

8. TOWNSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS

Introduction

- 8.1. This chapter of the ES assesses the likely significant effects of the Development on the environment in respect of townscape and visual effects.

Policy Context

- 8.2. Key legislation, planning policy and guidance considerations relevant to the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) are summarised below; further detail is provided in Appendix 8.1.

National Planning Policy Frameworkⁱ

- 8.3. The NPPF promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, with paragraphs 124-132 focusing on achieving well-designed spaces and seeking to promote good design of the built environment. Paragraph 130 states that development should be refused if it fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Planning Practice Guidanceⁱⁱ

- 8.4. The PPG which sits alongside the NPPF, supports the use of landscape character assessment as a tool for understanding local distinctiveness and Natural England's guidance on landscape character assessment. It includes guidance on character and visual matters within its design category section.
- 8.5. The National Design Guideⁱⁱⁱ has been produced to set out the characteristics of well-designed places and determines what good design means in practice. It builds on paragraph 130 of the NPPF requirement to avoid development of poor design and forms part of the government's collection of planning practice guidance. The guide states that "*well-designed places have individual characteristics which work to create its physical character*" and establishes ten characteristics to nurture and sustain a sense of community. Of particular relevance to undertaking this assessment is the characteristics 'Context' and 'Identity'.

- 8.6. Paragraph 38 under the Context characteristic states:

"An understanding of the context, history and the cultural characteristics of a site, neighbourhood and region influences the location, siting and design of new developments. It means they are well grounded in their locality and more likely to be acceptable to existing communities."

8.7. Paragraph 49 under the Identity characteristic states:

"The identity or character of a place comes from the way that buildings, streets and spaces, landscape and infrastructure combine together and how people experience them. It is not just about the buildings or how a place looks, but how it engages with all of the senses. Local character makes places distinctive."

Regional Planning Policy

London Plan

8.8. The London Plan^{iv} was adopted in 2011 and there have been alterations culminating in the 2016 consolidated Plan.

8.9. Policy 7.1(D) – 'Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities' states that the design of all new buildings and the spaces they create should help reinforce or enhance the character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of the neighbourhood. This is reinforced with Policy 7.4 – 'Local Character', which states that:

"development should have regard to the context of the area and scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings... development should build on the positive aspects of an area where character is ill-defined in order to contribute to establishing an enhanced character for the future function of the area."

8.10. London Plan Policy 7.7 – 'Tall and Large Buildings' requires that *"Tall and large buildings should be part of a plan-led approach to changing or developing an area by the identification of appropriate, sensitive and inappropriate locations... should not have an unacceptably harmful impact on their surroundings ... should only be considered in areas whose character would not be affected adversely by the scale, mass or bulk of a tall or large building... should not impact on local or strategic views adversely"*

8.11. London Plan Policies 7.11 and 7.12 concern the London View Management Framework which identifies a list of strategic views designated by the Mayor and requires that all new development should:

"be assessed for its impact on the designated view if it falls within the foreground, middle ground or background of that view...New development should not harm, and where possible should make a positive contribution to, the characteristics and composition of the strategic views and their landmark elements."

Intend to Publish London Plan 2019

8.12. The Intend to Publish (ItP) London Plan (2019)^v is a material consideration in planning decisions. Policy SD1: 'Opportunity Areas' of the draft London Plan designates the Great West Corridor, within which the Site is located, as a London Opportunity Area.

8.13. 'Policy D3: Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach' recognises that development design should be undertaken in regard to quality and character:

"11) respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute towards the local character"

"12) be of high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail, and gives thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan through appropriate construction methods and the use of attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well."

8.14. Draft Policy D8: 'Tall Buildings' states that tall buildings should be part of a plan-led approach and that local authorities should identify in Development Plans locations where tall buildings are appropriate in principle and indicate general building heights that would be appropriate.

8.15. Draft Policy HC3: 'Strategic and Local Views' and Policy HC4: 'London View Management Framework', consider development proposals within both strategic and borough views.

GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG

8.16. The GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG (2014)^{vi} sets out an approach and process to help understand the character and context of a place to help inform the planning and design process and to guide change in a way which is responsive to individual places and locations.

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew World Heritage Site Management Plan

8.17. The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew World Heritage Site Management Plan (2020-2025)^{vii} sets out a framework for the management of the World Heritage Site (WHS) to ensure conservation

of its Outstanding Universal Value and defines a buffer zone for the WHS.

8.18. Appendix D of the Royal Botanic Gardens World Heritage Site Management Plan considers the setting of the WHS. Figure 4 of the plan identifies formal or designed views and vistas, none of which are directly orientated towards the Site. Figure 5 goes onto establish present day views out which includes the following views that are oriented towards the Site:

- Syon Vista; and
- Unnamed Gate.

8.19. Although it acknowledges that the experiences of the Royal Botanic Gardens landscape as a kinetic experience, Figure 6 of the Royal Botanic Gardens World Heritage Site Management Plan establishes the Syon Vista Terraces as an open pocket of space that illustrates the visual connections between the Royal Botanic Gardens Syon Park and the River Thames.

Thames Landscape Strategy

8.20. The Thames Landscape Strategy^{viii} is a 100-year blueprint and landscape strategy for the River Thames between Hampton and Kew and it identifies vistas between the river's landmarks, two of which are relevant to the Site.

London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan

8.21. Adopted in September 2015, the London Borough of Hounslow's (LBH) Local Plan (2015-2030)^{ix} contains detailed policies to be used by decision makers considering development proposals for the use of land and building in the borough. Of particular relevance to this assessment are Policy SC4 – Scale and density of new housing development; Policy CC1 Context and Character; Policy CC2 - Urban Design and Architecture; Policy CC3 Tall Buildings; and Policy CC4 - Heritage.

8.22. Policy SV1 – Great West Corridor Plan commits LBH to work with residents and stakeholders to explore and identify the potential capacity for additional employment-led mixed-use development along the Great West Corridor.

Draft Great West Corridor Local Plan Review

- 8.23. To fulfil the objective of LBH Local Plan Policy SV1 - Great West Corridor Plan, LBH have prepared the draft LBH Great West Corridor Local Plan Review^x which contains draft policies GWC5: Design and Heritage and P1.
- 8.24. Draft Policy GWC5 requires that development contributes to a strong sense of place and identity for the Great West Corridor (GWC) through a strong urban design-led approach which protects and enhances heritage assets within the Corridor and in the wider area around it and responds to the area's sensitive heritage locations and important views. Draft Policy P1 states that development which responds to the area's sensitive heritage locations and important views, delivers design excellence and contributes positively to creating a strong sense of place will be supported. The design of tall buildings will be required to be of an exemplary standard and follow the criteria set out in the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xi} and Policy GWC5.
- 8.25. The GWC Local Plan Review is supported by the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xii} and the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study Appendix: Views Testing^{xiii}. The GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xiv} establishes a visual and spatial framework for the GWC which will allow the renaissance of the Great West Corridor as a modern employment hub and attractive place to work, live and visit. The GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xv} envisages the establishment of Seven Quarters, each with its own distinct role and character; the Site is located within the Golden Miles Station Quarter.
- 8.26. The GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xvi} provides a height framework which tests the height of new buildings in the GWC and considers the potential impact on heritage assets, both within the corridor and beyond. This is supported by the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study Appendix: Views Testing^{xvii} which identifies and tests a range of views and specifically looks at the impact tall buildings could have on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.

Legislative Context

- 8.27. The European Landscape Convention (ELC) provides a basis for closer co-operation on landscape issues across Europe and was signed and ratified in the UK. This recognition of landscape matters raises their profile and the ELC has been set out to improve approaches to the planning, management and protection of landscapes throughout Europe.
- 8.28. The ELC defines landscape as "*an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors*" and it includes 'townscape', as well as all forms of rural landscape.

