

Appendix 1 - Heritage assets: their heritage significance, the contribution of elements of setting & the heritage impacts.

Matters to Note:

- This follows the settled best practice approach to assessing the impact on heritage significance set out in the documents listed in the Heritage Statement of Common Ground.
- Note we refer to elements of setting which contribute to significance, rather than those which might allow a better or worse appreciation / revealing of significance, or which might be neutral. This is to assist the focus on aspects which either detract from or enhance the conservation of the asset's significance as per NPPF paras 212 and 215.
- Reference to cumulative impacts adopts the definition in Historic England Good Practice Advice Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets, 2017. This document formed part of the Heritage Statement of Common Ground approach which, at page 12 (para 36), reads: *Cumulative assessment is required under the EU Directive on EIA. Its purpose is to identify impacts that are the result of introducing the development into the view in combination with other existing and proposed developments. The combined impact may not simply be the sum of the impacts of individual developments; it may be more, or less. It goes on, at page 2: Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset. Negative change could include severing the last link between an asset and its original setting; positive change could include the restoration of a building's original designed landscape or the removal of structures impairing key views of it (see also paragraph 40 for screening of intrusive developments).* Our assessment adopts this approach to assessing cumulative harms which are baseline (ie have been implemented) and future (ie pipeline permissions etc). In accordance with this, I define baseline cumulative harms and, as relevant, future pipeline cumulative harms.

- The 'scope of impacts' refers broadly to the areas of setting in which the relevant heritage asset can be experienced and elements of setting understood.
- For convenience, I set out the position of relevant stakeholder / the Parties as I was aware at the time of writing.

| <p>Battersea Park Registered Park and Garden (Grade II*) / Battersea Park Conservation Area & listed buildings within the area (Grade II)</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall Significance</p> |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>Battersea Park is at the heart of a premier piece of Victorian townscape of metropolitan and national significance. It is one of the earliest of the great Victorian public parks, furnished out of Battersea Fields.</p> <p>An 1833 Commons Select Committee on ‘public walks’ reported that parks are essential to public health and contentment and without them ‘great mischief’ could arise. A Royal Commission on the improvement of the metropolis would come to recommend the site for a public park in part for the great advantage of its river prospects, including towards the Royal Hospital. An 1846 Act of Parliament secured the Park,</p> | <p>Very high</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>alongside the future Chelsea (then Victoria) Bridge, whilst making initial provisions for what would become Albert Bridge, which would bookend the Park at both ends.</p> <p>It is a symbol of high-status Victorian civic improvements of the mid-19th in the prevailing sprit of metropolitan enhancement for the betterment of the urban condition in terms of grandeur, morality and the public health of the Capital. It is a symbol of Battersea and London, often portrayed as a city of parks, and was part of the nascent expansion of the Capital's public parks in the 19th Century.</p> <p>Its embanked river frontage forms a frontispiece and shares a relationship with other metropolitan-scale improvements to London's premier natural asset, the River Thames – including the Chelsea Embankment opposite. Otherwise, it forms a palimpsest of landscape design across the 19/20th Century, from Victorian to Festival of Britain, yet where the more picturesque/gardenesque Victorian structure still survives. This comprises permitter carriage drives originally for equestrian rides, formal tree-lined avenues, a huge serpentine boating lake, subtropical gardens (of international renown and said to be the first of their kind in England) and a rockery / cascade, which all come together in one of London's more romantic parks. Open recreation land was also accounted for, such as for cricket, enclosed by plantations it is said were to create the 'snug, rural appearance of a country district'. The River frontispiece was topped off in 1984-85 by the Japanese Peace Pagoda, to an 8th Century design using traditional techniques, and whose finial reaches over its mature treeline.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>The urbane scale of handsome Victorian mansion bocks and townhouses, which were to build on the character of the Chelsea Embankment opposite, decorously enclose the Park’s pre-eminent nature and openess.</p> <p>Much of this significance is intrinsic, in its form and structure, but elements of setting do make a strong contribution to significance.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Battersea Park registered landscape, Conservation Area and the associated listed buildings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Its historic visual relationships with the Chelsea Embankment (Thames, Royal Hospital and Cheyne Conservation Areas), the Royal Hospital (and landscape), Chelsea Physic Garden, Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge and Chelsea Old Church, in particular, as a picturesque, and historically resonant, landscape-led composition. This is apparent in broad Thames embankment views out and across the Park as part of a shared historic setting focused on the River Thames. This draws on a shared historic open and natural low-lying setting, where the verdant origins of this part of the Thames and the grand scale of Victorian metropolitan improvement can be understood. 2.) Its general openess and sense of secluded nature in what feels like a continuous natural landscape opposite the River Thames. This offers a secluded sense of being ‘set apart’ from the city in the pre- | <p>Medium to high contribution to significance.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>eminence of nature as was the intent of the park creators. This is captured in its big clear skies and in views and vistas across the Park and the River Thames.</p> | |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence, to a greater or lesser degree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from within the Park environs – element 1 and 2. • Views from Chelsea Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from Chelsea Embankment (including Chelsea Quay and Cheyne Walk) between Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from Albert Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from between Albert Bridge and Battersea Bridge (north side) – element 1. • Battersea Bridge – element 1. | |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Battersea Bridge to Chelsea Waterfront – element 1. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts.</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers. • The Montevetro Towers. • The Moravian Tower (355 Kings Road) • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • Kings Tower, 2 Bridgewater Avenue • 20th Century estate towers to the north and west. • Towers on the former Battersea Gasholders site. <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect the significance of the Park. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. In wider views along the river corridor of the reach from the west this would further compound a diminishment landmark presence, and elegant silhouette of the Bridge, bookending the Park’s landscape, detracting further from those historical relationships and wider, open and verdant setting of the river corridor. However, at much greater distance and of an apparent height and scale, lesser than the Appeal Scheme, the effect would be much lesser.</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| Impacts. | <p>As set out in this evidence the Appeal Scheme would breach the perimeter landscape treeline of the park in a series of important views and glimpses over and out of the park landscape and would, not least by greater proximity and scale, further the visual intrusion of the Chelsea Waterfront West Tower. This would further erode the general openness of the Park, intruding into those big clear skies, detracting from the sense of being ‘set apart’ in pre-eminent nature as a distracting urbanising influence. In particular, this would be of case closer to the Appeal Scheme, from the environs of Carriagedrive West, for example, the paths and the embankment gardens opposite Albert Bridge.</p> <p>In views from the Park’s formal promenade embankment the proposal would rise through sky-backed foliage and detract from the open River edge and the group value between the Park and those wider heritage assets identified – in particular Albert Bridge and those fronting the Chelsea Embankment, where there is group value.</p> <p>In riparian views between Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge, in particular, but also from between Albert and Battersea Bridges, the Appeal Scheme would add significantly to cumulative harm caused by existing modern towers which breach the mature landscape of its embankment, its landmark Peace Pagoda, and further encroach on the openness of the River edge. The Appeal Scheme would diminish/detract from the landmark presence and group value with Albert Bridge, and that historic setting on the Chelsea Embankment which has been identified.</p> <p>To a lesser extent, these harms still occur in riparian views west of Albert Bridge, where Albert Bridge (which is in the Conservation Area) remains a key landmark, edged by the park landscape, is appreciated in the context of that historic environment with which it shares a group value centred on the open and generally verdant nature of the River Thames.</p> |
|----------|--|

