

# 2A BUILT HERITAGE

## Introduction

- 2A.1 This chapter of the ES Addendum assesses the potential impacts and likely effects of the amended proposed development on built heritage at the site and within the study area. Consideration has also been given to the likely effects on three additional views as requested by the LBH post-submission of the application.
- 2A.2 The updated and additional assessment examines whether the amended proposed development would result in different conclusions to those of the built heritage assessment set out in the September 2020 ES.
- 2A.3 The updated and additional assessments presented in this ES Addendum should be read in conjunction with Chapter 2: Built Heritage of September 2020 ES Volume 2 and its accompanying appendix, as well as Appendix 2.2A to this Addendum.

## Methodology

- 2A.4 In respect of national and local legislation and policy, there have been no changes of relevance to the assessment since the September 2020 ES was completed.
- 2A.5 In respect of regional policy, it is noted that the Mayor of London formerly approved the Publication London Plan on 21 December 2020 and submitted it to the SoS. The Publication London Plan does not introduce any new matters for consideration in this updated built heritage assessment.
- 2A.6 As part of the post submission consultations with LBH Officers, three further representative views were selected for assessment to address comments from Historic England and the Kew Society. The detailed visual assessments and accompanying AVRs/non-verified computer generated visualisation are presented in Appendix 1.9 of the TVHIA Addendum. The built heritage assessment of the three additional views is presented within Appendix 2.2A of this Addendum.
- 2A.7 The assessment scope, baseline characterisation method and assessment methods remain valid for this updated built heritage assessment.
- 2A.8 The assessment criteria, assumptions and limitations remain valid for this updated built heritage assessment.

## Baseline Conditions

- 2A.9 The existing and future baseline conditions and sensitive receptors described in the September 2020 ES remain valid for this built heritage assessment.
- 2A.10 The previously established sensitivity of the built heritage receptors remains as set out within the September 2020 ES.

## Assessment of Effects

### Demolition and Construction Effects

- 2A.11 The proposed amendments of relevance to this assessment (Block J and the increased distance from the Oaklands Avenue homes, a minor amendment to Block F, options related to the bus route, as well as the flexibility introduced in the location of the mobility hub (previously referred to as Block K)) and amended

proposed development as a whole, would not alter the demolition and construction effects on built heritage receptors as reported in the September 2020 ES.

- 2A.12 The nature of the amended proposed development does not alter the relationship of demolition and construction effects and the built heritage assets being assessed in any meaningful way.
- 2A.13 The additional three views that have been modelled and assessed would not alter the previously reported conclusions in respect of all heritage receptors.

### Completed Development Effects

- 2A.14 The proposed amendments of relevance to this assessment (Block J and the increased distance from the Oaklands Avenue homes, a minor amendment to Block F, options related to the bus route, as well as the flexibility introducing in the location of the mobility hub (previously referred to as Block K)) and amended proposed development as a whole, would not alter the completed development effects on built heritage receptors as reported in as reported and illustrated in Table 2.7 the September 2020 ES.
- 2A.15 The nature of the amended proposed development does not alter the relationship of completed development effects and the built heritage assets being assessed in any meaningful way.
- 2A.16 Having applied the Methodology to the additional three views that have been modelled and assessed, it has been concluded that these views would not alter the overall conclusions on the heritage significance of heritage receptors as a whole as presented in Table 2.8 of the September 2020 ES.
- 2A.17 In regard to the Royal Botanic Garden Kew WHS, the negligible visibility from the amended proposed development makes no material difference to the ability to understand and appreciate the historic context setting of Kew. Therefore, the overall assessment conclusions for Kew remain unchanged as indirect, **Negligible Neutral**.
- 2A.18 In regard to Syon House, the 'Canaletto view' of Syon and the slight visibility was covered in paragraph 2.103 of the Heritage Statement. The change from the three additional views is none and negligible. Therefore, it is confirmed that the previous assessment remains unchanged at indirect, **Minor-Neutral**.

## Assessment of Residual Effects

- 2A.19 The residual effects for each stage of the amended proposed development, as reported in the September 2020 ES remain valid.
- 2A.20 The nature of the amended proposed development does not alter the relationship of residual development effects and the built heritage assets being assessed in any meaningful way.
- 2A.21 No further mitigation or enhancement is proposed as part of this updated assessment.

## Summary of Residual Effects

- 2A.22 The summary residual effects as reported and illustrated in Table 2.8 of the September 2020 ES remain valid.

## Cumulative Effects

- 2A.23 The residual effects for the amended proposed development as a whole remain unchanged for the intra-cumulative assessment as presented in Chapter 12: Cumulative Effects of the September 2020 ES.

2A.24 As no new cumulative schemes have been identified, the inter-project cumulative effects as reported in the September 2020 ES, remain valid.