Technical Standards and Guidance

- 8.29. The chapter is based on the methodology set out in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition, 2013 (GLVIA3)^{xviii} and An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment^{xix}.
- 8.30. The GLVIA3^{xx} was written in collaboration between the Landscape Institute (LI) and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) and was published in April 2013. It emphasises that this type of assessment has two interlinked elements: landscape, as a resource; and visual amenity, including views. The effects of both must be addressed within the TVIA. It provides detailed advice on the process of assessing the townscape and visual effects of developments and their significance.
- 8.31. An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment^{xxi} provides guidance on preparing character assessments and establishes approaches to desk-top and field studies. It recognises the importance of capturing the combination of elements that make a particular contribution to creating a distinctive character.

Assessment Methodology

Consultation

- 8.32. Table 8.1 summarises the consultation responses in regard to townscape and visual matters.

Table 8.1: Consultation Response Summary

Consultee (Date) and Comment summarised	Response
Consultation with Shane Baker at LBH regarding the representative views selection on 18th July 2019, 12th August 2019 and 13th August 2019, including responses from Shane since then. (Appendix 8.4)	
LBH commented on an initial representative view selection as part of the 2 nd Pre-application response letter, dated 6 th June 2019 regarding discounting a view from Gunnersbury Cemetery and including a view from near Gunnersbury Park Bowling Club and at the junction of the Great West Road (GWR) and Jersey Road.	The representative view from Gunnersbury Cemetery was removed and a representative view from the GWR and Jersey Road included (Representative view 24). Consideration was given to the provision of a representative view from the north-east of the Bowling Club pavilion. Visibility was not possible due to the construction plant associated with the new sports pavilion screening views from this area. Overall it was considered that the Development, if visible, is likely to be read behind Great West House, 1000 GWR and GSK building.
LBH EIA Scoping Opinion (15th October 2019) (Appendix 2.2)	
The proposed assessment methodology and scope of the TVIA is agreed.	The TVIA follows the approach set out in the EIA scoping report (Appendix 2.1).

A detailed explanation of the methodology used to produce any visual representations of the proposal within the townscape is required.	The full methodology used to produce the Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) is provided in Appendix 8.5.
For longer distance landscape views it is recommended that the methodology considers the Landscape Institute's guidance for Visual Representations of Development Proposals – TGN 06/91. Tilt-Shift lenses should only be used when the standard range of lenses have been ruled out due to the verticality of the development. In particular, any Actual Visual Representations should be annotated to ensure that it is clear what lens was used for the photography and if the images have been cropped or the photographer has applied tilt, vertical rise or horizontal shift during the taking of the shot. As such Images produced with the tilt shift should be stated as such and be presented with clear markings on the image to identify the point of perspective.	For each Representative View shown in Appendix 8.3 a standard lens has been used for all views excluding the immediate viewpoint 1. For this viewpoint a vertical shift lens has been used to ensure that the whole of the Development is accommodated within the view. All AVRs are annotated with clear markings to identify the point of perspective. The approach to preparing the AVRs are set out within Appendix 8.5 and include a reference to the type of lens used. For reference the immediate viewpoint 1 is provided with a central horizon in Appendix 8.6. This AVR does not alter the findings of the assessment set out in Appendix 8.3.
One additional viewpoint had been identified as needing to be reviewed to determine if further assessment is needed (Deer Park close the Kew Observatory (view towards the Site)). Further assessment has been undertaken which confirms the Development would not be visible from this location. Details of the assessment that demonstrates no further work is necessary should be included within the EIA.	Representative view 18 set out in Appendix 8.3 overlooks the public accessible area of the Old Deer Park and illustrates that the Development is not visible from this area due to the intervening vegetation. The remaining area of the Old Deer Park that contains the King's Observatory (a private residence) is a private golf course which includes clumps of mature planting. It is considered that the Development will also not be visible from this golf course. Representative view 17 is taken from the Thames Path as it passes the Old Deer Park and demonstrates that the Development is not visible.