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | It is recognised that seasonality will have a significant impact on the extent of these harms, namely from the Park itself. This has been accounted for. |
| Overall Impact Assessment | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – middle range. |
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. |
| Historic England | Less than substantial harm – likely low level. |
| Appellant | Preserved. |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – middle range. |

| <p>Albert Bridge (Grade II*)</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall</p> |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>Albert Bridge is one of the most elegant and iconic on the River Thames. Built 1871-73, to the designs of the noted engineer Rowland Mason Ordish, as altered by renowned engineer Sir Josphe Bazalgette, it mixes engineering innovation with architectural panache. Its elegant design adopts mixed Gothic embellishment and is a statement to the evolution of the Victorian Gothic Revival as applied to new engineering, combining the properties of both suspension and cable-stayed bridges. It lies at the heart of, and bridges, a wider Victorian townscape of metropolitan enhancement. It is particularly known after dark for its architectural lighting, which accentuates it as an ornament in the otherwise dark reservoir of the Thames.</p> <p>As identified by the Appellant, ‘it's prominence within this setting has contributed to its consideration as one of London’s landmarks, described by Sir John Betjeman as <i>“shining with electric lights, grey and airy against the London sky, it is one of the beauties of the London river”</i> (BHTVIA, para 5.176).</p> <p>Much of that significance is tied up in its built form and use, but a significant degree is drawn from setting.</p> | <p>Very High.</p> |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Albert Bridge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Its landmark status at the heart of significant Victorian metropolitan improvements focused around the River Thames, and the architectural and historic group value with the contemporaneous Chelsea Embankment (inc Cheyne Walk and Embankment Gardens), it having being intended to bookend Battersea Park (Grade II* landscape), and later Battersea Bridge (Grade II) in key riparian views up and downstream the river corridor. 2.) It's obvious siting on the River, as a historic crossing, whose openness it recedes to elegantly with its low span and lightweight structure. | <p>Medium to high contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Chelsea Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from Chelsea Embankment (including Chelsea Quay and Cheyne Walk) between Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from Albert Bridge – elements 1 and 2. | |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from between Albert Bridge and Battersea Bridge (north side) – elements 1 and 2. • Views from between Albert Bridge and Battersea Bridge (south side) – elements 1 and 2. • Battersea Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • Views from between Battersea Bridge, Cremorne Road and Cremorne Gardens - elements 1 and 2 • Views from the Thames Path around Chelsea Waterfront - elements 1 and 2 • Views from within the Battersea Park – elements 1 and 2. • Views from the Thames Path between Battersea Bridge and St Mary’s Church and immediate environs of St Mary’s Church - elements 1 and 2. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers • The Moravian Tower (355 Kings Road) |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • Kings Tower, 2 Bridgewater Avenue. <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect the significance of the Bridge. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. In wider views along the river corridor of the reach from the west this would further compound a diminishment landmark presence, and elegant silhouette of the Bridge, bookending the Park’s landscape, detracting further from those historical relationships and wider, open and verdant setting of the river corridor. However, at much greater distance and of an apparent height and scale, lesser than the Appeal Scheme, the effect would be much lesser.</p> |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>The Appeal Scheme in views up and down the long Thames corridor in the Chelsea and Battersea reach would significantly compound existing harms that undermine its pre-eminent landmark status and the open spatial qualities of the River it respected.</p> <p>Closer to the Bridge, and from the bridge itself, the height and scale of the development would loom large over the Bridge, dominating it as the most visually conspicuous intrusion, detracting from its architectural and historic group value and its open, lower-scale riverside setting. It would also undermine its skyline’s so-called ‘spiders web’ silhouette, diminishing its relative scale and elegance, by day – but also by night when it is lit against darker skies.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>This harm would manifest in more distant / mid-distant approach views, where the Appeal Scheme, reinforced by cumulative impacts, would significantly detract from the relative lightweight, elegant scale of the bridge which is susceptible to proposals of such excessive height and scale.</p> |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – middle range.</p> |
| <p>GLA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low to middle.</p> |
| <p>Historic England</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm - relatively low level.</p> |
| <p>Appellant</p> | <p>Preserved (application stage). We now note the settled position on exchange of the Heritage Statement of Common Ground was that there would be less than substantial harm – low level.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Rule 6</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – middle range.</p> | |
| <p>Battersea Bridge (Grade II).</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall</p> |
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>Battersea Bridge, dated 1890, is the last of the great Victorian landmarks to define this part of the River, marking Battersea Reach and its sweeping meander to the west. It is by the renowned Victorian engineer, J W Bazalgette, of the Metropolitan Board of Works: famous for some of London’s great metropolitan improvements of the 19th Century, including the adjoining Chelsea Embankment, and the Victoria and Albert Embankments. It is said to be an important example of a low lying five span bridge of unequal radii rising to a distinct, and attractively subtle central apex. An architectural ornament to the Thames, it forms the last part of a sequence of historic bridges in the Chelsea Reach. It has dynamic iron-ribbed, concave edge spans, gilt foliated decorative spandrels and exotic arabesque arcading to its balustrade. It is crowned and silhouetted against this open part of the Thames by an attractive ensemble of single and trident Windsor lanterns which add after dark elegance to the River and accentuate its group value with Albert Bridge.</p> <p>Much of that significance is innate, in its built form and use - but a significant degree is drawn from setting.</p> | <p>High</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Battersea Bridge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Marking the point of the historic Battersea Ferry, and the tidal Thames reaches of Chelsea and Battersea, it has landmark status as an important, historic crossing over the Thames, in particular in wider riparian views up and downstream. 2.) Its architectural and historic group value with other riparian landmarks and a fine-grain, low-scale historic environment, including Albert Bridge, Chelsea Old Church, Crosby Hall and those buildings and landscaping fronting the Chelsea Embankment. 3.) Its siting on the River and its low span which respects for the openness of the River Thames. | <p>Medium to high contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence to a greater or lesser degree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Battersea Bridge – elements 1, 2 and 3. • Views from Albert Bridge – elements 1, 2 and 3. | |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from between Albert Bridge and Battersea Bridge (north side) – elements 1, 2 and 3. • Views from the Thames Path (south side) between Albert and Battersea Bridge - elements 1, 2 and 3. • Views from between Battersea Bridge, Cremorne Road and Cremorne Gardens - elements 1, 2 and 3. • Views from the Thames Path around Chelsea Waterfront - elements 1, 2 and 3. • The Thames Path between Battersea Bridge and St Mary’s Church and immediate environs of St Mary’s Church - elements 1, 2 and 3. • Views on approach from Beaufort Street and Battersea Bridge Road - elements 1, 2 and 3. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • Kings Tower, 2 Bridgewater Avenue • The Moravian Tower (355 Kings Road) • The Montevetro Tower |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sommerset Estates towers. <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect the significance of the Bridge. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. This would compound a diminishment of its subtle landmark presence on the open river, but, at much greater distance, to a much lesser extent than the Appeal Scheme, which would overwhelm the bridge.</p> |
| <p>Impacts</p> | <p>The harmful impacts on Battersea Bridge, and its landmark Thames status, occur from the bridge itself, and from its riparian approaches in Chelsea and Battersea Reach.</p> <p>On the Bridge, and either side of the bridgehead, the Appeal Scheme would abruptly, starkly and unduly tower-over and overwhelm the historic bridge, dominating it, and compounding the impinging on its deft skyline presence and open river setting cause as a shattering of other tall buildings.</p> <p>In wider views, the Appeal Scheme, by reason of its sheer height and scale, would be the most visually conspicuous and unduly prominent skyline feature which would diminish its more subtle and decorous Thames landmark status marking this historic crossing of the River. It will detract from its relative scale, impinge on its open river setting and (in places) its skyline silhouette, and unbalance and intrude in broader views to undermine its architectural and historic group value with its lower-scale, finer grain historic River setting.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Overall Impact Assessment | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – middle level. |
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. |
| Historic England | Less than substantial harm – low. |
| Appellant | Enhancement – medium. However, we noted on exchange of the heritage specific statement of common ground that the Appellant’s position might now just be that the asset is preserved (ie no harm), rather than enhanced. This might be as the Appellant is to now assert that, following an ‘internal balance’, any heritage benefits ‘net off’ the harms. In any event, I have addressed the matter of claimed heritage benefits and NPPF para 212/215 in the main evidence. |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – middle level. |