## Summary of Assessment

2A.25 This updated assessment has reviewed the potential above ground built heritage effects due to the demolition and construction stage and completed development stage of the amended proposed development. Assessment has been undertaken in line with the methodology set-out in the September 2020 ES.

2A.26 It is concluded that no material change would be brought about by the amended proposed development in any of the effects as described in Chapter 2: Built Heritage of September 2020 ES Volume 2 and therefore all conclusions remain unchanged.

# **Technical Appendix 2.2A: Additional Views Heritage Impact Assessment**

Tesco, Osterley: Assessment of additional views taken from inside the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew World Heritage Site

Contents

The Purpose of this report.....	1
Additional views.....	1
<i>Old Isleworth Gate (view 26)</i> .....	1
<i>Thames Path (view 27)</i> .....	2
<i>Kew Gardens, Woodland Walk (view 28)</i> .....	2
Summary of baseline and sensitive receptors .....	2
Summary of effects.....	2
Conclusion .....	2

December 2020

The Purpose of this report

- 1 This addendum to the Heritage Statement ('HS') and to Chapter 3: Built Heritage ('ES') prepared in September 2020 (Application reference P/2020/3100), has been prepared in response to a request by Hounslow Council to further assess the likely significant effects of the Development primarily on the setting of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew from three additional viewpoints within the World Heritage Site. This addendum should be read in conjunction the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment ('TVIA').
- 2 The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew is a UNESCO World Heritage Site and is listed Grade I on the National Heritage List of Parks and Gardens. The gardens fall within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames' 'Royal Botanic Gardens' Conservation Area.

Additional views

- 3 The three additional views and their sensitivities are described and assessed in detail in the TVIA Addendum. The views are:  
*Old Isleworth Gate (view 26)*
- 4 Situated behind the viewpoint is the Grade II listed 'Isleworth Drawbridge And Ferry Gate' (List Entry Number: 1251963). This is an early to mid-19th century cast-iron drawbridge and gate which was possibly used for boats ferrying passengers to Syon House opposite. This feature is no longer operational. It is not publicly accessible and no longer provides access into the Royal Botanic Gardens. There is a view from here towards Syon House and its grounds.

*Thames Path (view 27)*

- 5 This viewpoint, sometimes referred to as the 'Canaletto view' references a 1749 painting by Canaletto (Giovanni Antonio Canal, 1697-1768) which is a view of Syon House from the south east, taken from a point on the eastern tow path of the River Thames. The view in the painting is acknowledged to be very approximate with the perspective and distance distorted so as to position the viewer much closer to Syon House than is physically possible. There is a view from this point towards Syon House and its grounds.

*Kew Gardens, Woodland Walk (view 28)*

- 6 This is a managed woodland area within the Royal Botanic Gardens, on its western boundary parallel to the River Thames. The river and landscape beyond, are screened from view at this point by foliage.

Summary of baseline and sensitive receptors

- 7 Baseline conditions: No changes have been made to the established Baseline Condition since the September 2020 HS (Chapter 3: the heritage significance of the site and its surroundings) and ES (paragraphs 2.54-2.64) were undertaken.
- 8 Sensitive receptors: No changes have been made to the established Sensitive Receptors since the September 2020 HS (Chapter 3: the heritage significance of the site and its surroundings) and ES (paragraphs 2.65-2.90) were undertaken

Summary of effects

- 9 Assessment of Effects: No changes have been made to the conclusion of the Assessment of Effects on the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, both during demolition and construction and for the completed Development since the September 2020 HS (Chapter 5: The proposed development and its effect and Chapter 7: Summary and conclusions) and ES (paragraphs 2.91-2.128) were undertaken.
- 10 Residual Effects: No changes have been made to the conclusion of the Assessment of Residual Effects on the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, both during demolition and construction and for the completed Development since the September 2020 HS and ES (paragraphs 2.107-2.112) were undertaken.
- 11 Cumulative Effects: No changes have been made to the conclusion of the Assessment of Cumulative Effects on the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, since the September 2020 HS and ES (paragraphs 2.113-2.119) were undertaken.

Conclusion

- 12 Having carried out the Assessment of Effects (including Residual and Cumulative) during demolition and construction and for the completed Development, as described in the Methodology of the ES (paragraphs 2.5-2.53); it is the conclusion of this report that no new effect upon the significance of any previously identified heritage assets - and specifically the Royal Botanic Garden, Kew - has been discovered from assessing the three additional viewpoints, over and above those effects already described in the Heritage Statement and

Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement. Therefore, it remains the case that there is no level of harmful effect from the Development upon the significance of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew World Heritage Site and Grade I listed Park and Garden.

**KMHeritage**

72 Pymers Mead  
London SE21 8NJ  
T: 020 8670 9057  
F: 0871 750 3557

[mail@kmheritage.com](mailto:mail@kmheritage.com)  
[www.kmheritage.com](http://www.kmheritage.com)

© 2020