Study Area and Scope

- 8.33. It is necessary to define an appropriate study area to ensure a thorough and robust assessment on the effect of a development on townscape and visual receptors. The study area for this TVIA will consider a 2.5km study area (see Figure 8.1). Consideration will be given to the likely visual receptors, defined as individuals and/or groups of people who are likely to experience views to the Site or be affected by the Development. The effects of the Development on the identified townscape and visual receptors will be informed by a series of Accurate Verified Views¹ (AVRs) from representative view locations. To determine the locations of the views, consideration has been given to relevant regional and local planning policy.

¹ Accurate Verified Views are defined as a still image, or animated sequence of images, intended to convey reliable visual information about a development

Assessment Methodology

- 8.34. The assessment methodology is provided in full at Appendix 8.2: Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology.
- 8.35. The two fundamental considerations in the TVIA are the sensitivity of townscape character areas, townscape features and visual receptors and the magnitude of effect that these receptors are likely to experience as a result of the Development at year 1 of operation and the combined effect of the Development with the identified future baseline schemes.
- 8.36. The sensitivity of a receptor is established through the combined consideration of their value and susceptibility, and is categorised as either High, Medium or Low.
- 8.37. The magnitude of effect is informed through judgements on the size and extent of change resulting from the Development and is categorised as either High, Medium, Low, Negligible or None.
- 8.38. The consideration of the relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of effect results in a significance of effect, ranging from Major to No Effect. Effects can be adverse, beneficial or neutral.
- 8.39. Table 8.2 illustrates the typical relationship between the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of effect and the resulting likely significance of effects:

Table 8.2: Townscape Character and Representative Viewpoint Significance of Effect Matrix

Sensitivity	Magnitude of Potential Effect			
	High	Medium	Low	Very Low and/or None
High	Major	Moderate and/or Major	Moderate	Minor or Negligible or None
Medium	Moderate and/or Major	Moderate	Minor and/or Moderate	Minor or Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor and/or Moderate	Minor and/or Negligible	None

- 8.40. This corresponds to the extent to which the Development improves and has a beneficial effect or causes damage and has an adverse effect or has a neutral effect on the existing townscape receptors and visual receptor representative views. Neutral effects are those where the effect would be neither beneficial nor adverse or a balance of adverse and beneficial influences.

- 8.41. It is considered that 'major' to 'moderate' scale of effects are significant and 'minor to moderate', 'minor' to 'negligible' scale of effects are not significant. Effects that were assessed to be not significant were still considered within the assessment.

Limitations and Assumptions

- 8.42. The assessment of effects has been undertaken on the basis of the information supplied on the construction period (between 2021 and 2026) and the design of the Development. Further details can be found in Chapter 3 Site and Development Description and Chapter 5 Construction Methodology and Phasing.
- 8.43. In considering the effects of the Development upon the significance of the identified townscape character area receptors and visual receptors representative views, the assessment has been based on the drawings and information that comprise the application and are submitted for approval. This approach allows for a balanced assessment that considers all the relevant material and allows for judgements to be made on design quality and associated mitigating effects.
- 8.44. The majority of the representative view visualisations, set out in Appendix 8.3, were taken in the winter, when intervening trees were bare of leaves and the Visual Impact Assessment does not attempt to predict the visual effects of seasonal changes throughout the year but describes the worst-case scenario in terms of the views from the identified visual receptor's viewpoints, i.e. in the winter when deciduous trees have lost their leaves and visibility is generally increased.
- 8.45. Entry was not been made to individual properties, but where relevant, an assumption has been made about the nature of the potential view by visiting adjoining areas of public access such as roads, footpaths or publicly accessible open space.

Baseline Conditions

Baseline Townscape Character

- 8.46. This section considers the townscape features that contribute to the existing character of the Site and of the study area.
- 8.47. The GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG (2014)^{xxii} sets out how to assess character areas. It builds on Policy 7.4 Local Character of the London Plan and sets out four principles:

- Character is all around us and everywhere has a distinctive character;
- Character is about people and communities;
- Places are connected and overlap – boundaries and transitions are important; and
- The character of a place is a dynamic concept.