| <p>Thames Conservation Area (RBKC)</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall</p> |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>The Thames Conservation Area spans the whole of the of the RBKC riparian frontage, its immediate embankments and gardens, and those RBKC sections of Battersea, Albert and Chelsea Bridges. It incorporates the Chelsea Embankment, whose carriageway covers the Victorian sewers below, with its high Victorian granite river walls, balustrades, iron lamp standards, avenues of mature trees and informal gardens and nationally important figurative sculptures. These mark a decorous River edge intended for promenading the open, clean air views along the rejuvenated Victorian River - with its contemporary associations with moral and physical health. The open expanse of the River Thames covers London’s premier natural asset – England’s largest river – which is fundamental to how the Capital evolved. This provides the verdant, leafy setting to important civic landmarks, not least Chelsea Old Church, St Mary’s Church, Battersea Park and the nationally important institution, the Chelsea Physic Garden and Royal Hospital. It has strong historic associations with artists and other luminaries at the heart of the National story who were drawn to the spatial qualities of the Thames environs here.</p> | <p>Very High.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Much of the significance of the Conservation Area is intrinsic and tied up on physical fabric, not least of the Embankment and its associated public realm and structures, but a significant degree is also drawn from setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The Thames Conservation Area Appraisal SPD identifies long and deep riverine views and panoramas which include all of those assessed in this Proof. The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Thames Conservation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Broad, deep and open viewing corridors running east-west, north-south across and through the Conservation Area (from inside and out), of the landmark Thames Bridges, but also their relationship to historic old Chelsea and the more urbane scale of the later Chelsea Embankment. A broad sense of the low-lying, open and verdant historic character of the River here which has a deep past as once a semi-rural retreat that still feels ‘at the edge’ of the Capital, but where views open up of the denser central London skyline beyond, allowing a reading of the Capital’s evolution. 2.) The open recreational use and pre-eminent status of the River. | <p>Moderate to high contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence:</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All viewing area up and downstream the river corridor in the Chelsea and Battersea Reaches from Chelsea to Battersea Rail Bridge – elements 1 and 2. • The approaches from Royal Hospital Road, Beauford Street, Battersea Bridge Road and Danvers Street – elements 1 and 2. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts.</p> | <p>In this instance cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • Kings Tower, 2 Bridgewater Avenue • The Moravian Tower (355 Kings Road) • Montevetro Tower • Sommerset Estate towers. <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect significance. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. This would act to compound the influence of taller built development on the openness and pre-eminence of the River. However, the effect would be much lesser than the Appeal Scheme, set at much greater distance to the river corridor.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>In relation to setting element 1, from those viewing areas addressed in this Proof, in views from, across and through the Conservation Area’s broad reach, the Appeal Scheme, by reason of its excessive height and scale, would be unduly prominent and dominant, detracting from the River’s openness and pre-eminent gravity towards its low horizontal plane. It would dominate, and in some instance, overwhelm, its lower scale, verdant and finer-grain historic skylines, and those attendant riparian landmarks framing the river. The Appeal scheme would detract from a more balanced scale relationship this reach and the emergent central London skyline in the most intrusive way.</p> <p>The Appeal Scheme, hard up against the River’s edge in an important transition in the curvature of the River between Chelsea and Battersea Reach, the Appeal Scheme would damage the openness and pre-eminence of the River. In all instances, this harm would compound but be of greater magnitude than those identified baseline harms.</p> |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – middle level.</p> |
| | |

