that the application scheme has the potential to better reveal the significance of the designated heritage assets of the listed Westbourne Bridge. This is a 'heritage benefits', as defined by NPPG, and should be regarded as a public benefit for the purposes of the Framework.
- 2.13 With further regard to the revised scheme, it has been noted that it is the Applicant's view (as set out in the updated application material) that the changes to the design and mix of uses of the previous development would enhance the public benefits of the scheme without materially altering its environmental impacts. Such change to what the scheme would be able to deliver in planning terms would be for Greater London Authority officers to judge.
- 2.14 Overall it would again be for Greater London Authority planning officers; as informed by our assessment and advice with regard to built heritage asset impacts, now to carry out the wider balancing exercise in weighing up all relevant and potentially competing material planning considerations, and then to ultimately make a recommendation to the Mayor with regard to this revised application scheme.

**Appendix 1: Built Heritage Review and Advice
(Application Scheme) dated June
2020**

Turley Office
8th Floor
Lacon House
84 Theobald's Road
London
WC1X 8NL

T 020 7851 4010