The Site

- 8.48. The Site, which is 1.5ha in area, is a rectangular plot of land currently occupied by a large single level Homebase store and associated parking; the parking is accommodated both at surface level and in an undercroft car park. The Homebase store comprises of a large industrial style shed with metal cladding. The building is effectively two storeys high with a central pylon to the front which is visible in many views towards the Site and is identified in the Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study^{xxiii} (2014) as a 'landmark'. Landmarks are defined in the Hounslow study as:

'prominent elements which by virtue of their height and/or mass are highly distinctive relative to their surrounding environment...create distinct visual orientation points....provide a sense of location within the larger townscape and may act as markers of other elements, often unintentionally.'

- 8.49. The Homebase store is of architectural interest. However it is set back from the street within a large surface car park and does little to respond to the surrounding context. There are limited areas of soft landscaping areas within the Site boundary; these are located to the north and west of the Site and are in varied condition.
- 8.50. The Site is bound by the A4 GWR to the north, and Syon Lane to the south-west. There is a car showroom to the east, and a service road, Syon Gate Way which extends along the south-eastern boundary, and further southeast is Syon Lane station and railway line.
- 8.51. The topography slopes from the GWR to the north down towards the Site's southern boundary along the railway line. There is an approximate 4m drop in level from the north-west corner of the Site to the south of the Site.

The Surrounding Context

Landform

- 8.52. Within the wider study area the landform is generally low lying associated with the valley floor of the River Thames and slopes gradually towards the river, located to the southeast of

the Site. To the north, the land rises to approximately 25m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD), as shown in Figure 8.2.

Land Use

- 8.53. Although the study area comprises primarily residential uses and the built form generally reflects this in scale, footprint and height, within the GWC the character is more mixed, with big box/industrial, office parks side by side with earlier, loose grid post-war housing (see Figure 8.3).

Movement

- 8.54. The townscape assessment study area is crossed by two primary, busy vehicular routes, namely the M4 motorway and the Great West Road (A4). Secondary and tertiary routes, accessed from the primary roads, provide access to the surrounding residential and commercial areas. Whilst approximately 25m to the southeast of the Site is Syon Lane railway station and the overground railway line.
- 8.55. The Capital Ring walking route crosses the study area from north to south, following the River Brent before passing through Syon Park and joining the Thames Path on the northern bank of the River Thames. The study area is crossed in its southern most extent by the River Thames, which marks the boundary between LBH and the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBRuT). The Thames Path follows either side of this waterway apart from when it passes Syon Park.

Height and massing

- 8.56. In general, built form in the study area is not particularly tall; tall buildings and structures are concentrated along the A4 and M4 corridors to the north of the Site and have been designed to be visible from these important transport corridors. The imposing skyline they create is an important contributor to the existing character of the area. Some of the area's tall buildings and local landmarks date back to the early development of the GWC, such as the former Gillette Factory, located approximately 100m to the north of the Site.
- 8.57. To the northeast and east of the Site is the Gate Centre, Great West Trading Estate and West Cross Industrial Park. These areas contain a number of light industrial buildings and the built form in this area is varied with a range of buildings of differing ages and scales ranging from 1-2 storey brick built inter-war offices and warehouses to larger scale more modern sheds which are several storeys taller.

- 8.58. Beyond the GWR and West Cross Industrial Park is the Sky Isleworth Campus, to the northeast of the Site. This comprises of a variety of building footprints ranging from large studio spaces to smaller office blocks. The height of buildings varies between 7 and 13 m; the associated wind turbine is the tallest element within the campus and is a local landmark within views to the north of the study area.
- 8.59. To the south of the railway line and west of Syon Lane are interwar and early postwar period semi-detached or short terraces residential dwellings that are predominantly two storeys in height. The residential area to the west of Syon Lane, accessed via Northumberland Avenue, has been identified by LBH as an Area of Special Character within the LBH Urban Context and Character Study^{xxiv}.
- 8.60. LBH Urban Context and Character Study^{xxv} has established seven broad urban types and Figure 8.4 identifies those that fall close to the Site and within the study area. Table 8.3 summarises the key characteristics and their location to the Site. Where the study area falls within London Borough of Ealing (LBE) or LBRuT considerations has been given to the areas characteristics in order to establish the Urban Type.