| | | |
|---|--|----------------|
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Preserved. | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – middle level. | |
| Cheyne Conservation Area and multiple listed buildings within the area including Chelsea Old Church (Grade | Assessment | Overall |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------|
| <p>I); Crosby Hall (Grade II*); Lindsay House (Grade II*) and Grade II listed houses in Cheyne Walk, Danvers Street, Paulton’s Square and Ropers Garden’.</p> | | |
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>The Cheyne Conservation Area is an area of great heritage significance. Fronting on to the River Thames and the historic crossing at Battersea, it forms the area of the old Chelsea village but now extends up to the King’s Road comprising some of the oldest and finest building in RBKC. Much of it includes fine rows of Georgian and Victorian terraces with consistent historic skylines. This is a (relatively) large conservation area, of which parts, albeit significant parts, would be affected – and which draws much significance from its built form. However, it still does draw a good amount of significance from setting.</p> | <p>High to Very High.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Chelsea Old Church (All Saints) requires a dedicated treatment. This is one of the oldest parish churches to survive in London, serving the original village of old Chelsea since at least the 12th Century. Much restored followed 1941 bomb damage, it is a relative treasure trove of historic artifacts and church monuments testament to the ancient noble and aristocratic historic associations of Chelsea. It was painstakingly restored in facsimile and recreated in 1958 to be opened in the presence of Queen Elizabeth The Queen Mother. The humble landmark presence of the Church on this part of the River has artistic pedigree, having been painted by J M W Turner and James McNeil Whistler, and is a symbol of this part of the River's ancient origins. The asset draws a substantial degree of significance from its built form, fixtures, fabric and use – but a not insignificant degree is drawn from the contribution of setting.</p> <p>Crosby Hall is a fascinating example of an Edwardian re-erection of a later Medieval wool merchant's hall from Bishopsgate (City of London), 1909-10. Principal aspects of the Great Hall survive which is expressed onto Danvers Street. A north wing was added in 1925-6 and it was extended to the south in the 1950s. It is the only example of a medieval City merchant house to survive in London, albeit fragmentary and not on its original site. Its flagrantly picturesque outline, of ogee turrets, glit weathervane finials, moulded Tudor chimneys, gables, cupola and steeply-pitched great hall roof form a grand, if respectfully subtle, skyline presence marking old Chelsea in riparian views. Even if re-located here, it stands as a testament to Cold Chelsea village's ancient origins as a 'village of palaces'. Given it was moved to this location, and that the high listing is largely a result of its ancient fabric, it still draws some significance from setting contribution.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Ropers Garden (Grade II registered) and its contemporaneous ‘Awakening’ statue (Grade II) is noted as a particularly good example of an urban communal garden of the post-war period fashioned out of the basements of a bomb-damaged terrace at the heart of the old village of Chelsea. Historically it formed part of Henry VIII’s contemporary, Sir Thomas Moore’s orchard. It is sunken and gives a sense of seclusion and reflection beneath the busier Embankment. It is an important example of the work of Peter Shephard which remains intact (with thoughtful later interventions) deemed to have been successful at fashioning views of the Old Church and Crosby Hall. Peter Shepherd was a passionate architect, town planner and landscapist – who fought for high-density low-rise against the loss of urban character in large tower blocks. The garden is simple and reflective – laid in York stone with stock brick retaining walls and edgings, formal lawns and eight square beds for trees and roses in addition to some nicely scaled trees. All seating is oriented to enjoy the open southern aspect to the River. All allows for focus on the centrepiece - ‘Awakening’ - (originally ‘regeneration’) by Gilbert Ledward – noted as a finely rendered figurative sculpture (1922-23) of cast bronze, whose arms reach for the skies in an opening posture symbolic, as the gardens are, of renewal and beauty as a symbol of enduring life. Clearly, this asset draws much significance from its form and layout, but this was designed with a setting in mind, and thus it draws significantly on setting for significance.</p> <p>34-56 (east side), 27-33 (south side) and 1-26 (west side) Paulton’s Square for a set-piece early Victorian elongated square, of impressive scale and unity, comprising sweeping terraces of 3 storey (plus basement) in the neat and handsome ‘stock brick and stucco’ vernacular of this part of west London. Harmoniously planned and symmetrical, with a raised attic central range, there is an elegant harmony, openness and scale with clean skyline parapets (hiding London butterfly roofs), centred picturesquely around the central open</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>green square. This forms an impressive group with 37-57 and 24-36 Danvers Street as a unified southern route towards the Chelsea Embankment. Much of their significance will be innate, contained in plan form and fabric – but their group value and context still allow setting to make a significant contribution to significance.</p> <p>91, 92, 94-94, 107-108, 109, 110, 113 & 118-119 Cheyne Walk (Grade II), including Lindsay House (Grade II*): this comprises a fragmented, but still coherent group of (altered) Georgian (mid-late 18th Century) townhouses of various orders, of the handsome brick-faced manner, with later bays and dormers in some instance to take in the expansive River view. These represent important remnants of the development of old Chelsea into a fashionable Georgian retreat and include the house in which J M W Turner, who painted this part of the River, died in 1851. Lindsay House represents the oldest, of 1674, but much altered – and have an association (amongst others) with J A M Whistler, who also painted this historic River reach. Whilst much significance will be tied up in plan form and fabric, these river-facing historic properties do retain some contribution of from setting to significance.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of these assets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Conservation Area: the contribution of setting principally derives from its historic relationship with the River Thames, to which it presents its historic, finer grain scale to the verdant Chelsea | <p>Modest to moderate contribution</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>Embankment, and which allows the landmark presences of Chelsea Old Church and Crosby Hall create a picturesque historic skyline.</p> <p>2.) 91, 92, 94-94, 107-108, 109, 110, 113 & 118-119 Cheyne Walk (Grade II), including Lindsay House (Grade II*): these form a link of generally lower-rise, small scale 2-4 storey, finer grain buildings which defined the historic Battersea reach riverfront. Their common height, lively historic rooflines and quaint sense of scale afforded to this riparian frontage is the main common contribution of setting. They are also seen in association with a common lower-scale historic environment and they share a group value with the landmark Battersea and Albert Bridges.</p> <p>3.) 34-56 (east side), 27-33 (south side) and 1-26 (west side) Paulton’s Square and 37-57 and 24-36 Danvers Street: their main contribution of setting stems from their location wider contemporaneous and historic context and group value at the heart of Chelsea where it is seen in the context of a wider, finer grain historic environment of residential terraces and parades. The openness manifest in the central sequence and clean parapet lines also offers a sense of authenticity and seclusion set away from the King’s Road and Chelsea Embankment.</p> <p>4.) Chelsea Old Church: the continuity in the pre-eminence of the Old Church as a picturesque riverside landmark, with notable artistic representations. This is visible in views up and downstream and of group value when appreciated through the frame of Albert Bridge (Battersea Park) and from the acute bend of the Battersea reach.</p> | <p>to significance.</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>5.) Crosby Hall: the statement architecture of Old Crosby Hall draws significantly on its group value with a wider complementary historic environment, in particular the low-lying but picturesque Battersea and Albert Bridges and Chelsea Old Church.</p> <p>6.) Roper’s Garden and ‘Awakening’: the sense of being set-aside from the busier Embankment, with an open south-facing aspect, in a human-scaled setting, with a focus on the openness of the Thames and the enclosing landmarks of the Old Church and Crosby Hall are important. ‘Awakening’, as the centrepiece, contains a re-birth symbolism strongly tied to the open skies and the repose of its historic enclosure.</p> | |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in the Proof of Evidence. In particular from the river corridor between Chelsea Bridge and Chelsea Harbour, on the north and south side, and from its bridges. This is most apparent from between Albert and Battersea Bridge and on the north side as far as Chelsea Harbour. It is also apparent on approaches to Battersea Bridges.</p> <p>The inland impacts on Paulton’s Square and Danvers Street are apparent from across the square and street from as far back as the King’s Road. Similarly, the impact would be felt in views out of the main southern aspect of Roper’s Garden.</p> | |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • Kings Tower, 2 Bridgewater Avenue • The Moravian Tower (355 Kings Road) • Montevetro Tower <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect the significance of the Bridge. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. In wider views along the river corridor of the reach from the west this would further compound a diminishment of the Conservation Area, and its landmarks, lower-scale skyline. However, given the orientation and greater distances involved, this would be of a much less magnitude of impact of the Appeal Scheme.</p> |
| <p>Impacts</p> | <p><u>Cheyne Conservation Area:</u></p> <p>By reason of its height and scale, the Appeal Scheme would detract from the consistent, lower scale, historic riparian frontage and its skyline, diminishing the pre-eminence of its historic landmarks and detracting generally from its historic group value relationships, for example with the Battersea and Albert Bridge.</p> |

91, 92, 94-94, 107-108, 109, 110, 113 & 118-119 Cheyne Walk (Grade II), including Lindsay House (Grade II*):

By reason of its height and scale, the Appeal Scheme would detract from the almost quaint sense of a lower-scale development and finer-grain patterns of development, whilst detracting from its openness on the River. It would also diminish the group value between these and the wider historic environment on the Chelsea Embankment, including that with the landmark Battersea and Albert Bridges.

34-56 (east side), 27-33 (south side) and 1-26 (west side) Paulton's Square and 37-57 and 24-36 Danvers Street:

The Appeal Scheme, due to its height and scale, would rise above the long run of terraces on the western side of Paulton's Square / Danvers Street, diminishing its unblemished and integral parapet line, detracting from the group value of the whole ensemble.

Chelsea Old Church:

The prominent landmark status of the Church, pre-eminently marking the position of old Chelsea in sweeping riparian views, would be diminished by the assertive relative height and scale of the Appeal Scheme. This would also diminish its group value relationships, intruding on its open river aspect and the harmonious aesthetic and scale relationship with its wider riparian skyline.