Table 8.3: LBH Urban Areas

Urban Type	Characteristics (summarised from the Urban Context and Character Study)	Location
Urban Type 1 – Compact Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly from the late 19th century and pre-World War One periods with some recent examples. • Compact grid layout ranges from clearly laid out streets in rigid grid patterns to loose organic grids. • Streets typically connect together. • Street lengths and blocks size and shape vary resulting in a variety of grid layouts. • Predominantly residential buildings include terraces and semi-detached properties - overall medium to high density (60 – 100 dwellings per hectare (dph)). • Low rise - predominantly two to three storeys in height. • Small scale mixed use - often found on corner plots or on main routes. • Minimal building setbacks with well-defined front boundaries – often defined with low brick walls. • Chiefly brick facades and chimneys. • The layout typically lacks civic and amenity spaces. 	This urban type is typically found on the edge of historic town or local centres such as Hounslow, Isleworth or South Ealing. They are typically found on the edge of the study area to the northeast and southwest. Small areas also exist at historic transport routes such as Thornbury Road.
Urban Type 2 – Loose Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly from the interwar and early postwar period - late 1910s to late 1940s and early 1950s. • Large areas of LBH contain variations of this type resulting in it being abundant within the study area. • Can also be found across outer London, especially outer West London, known as Metroland due its growth post-expansion of the London Underground. • Mostly comprises large, irregular blocks on a network of wide, curving streets with a mixture of associated closes and cul-de-sacs. • Some blocks are more regular and straight, others are more curving and organic. 	This predominant urban type found throughout the study area and can be found to the immediate south and west of the Site.

Urban Type	Characteristics (summarised from the Urban Context and Character Study)	Location
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Characterised by their low density, consisting of large plots with generous front and back gardens. Consists of largely detached, semi-detached or short terraces and predominantly two storeys in height. Characterise suburban character - a generosity of space, large back gardens, deep front gardens, space for your car, space to extend your house, uniform and conservative in style and detailing. 	
Urban Type 3 - slabs and towers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited examples of this type within LBH but these few have significant impact due to their structure, scale and height. Freestanding buildings set within open space which consists of large car parking areas, grassed areas, mature trees and shrub planting. Mixture of high-rise towers (point blocks) and lower-rise, linear slab blocks. Typically medium to high density, with a mix of housing types, commonly flats, maisonettes and terraced houses. Highly visible and prominent on the skyline Segregated movement of internal access roads and pedestrian footpaths. 	Small areas of this urban type can be found to the east and south of the study area within Isleworth and Brentford.
Urban Type 4 – Courts and cul-de-sacs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples are predominantly from between the 1960s to the 1990s. The types are characterised by a main distributor or loop road with a series of access roads forming semi-enclosed courts or cul-de-sacs, creating a large 'superblock' layout. Traffic separation principles ensure vehicles and pedestrians are often segregated especially in the early Radburn-esque examples. Lower-rise buildings are arranged in groups around a semi-enclosed court or cul-de-sac, sometimes inward facing, sometimes outward facing. Predominantly medium density but can vary greatly depending on dominant building type - 1980s examples can be very low density (range 30-50dph). Building types can be very mixed with apartment blocks, short terraces and semi-detached properties. Car access and parking is integral element of the design, with ease and proximity a key design feature. Characterised by an insular, self-contained feel, resulting from its lack of through-movement and wider connectivity with the surrounding townscape. 	Small areas of this urban type can be found within the study area with the closest being Field Lane situated 500m to the east and Stags Way 500m to the west.
Urban Type 5 – urban renaissance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Almost exclusively 1990s to present day. Typical found off main roads and reflects the early 21st Century type of planning and urban design arisen out of the Urban Task Force Report: Towards an Urban Renaissance which encourages reuse of brownfield land, higher densities and mixed use type development. Mostly comprises a return to the perimeter block with buildings fronting onto and enclosing streets and public space with strong axes. Blocks tend to be smaller, more square in shape and respond to the underlying landscape in comparison to the compact grid urban type 1 which tended to have longer rectangular blocks. Higher densities achieved (up to 250 dph) through compact design principles. Provision of a mix of housing types including flats, maisonettes, townhouses, mews and terraces, reflecting the diversity of housing need. Predominantly mixed in tenure with private and affordable units integrated into one scheme. 	Small areas of this urban type can be found within the study area with the closest being Union Lane situated 550m to the south and Academy Place 900m to the west.