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | <p><u>Crosby Hall:</u></p> <p>The relative height and scale of the Appeal Scheme would cause a substantial rupture into the wider skyline setting on the otherwise more open edge of the River which allows Crosby Hall’s picturesque wider riparian setting relationship to be read – leaving it diminished.</p> <p><u>Roper’s Garden and ‘Awakening’:</u></p> <p>The Appeal Scheme, by virtue of its undue height and scale, would perform an unduly prominent breaking of the open skyline setting of Roper’s Garden, diminishing the human scale, openness, sense of more secluded enclosure and relative scales of its landmark framing by Chelsea Old Church and Crosby Hall. It would rise either behind or near the Awakening Statue to diminish its integral big open skyline setting from the sunken garden.</p> |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> |
| <p>GLA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low to middle.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| | | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Preserved. | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. | |
| Church of St Mary (including churchyard wall and gates) (Grade I): | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | St Mary’s Church is the historic parish church of the original settlement of old Battersea Village. Dated 1775-77, by Jospeh Dixon, it is old Battersea’s premier landmark, and reminder of its origins as a smaller village by the Thames. It is a handsome parish church in the classical tradition: a classical preaching box, | Very High. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>but with a more Gothic tower, replete with belfry stage, maritime clock, urn finials and an open final stage crowned by an interesting octagonal spire and weathervane finial. Its primary elevation addresses the historic River traffic, rather than the former old Battersea Village square. It is symmetrically composed, of brick with stone dressings, and a sober tetrastyle Doric pedimented porch.</p> <p>Much of its significance is contained in its use, fabric, plan and fixtures – but some is drawn from its setting near the heart of the old village and being its surviving ancient riparian landmark. This has been much diminished by cumulative towers making what remains of setting of greater importance.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Church of St Mary (including churchyard wall and gates):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) What remains of its prominent, landmark maritime presence on the great sweep of the Chelsea-Battersea bend. This is also understood from Thames Path (south side). 2.) Appreciation of its open setting defining its immediate historic churchyard and relationship with the lower scale Battersea village. | <p>Medium contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | | |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from the Thames Path around Chelsea Waterfront and Chelsea Creek - element 1 and 2 • Views from the Thames Path (south side) from old Battersea Village riverfront - element 1 and 2. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Montevetro Tower • Sommerset Estate towers. • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>In relation to setting element 1, the Appeal Scheme, by reason of its height and scale, would accentuate and compound the existing baseline harms of the towers which now dominate and detract from landmark maritime presence of the old Church at its formal river address on the meander in the Thames reach. It would detract further from this prominence and the openness of its river setting and further diminish the sense of the low-scale historic Battersea Village.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | In views from a section of the Thames Path, around Valient House, the Appeal Scheme would intrude above the deferential rake attempt of the Montevetro Tower into open sky around the landmark spire, further diminishing its landmark presence. |
| Overall Impact Assessment | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. |
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. |
| Historic England | Not assessed. |
| Appellant | Preserved. |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – middle level. |

| <p>Royal Hospital Conservation Area, the Royal Hospital Listed Buildings (Grade I) & the Royal Hospital, Chelsea and Ranelagh Gardens Historic Park and Garden (Grade II) and the associated Chelsea Physic Garden, a Registered Park and Garden (Grade I).</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall</p> |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>At the heart of the Conservation Area are seven connected three-storey (plus garret) blocks, by seminal British architect Sir Christopher Wren, designed under Royal patronage of Charles II. Built 1682-1702, in his signature English Baroque manner - it's grand, formal ranges, symmetrically composed and aligned around avenues and set-piece squares, form the centrepiece of the Conservation Area. The buildings have a peaceful and sober dignity, of sparing ornament, befitting their original promise. It is still the home of the Chelsea Pensioner – having been established (in the vein of the Royal Naval Hospital downstream at Greenwich) to house infirm and lame former army servicemen (and now, women).</p> <p>Its extensive designed grounds extend from the King's Road, with its processional approach, the Royal Avenue, is an axis running through the heart of the Hospital to the Chelsea Embankment, on alignment with its porticos and central tower which runs through to the monumental south terrace overlooking the Thames with a broad elevated terrace and lawns which formed another processional advance from the River. These now host events, sometimes of national significance, such as the Chelsea Flower Show, which represent the deeper history of this area as semi-rural market gardens. Stables were added 1814-1824 to the west of the main Hospital ranges by renowned architect Sir John Soanne.</p> <p>The high-status and quality residential streets of the wider Conservation Area picturesquely mix the formal and informal, from the Georgian to the Victorian, often set in verdant, well treed streets. The areas spatial qualities by the River would attract artistic and other creatives in the later 19th Century. The stretch of riverside comprising the Chelsea Embankment is a Victorian civic infrastructure project of metropolitan</p> | <p>High to Very High.</p> |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>scale, which should be seen in the spirit of ennobled metropolitan beatification, moral and physical health projects.</p> <p>But the most significant remnant of this is Chelsea Physic Garden which is of enormous historical significance as a medicinal garden still in use, one of the oldest of its kind in England. Founded in 1673 by the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London, who purchased this plot with a 100m Thames frontage, and by 1679 12000 different plants were recorded from across the world. The main part of Chelsea Physic Garden is divided into four by gravel paths. The quadrants are in turn subdivided into theme areas. To the south of the main garden and running parallel to the Embankment are two shrub borders. It is a remarkable example of a physic garden in continuous use for hundreds of years.</p> <p>In all instances here, most significance is contained in its essential plan form and historic fabric, but in particular in relation to the Royal Hospital, a not significant amount of significance is drawn from setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Conservation Area and the individual assets contained therein:</p> <p>1.) In the case of the Royal Hospital, in particular, a designed and formal, functional and aesthetic relationship with the River Thames. This is read from the River, its embankments (Chelsea, Battersea Park) and from its bridges. There is also a group value with an authentic wider historic</p> | <p>Moderate to high contribution to significance.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>environment, in particular Battersea Park and the Chelsea Embankment as part of a landscape-led part of the Thames.</p> <p>2.) The palpable sense of living history and tradition in both the Royal Hospital grounds and the Chelsea Physic Garden is advanced by their distinct sense of seclusion from the wider city beyond, but also its landscape setting, in particular open orientations and aspects opposite the River Thames where they are appreciated as part of a historically open and verdant part of the River, beyond the edge of the Capital.</p> | |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from within the Royal Hospital grounds - element 2. • Views from within Chelsea Physic Garden – element 2. • Views from Chelsea Bridge – element 1 and 2. • Views from the Chelsea Embankment between Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge - element 1 and 2. | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Battersea Park (the embankment) - element 1 and 2. • Views from Albert Bridge - element 1 and 2. • Views from Battersea Bridge - element 1 and 2. • Views from Cremorne Gardens and Chelsea Waterfront - element 1 and 2. |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts.</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • The World’s End Estate Towers. • Battersea Gasholder site towers. <p>The Appellant introduced new, late evidence in relation to pipeline cumulative change which we consider would also adversely affect the significance of the Bridge. We understand this could be the Fulham Gasworks site. In wider views along the river corridor of the reach from the west this would further compound a diminishment of the open, verdant wider landscape of the river corridor which contributes to those setting elements. However, given the relative distance, this would be to a much lesser magnitude of the Appeal Scheme.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | |
| Impact | <p>The Appeal Scheme, due to its height and scale, would breach the historic skyline in views around the grounds of the Royal Hospital and Chelsea Physic Garden. This would detract from the more secluded sense of being beyond the city, diminishing their palpable sense of historic authenticity, and being in a wider landscape-led setting.</p> <p>Similarly, from outside these assets, where they are appreciated as part of that wider, open, verdant, historic landscape focused on the River Thames - the detraction caused by the height and scale of the tower would undermine that group value.</p> |
| Overall Impact Assessment | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. |
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – low to middle. |
| Historic England | Less than substantial harm – relatively low level. |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Appellant | Preserved. | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| 4, 5, 6 and 15 Cheyne Walk, Queens House (Grade II*) and Swan House and Garden Corner (Grade II*) | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | <p>This is a collection of fine, high-stature townhouses reflecting the evolution of the Chelsea Embankment as a fashionable early Georgian village on the edge of the Metropolis to denser bourgeois Victorian London suburb and retreat for local and national creative luminaries. 4, 5, 6 and 15 are of a common 1718 date and represent fine, grand examples of early Georgian brick-faced terraced in the red brick vogue (with later alterations). Their front gardens have synergy with the Chelsea Embankment and Gardens. No 4 and</p> | High to Very High. |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | <p>Queen’s House have associations with pre-Raphaelite Dante Gabriel Rossetti, illustrious author George Elliot and poet/painter Algernon Charles Swinburne.</p> <p>Swan House and Garden Corner are fine, later 19 Century mansion-style townhouses which carry the wider Victorian character of the Embankment as one of the best places in London to see the Queen Anne Revival style, associated with garden settings and ‘sweetness and light’. Contemporaneous with the Chelsea Embankment, their broad, elegant primary facades offer the river its elegant frontispiece, with big broad full height sashes and oriels windows to take in the panoramic riparian views and clean air. They have associations with seminal British architects Richard Norman Shaw and C F A Voysey.</p> <p>Despite being nearly 200 years apart, there is a architectural appearance, form, design and scale share a strong group value with Cheyne Walk, part of the Chelsea Embankment ensemble which includes Albert Bridge and Battersea Park.</p> <p>In all instances here, the bulk of significance is drawn from plan form and fabric, and to a lesser but significant degree, from the contribution of setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of</p> | <p>The following element comprises the contribution of setting to the significance of these individual assets which share a common setting:</p> | <p>Moderate contribution</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| <p>Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>1.) Their formal address of the Chelsea Embankment and that contribution to the dignified, high-stature, open and verdant River edge, offering an urbane scale as part of the Chelsea Embankment as part of the historic old Chelsea skyline.</p> | <p>to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that this element of setting is apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Chelsea Bridge. • Views from the Chelsea Embankment between Chelsea Bridge and Albert Bridge, including Cheyne Walk and Chelsea Embankment Gardens and Chelsea Physic Garden. • Views from Battersea Park (the embankment). • Views from Albert Bridge. | |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance baseline cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chelsea Waterfront East and West Towers • King’s Tower | |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The World’s End Estate Towers. |
| Impacts. | The Appeal Scheme, due to its sheer height and scale, as a dominant feature in that wider setting group value it would detract from that group value, undermining the harmonious sense of openness, scale and architectural synergy. |
| Overall Impact Assessment | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. |
| GLA | Not assessed. |
| Historic England | Not assessed. |
| Appellant | Preserved. |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Rule 6</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low to middle level.</p> | |
| <p>Westbridge Road Conservation Area and the Grade II listed buildings within the area:</p> | <p>Assessment</p> | <p>Overall</p> |
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>The significance of the Conservation Area is derived from its special character as an interesting enclave and mix of high quality, earlier Victorian terraces and villas which demonstrate the 19th Century evolution of old Battersea. There is a historic contrast between the scale of the quieter, leafier residential streets, and the step up to the historic, commercially-lined retail parade approach to Battersea Bridge – with some well-surviving shopfronts. It comprises a block contained by four streets plus facing properties on Battersea Bridge Road and Westbridge Road, with their own particular character, centred around the Victorian school. Much of that significance is drawn from its grain, pattern of development and fabric, but a not insignificant degree is drawn from setting contribution.</p> | <p>Moderate</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>2-4 Westbridge Road is one of the earlier Victorian survivals, of 1845 - comprising a striking pair of Gothic Revival homes, some of the most distinctive in the Borough – with later Medieval Gothic detailing complete with traceried windows and gables containing figurative niches, and all faced in a knapped flint. It is a bit of a medieval fantasy amidst the handsome restraint of more standard Italianate classicism. Much of significance is drawn from plan form and surviving (internal and external) fabric, but a not insignificant amount is drawn from a setting contribution.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Westbridge Road Conservation Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) A broad consistency of heights, and the more open edges of the enclosing estates, ensure a sense of the historic scale and more open and green pattern of development can be understood against open skies in most locations, keeping the scale intimate, and allowing the subtle historic sense of stepping up to the commercial Battersea Bridge Road to be read. <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the 2-4 Westbridge Road:</p> | <p>Modest-moderate contribution to significance.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>1.) Its relative scale and prominence near the important junction of Westbridge, Battersea Bridge and Parkgate Road give its architectural panache an open architectural expression and contrast.</p> <p>2.) Its unfettered gabled skyline presence, and the consistent scale, but divergent styles, of its lower-scale, finer grain historic setting, draws on its unique architectural expression.</p> | |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westbridge Road; • Battersea Bridge Road; • Parkgate Road. | |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>The surrounding 20th estates have fragmented and undermined its wider setting somewhat, namely the Sommerset and Surrey Lane Estates and the Montevetro Tower.</p> | |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>In relation to setting element 1, the broad west and south elevations of the Appeal scheme, including the massive 10 storey landside part, would be an unprecedented and alien height and scale in this finer grain, almost quaint domesticity of</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>the Conservation Area. It would loom over views from Westbridge Road, Battersea Church Road and from Battersea Bridge Roads, at the core of the Conservation Area. That consistency of heights, proportions and scales and open skyline which keeps the scale intimate would be diminished in key views where the Appeal scheme would be unduly dominant. That subtle stepping up in the spatial hierarchy to Battersea Bridge Road would be diminished.</p> <p>In relation to 2-4 Westbridge Road, from around the junction of Westbridge, Battersea Bridge and Parkgate Roads, the sheer height and scale of the Appeal Scheme would dominate and detract from its prominence (setting element 1). It would rupture and dominate the prevailing historic scale and grain which forms of important context, whilst, it is assumed (based on the ZTV), that on approach from Westbridge Road, the Appeal Scheme’s 29 storey element, would impinge its skyline silhouette and diminish its unique architectural expression.</p> |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – middle level.</p> |
| <p>GLA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------|