Urban Type	Characteristics (summarised from the Urban Context and Character Study)	Location
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Built almost exclusively by private developers or housing associations. 	
Urban Type 6 – big box	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominantly 1980s to present day. Located close to major A roads and across the borough but more common in the west and along the Golden Mile section of the GWR. Self-contained pods with one or two access roads (little to no through movement). Large footprint, rectangular, freestanding buildings, also known as super sheds and large single-storey buildings. Buildings surrounded by car parking and/or hard and soft landscaping. 4-10m building heights - often with double height ceilings. 	The Site falls within this urban type along with the immediate area to the north and east. Smaller areas of this urban type can also be found pepper potted within the study area.
Urban Type 7 – urban centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed land use areas with high levels of local accessibility, along with a mix of building types and ages reflecting their historic origin. Centres spatially arranged along high streets, historic cores and at key road junctions. Streets and spaces addressed by buildings with ground floor non-residential uses. Residential or commercial uses often stacked above ground floor retail. 	This urban type can be found in the centre of Brentford, Isleworth and Hounslow, to the southeast, south and southwest respectively.

Heritage Assets

- 8.61. Heritage assets within the study area include nine Conservation Areas which fall either wholly or partially within it; seven within LBH and two within the LBRuT (see Figure 8.5). The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, which is a World Heritage Site (WHS) and contains Grade I listed buildings, and the Buffer to the WHS fall partially within the southern extent of the study area.
- 8.62. The chapter does not assess whether harm which may arise as a result of the Development to the significance of these heritage assets (see Chapter 7 Built Heritage), however the heritage assets have informed the assessment of the value of the townscape receptors.
- 8.63. The Site itself is not covered by any planning policy designations relating to townscape value and does not contain any designated or non-designated heritage assets.

Open Space

- 8.64. The study area includes a number of accessible open space areas associated with heritage assets, as illustrated in Figure 8.3, including:
- Syon Park (Registered Historic Park and Garden) Syon House's garden is publicly accessible during the summer upon payment of a set fee and approximately 930m from the Site's boundary;

- Osterley Park (Registered Historic Park and Garden) the area of the park that surrounds Osterley House is accessible between 7am and 7.30pm throughout the year and is located some 1.5km from the Site's boundary;
 - Boston Manor Park is open throughout the year and approximately 550m from the Site's boundary; and
 - Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew (Registered Historic Park and Garden and WHS) is publicly accessible upon payment of a set fee and approximately 1.5km from the Site's boundary.
- 8.65. All of these are privately owned but publicly accessible, bar Boston Manor Park which is owned by LBH.
- 8.66. Further smaller playing fields and incidental areas of open space associated with residential areas can be found within the study area along with private playing fields such as Goals Gillette Corner or educational facilities.

Townscape receptors

- 8.67. Existing character assessments and field surveys have been used to establish the existing townscape character within the study area and to identify individual Townscape Character Areas (TCAs) as townscape receptors.
- 8.68. At a national level, the study area falls within National Character Area Profile: 112 Inner London^{xxvi}, which is described as:

"Predominantly urban, the Inner London National Character Area (NCA) lies at the centre of the Thames Basin on a broad flood plain which rises in gentle terraces, providing panoramic views of London's skyline from the clay plateaux and ridges in the north at the border with the Northern Thames Basin. The NCA is steeped in both historical and contemporary culture; it is the centre of UK Government and a major international hub for finance, business, tourism, transport and recreation. Owing to its urban nature, Inner London relies heavily on ecosystem services provided by the surrounding NCAs, such as flood alleviation, air temperature regulation and recreational services."