| Historic England | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| Appellant | Preserved. | |
| The Boltons Conservation Area (RBKC): | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | <p>The bulk of the Boltons Conservation Area was developed between 1850 and 1876, largely in a textbook or flamboyant Italianate manner, which was flourishing in this part of west London. It contains two architectural set pieces: The Boltons and Redcliffe Square which both focus on churches. It has a tight knit urban form, contrasting with more open areas, with broadly consistent rooflines and containing many fine Victorian and Edwardian buildings of a consistent height with their rooflines. Much of this good-sized conservation area’s significance is drawn from its innate grain, pattern of development and surviving fabric, but a modest amount is drawn from a setting contribution.</p> | High. |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following elements comprise the contribution of setting to the significance of the Boltons Conservation Area:</p> <p>1.) Views out from the Conservation Area which place it in its wider Georgian and Victorian context in which there are strong synergies of architectural expression, consistency of heights and scales, with lower buildings set around landmark churches. This reflects the explosion in growth of this part of inner west London in the 19th Century.</p> | <p>Low to moderate contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>It is considered that these elements of setting are apparent in the following viewing areas addressed in this Proof of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Park Walk, south. | |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>In this instance cumulative harms stem from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Moravian Tower. | |
| <p>Impacts</p> | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>The Appeal Scheme would be visible in views out of the Conservation Area south and into the Chelsea Park / Carlyle Conservation Area along Park Walk. The proposed tower would appear at odds with historic skyline and would add to the harm caused by the Moravian Tower on the skyline. It would erode the harmonious heights and skyline composition of the foreground / middle ground historic terraces and diminish the landmark presence and group value with the Church of St Andrew (Grade II). This would undermine the common historic setting of the Conservation Area which places it in a wider historic environment.</p> | |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> | |
| <p>GLA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> | |
| <p>Historic England</p> | <p>Not addressed.</p> | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|--|----------------|
| Appellant | Not assessed. | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| Chelsea Park / Carlyle Conservation Area (RBKC). | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | <p>This is a large, peaceful and often lush residential ‘oasis’ framed and in contrast to the north by the relative commercial bustle and parades of the King’s Road and Fulham Road. It displays a true variety, and several high-quality and set-piece examples of London residential typologies: ranging from the late Georgian to the inter-war and even later. This includes some modest and good examples of late Georgian brick-faced terraces on Park Walk, to some fine, planned set-piece inter-war arts and crafts / neo-Georgian between there and Beaufort Street, and the later Victorian/Edwardian Queen Anne mansion block elsewhere. Some set-piece townscape ensembles survive well, for example Carlyle Square, named after the eminent local historian, a garden square ensemble providing urban relief, and an early Victorian speculation with its</p> | High. |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| | <p>composed, paired Italianate villas with classical porches. The Church of St Andrew forms the only place of worship and is a landmark skyline presence as identified in the Area Appraisal (Fig 4.1, CD5.23).</p> <p>This pleasing variety is assisted by a high-quality, often verdant streetscape, broadly consistent proportions, finer-grain harmoniously scaled and intricate skyline which survive with a good level of authenticity and integrity.</p> <p>Whilst much of this significance is intrinsic, over a larger area, inherent in its plan and built form, it does draw a lesser, but not insignificant contribution from setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The Applicant acknowledges the contribution of setting stemming from a commensurate common historic setting, surrounded by other conservation areas forming historic Chelsea. We expand on this to be specific about which elements contribute to significance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wider historic urban context of the conservation area, with its parallel of grain, heights, forms and expressions, often read as part of a consistent skyline, and in views through and out of the Conservation Area such as those from Beaufort Street and out over Carlyle Square identified in the Area Appraisal (Fig 4.1), which face towards the River to the south. | <p>Lower to moderate.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The skyline presence of landmarks such as St Andrew’s Church, the sole place of worship in the Conservation Area, as the Area Appraisal notes: ‘the lower rooflines allow the spire of St Andrew’s Church to make an important contribution to the skyline’ (3.8, CD5.23). | |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>The Appellant states that invisibility with the Appeal Scheme would only stem from ‘one specific viewing position looking out of the CA’ (BHTVIA, 8.45, CD 1.02). This is not true, even by its own evidence. The ZTV shows visibility from much of Carlyle Square, Old Church Street, Beaufort Street, Park Walk, from The Vale and Chelsea Park Gardens. In terms of what we can understand from the BHTVIA, it would be visible in views from Beauford Street; Park Walk and Carlyle Square.</p> | |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>The Moravian Tower detracts from the setting of the Conservation Area, in particular in views from Park Walk.</p> | |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>The Appeal Scheme, by reason of its height and scale, would breach consistent, historic parapet/ridgelines on Park Walk, diminishing their historic authenticity and integrity, their self-contained sense of scale, and dilute the landmark skyline presence of the Church of St Andrew and its group value.</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>From Carlyle Square, in views out and across much of its north and east side, the Appeal Scheme would breach the wider historic skyline which helps enclose it, diminishing that wider historic environments contribution to its authenticity and integrity.</p> <p>From the long extent of Beaufort Street, on near alignment with the site on approach to Battersea Bridge, even at a further distance , on its slender edge – the relative height and scale of the Appeal Scheme would draw significantly away from the consistent, finer grain historic scale and skyline of the foreground. That the Appellant notes it would read differently or even mark a boundary between Wandsworth and RBKC is irrelevant to this diminishment of elements of setting to significance.</p> |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | |
| <p>LPA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> |
| <p>GLA</p> | <p>Less than substantial harm – low level.</p> |
| <p>Historic England</p> | <p>Not addressed.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| | | |
| Appellant | Preserved (ie no harm). | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| Church of St Andrew (Grade II) | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | <p>Late gothic revival church, 1912-13, of red brick and ashlar stone, attributed to noted architect Arthur Blomfield, replacing an earlier 18th Century chapel, but consecrated by the Bishop of London prior to the outbreak of the First World War. It comprises of nave (with aisles), chancel, narthex with tall and traceried roof and clerestory. Its near detached bell tower and broach spire with pinnacles is a symbolic parish skyline marker.</p> <p>Much of its significance is intrinsic, in its plan form and fittings which form part of its core mission, but also how this relates to its external expression. However, it also draws on setting for significance.</p> | High. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance. Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>The following elements contribute to the setting and thus significance of the asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its striking skyline presence, on a prominent junction, which soars and transcends its commensurably lower historic environment, with which it shares an architectural and historic relationship at the heart of the parish. • Its churchyard and how this embeds itself in an open and green historic streetscene. | <p>Moderate contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts</p> | <p>Its preeminent skyline presence has been eroded by the incursion of the Moravian Tower on its silhouette and sky space.</p> | |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>The Appeal Scheme, due to its height and scale, would further the intrusion of the Moravia Tower into the skyline presence of the tower and spire and diminish the integrity of its group value with its lower-scale historic environment. This would take place in views from Park Walk on approach from as north as Fulham Road.</p> | |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------|
| | | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| GLA | Not assessed. | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Not assessed. | |
| Rule 6 | Unclear at time of writing. | |
| Hyde Park Registered Historic Park and Garden | Assessment | Overall |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>(Grade I) & Royal Parks Conservation Area.</p> | | |
| <p>Heritage Significance.</p> | <p>The significance of the Royal Parks includes Hyde Park, St James Park, Green Park, Buckingham Palace Gardens and Kensington Gardens. The Parks are a product of the picturesque landscape tradition of the mid 18th Century to mid 19th Century; are dominated by their lakes, wooded paths, avenues and informal planting. Much of its significance is innate, in its form and fabric, but its open prevalence in the heart of the historic west end draws on a contribution of setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The following element contributes to the setting and thus significance of the assets:</p> <p>1.) The generally open setting of the parks landscape and views to the surrounding historic environment.</p> | <p>Moderate contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>From around the junction with Exhibition Road.</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Cumulative Impacts | None identified. | |
| Impacts. | The Appeal Scheme (Figure 11.11 of the submitted BHTVIA) would rise prominently into an otherwise consistent open skyline in a prominent threshold vista out from West Carriageway Drive, looking south into the heart of ‘Albertopolis’: the world-famous South Kensington museum quarter. Its prominent rise on the street axis would draw away from the Park’s open setting, harming that aspect of setting contributing to significance. | |
| Overall Impact Assessment | | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| GLA | Less than substantial harm – very low. | |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------|
| Historic England | Not addressed. | |
| Appellant | Not assessed. | |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| Three Sisters Conservation Area | Assessment | Overall |
| Heritage Significance. | The Conservation Area forms a distinct enclave of period Battersea residential grid made up of predominantly paired suburban villas and a few detached houses from the 1860/70s. There is, in general, a more open, spacious and leafy character of broad streets and back gardens as a result of generous streets, open gardens and glimpses of verdant rear gardens and hipped or generally recessive roofs. A degree of high Victorian variety exists within a generally harmonious scale and skyline. | Moderate. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Much of this significant is inherent in its surviving plan and built form and much less from a relationship with setting which has been much reduced, most strikingly, by its abrupt relationship with the towers of the Surrey Lane Estate which loom in a number of vistas through the Conservation Area.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>The Appellant states (BHTVIA, para 5.67) that the Conservation Area draws no contribution at all from setting, in conclusion to a basic description of that setting. We contest this.</p> <p>Our view is the following elements contribute to the setting and thus significance of the asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long and open vistas, in particular those N-S, through and out of its grid of streets add to its bright, open and airy spatial character and consistent skyline. • Its contrast with the denser period terraces to the south, forming part of wider Battersea’s historic evolution in the Victorian period. This is apparent in views from the southern end of the Conservation Area. | <p>Modest contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>The BHTVIA ZTV shows extended visibility of the Appeal Scheme up its north south roads which make that modest contribution of setting to significance. The BHTVIA includes no representative views from the Conservation Area.</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| Cumulative Impacts. | As discussed, as a baseline the Surrey Lane and Sommerset and Estate towers have significantly undermined the contribution of setting to significance in views across and out to the north. | |
| Impacts. | It is apparent that in locations the tower would further erode the open skyline backdrop setting of this enclave, both from within and on approach from the south. The Appeal Scheme, albeit at greater distance, due to its height and scale, would compound the cumulative harms of the Surrey Lane Estate towers in diminishing the integrity and authenticity of this cogent period piece. It would detract from its harmonious sense of open, airy spaciousness in those long vistas across and out of the Conservation Area. | |
| Overall Impact Assessment | | |
| LPA | Less than substantial harm – low level. | |
| GLA | Stated it was not able to assess. | |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Historic England | Not addressed. |
| Appellant | Not assessed. The Appellant scoped this Conservation Area out of assessment. |
| Rule 6 | Less than substantial harm – low level. |

| | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Non-Designated Heritage Assets | | |
| 10-14, 24-52 Westbridge Road. | Assessment | Overall Significance |
| Heritage Significance. | | Moderate local |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| | <p>At the heart of what the Area Appraisal refers to as ‘the most varied and interesting group in the area’ is 10-14 and 24-52 Westbridge Road. 10-14 reflects a three-storey c.1860 terrace, a handsome short run of polite Italianate stock brick and stucco over basements with mature trees in the front garden.</p> <p>24-52 is a more varied run of c.1840s villas in either the Gothic the classical manner, with gabled, hipped, and mansard slate roofs, united in their human-scale variety by a common language, pattern and roofscape. These represent some of the earliest Victorian expansion around Old Battersea village. Their generous front and rear gardens still hark back to the open and verdant nature of early suburbanisation.</p> <p>Much of their significance is intrinsic and contained in fabric, form and expression, but some significance is also drawn from its relationship to setting.</p> | |
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>We broadly agree with the Appellant’s assessment of setting contribution set out the BHTVIA (para 5.306). In our summary, that element of setting is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared architectural and historic relationship with a surviving historic, finer-grained, open, leafy, human-scaled pattern of development which marks the Victorian expansion of old Battersea, with its subtle stepping up towards the main historic bridge approach on Battersea Bridge Road. | <p>Moderate</p> |
| | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| Scope of impacts. | Impacts are apparent on approach from Westbridge Road and the junction with Battersea Bridge Road and Parkgate Road. | |
| Cumulative Impacts. | Their setting contribution has been diminished in baseline by the wider fragmentation and scale contrast with the Sommerset / Surrey Lane Estates and the Montevetro Tower. | |
| Impacts. | The Appeal Scheme, namely its sheer height and scale in the near distance, would further rupture the integrity and authenticity of its skyline, detract from that historic pattern of development, its common architectural and historic group value. | |
| Overall Impact Assessment | | |
| LPA | Moderate harm. | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| GLA | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Preserved (ie no harm). | |
| 52-68 Battersea Bridge Road. | Assessment | Overall Local Significance |
| Heritage Significance. | <p>52-56 is a three-storey shop terrace of stock brick with stucco window surrounds and simple cornice of c.1860. Nos.58-68 (c.1840) are three storey terraced villas with hipped slate roofs, also of stock brick with gauged arches. Later, characterful, and some good surviving historic shopfronts survives in this historic retail parade.</p> <p>Much of that significance is innate, in their historic fabric and expression, but draws some significance from setting.</p> | Moderate. |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance.</p> | <p>We broadly agree with the Appellant’s assessment of setting contribution set out the BHTVIA (para 5.306). In our summary, that element of setting is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A shared architectural and historic relationship with a surviving historic, finer-grained pattern of development around the historic Battersea bridgehead and its common relationship, and subtle contrast with, the leafier, more open residential historic streets running off the main approach. | <p>Moderate contribution to significance.</p> |
| <p>Scope of impacts.</p> | <p>Impacts are apparent on from Battersea Bridge Road and around junction with Westbridge / Parkgate Roads.</p> | |
| <p>Cumulative Impacts.</p> | <p>Their setting contribution has been diminished in baseline by the wider fragmentation and scale contrast with the Sommerset / Surrey Lane Estates.</p> | |
| <p>Impacts.</p> | <p>The Appeal Scheme, by reason of its sheer height and scale in closer range views, would result in a substantial rupturing of the local skyline setting, detracting from the historic skyline, scale, hierarchy and general pattern of development.</p> | |
| <p>Overall Impact Assessment.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|
| LPA | Moderate harm. | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |
| GLA | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Preserved (ie no harm). | |
| 11-35, 61-71 Battersea Church Road. | Assessment | Overall Significance |
| Heritage Significance. | Battersea Church Road is comprised predominantly of terraces of earlier Victorian workers' cottages, a vestige of nearby industry. Some these are humble 2-3 (with garret) storeys of brick and stucco, behind | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>charming front gardens. They are united by the common period architectural forms and expressions in a long terrace run on approach and stepping up to Battersea Bridge Road as a local historic street pattern.</p> <p>Much of that significance is innate, in their historic fabric, as much of its once historic and industrial setting has been lost and incrementally eroded. However, it still draws on a setting contribution.</p> | |
| Contribution of Elements of Setting to Significance. | <p>Our view is the following elements contribute to the setting and thus significance of the assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its relationship | Moderate contribution to significance. |
| Scope of impacts. | Impacts from Battersea Church Road. | |
| Cumulative Impacts. | Their setting contribution has been diminished by the wider fragmentation and scale contrast with the Sommerset and Surrey Lane Estates and the Montevetro Tower which has, in part, cut them off from the heart of old Battersea village. | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Impacts. | On approach from Battersea Church Road, which connects, physically and visually, these humble and domestically-scaled survivors of older, later industrial Battersea, the height and scale of the Appeal Scheme would dominate and overwhelm their common scaling, further diminishing their relationship with the historic pattern of development in old Battersea. It would compound the existing harms. | |
| Overall Impact Assessment | | |
| LPA | Moderate harm. | |
| Historic England | Not assessed. | |
| GLA | Not assessed. | |
| Appellant | Preserved (ie no harm). | |

END