- 8.69. At a regional level the London's Natural Signatures: The London Landscape Framework^{xxvii} locates the Site at the eastern-most extent of Landscape Area 12 Hounslow Gravels, described as:

"An area characterised by recent industrial and interwar suburban development on flat land. Built development is interspersed by corridors and patches of open space along tributary streams."

- 8.70. Both the national and regional assessments cover a much wider area and whilst they serve to provide useful background and context to the wider area, the scale is such that there would be no notable effect resulting from the Development and accordingly no further references will be made within this assessment.
- 8.71. At a local level the chapter has sub-divided the study area into seven TCAs (see Figure 8.6) to better understand the finer grain of the receiving townscape and identify any potentially sensitive landscape receptors. This has been informed by The GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context SPG (2014)^{xxviii}, LBH's GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xxix} and the LBH Urban Context and Character Study^{xxx}.
- 8.72. The key characteristics of the TCAs and an assessment of their value are summarised in Table 8.4. The Site itself falls within TCA 1 GWR.

Table 8.4: Townscape Character Areas

Townscape Character Areas	Characteristics	Value
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major transport corridor, characterised by heavy vehicular use and an open aspect reinforced by relatively sparse vegetation to each side. • The road comprises six lanes, with cycle lanes on both sides, wider verges and pavements and a central reservation. • Bisects the study area on an east/west axis. • Along the eastern extent, almost entirely non-residential frontages and an area of coarse urban grain, constituting large commercial plots occupied by predominately low rise, commercial buildings. • Limited sense of enclosure due to the set-back for parking to the front of commercial buildings. • The western extent is fronted by interwar residential semis, the majority with paved front gardens to accommodate off-street parking. • Contains the Site - the focal point for the junction of the GWR and Syon Lane is the Homebase tower. • Includes several listed Art Deco buildings, including the former Gillette Factory; part of the former Coty Factory; Westlink House; 991 GWR; and the National Westminster Bank. 	Poor
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A predominantly commercial and industrial townscape. • A coarse-grain townscape characterised by large-footprint buildings - 'big box commercial landscape'. • Includes the post-modern Sky campus and Goals. • The majority of buildings to the northern edge of the GWR post-date 1980. 	Low
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compact urban grid. • Bounded by the tidal River Thames to the south and east. • Predominantly residential with historic cores. • Waterside character in Brentford is shaped by its canal and riverside buildings, remaining active boatyards and established residential moorings. • Residential types include 2 storey late 19th century terraces, early interwar garden suburbs, 1970s tower blocks and 2000s urban renaissance mid-rise apartments. 	Medium to High

Townscape Character Areas	Characteristics	Value
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Brentford the TCA includes The Butts and St Pauls Conservation Areas and in Isleworth, the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area. Includes over 75 listed buildings. Isleworth is characterised by a high quality, low-rise (2-4 storeys), compact, fine-grain townscape with a wide variety of building styles, including Georgian, Victorian and 20th century architecture. 	
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily residential. Low-rise mixture of early interwar ribbon development estate; two-storey semis, Victorian and Edwardian two storey long terraces; and postwar estate of local authority social housing. Contains two Areas of Special Character as identified in the LBH Context and Character Study. On-street parking. Includes approximately 30 listed buildings. 	Low
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-rise residential development running east-west alongside and north of the GWR. Predominantly interwar ribbon development. The area is exclusively residential, with the southernmost properties facing the GWR. Interwar residential estates, including three Areas of Special Character as identified in the LBH Context and Character Study, and the Spring Grove and Osterley Grove Conservation Areas. Predominantly two-storey, semi-detached, with some short terraces. Considerable uniformity of scale, typical of interwar ribbon development in its density, layout, and building type. Includes playing fields and sports pitches, educational and religious establishments. Despite being the largest TCA in the study area, includes approximately 25 listed buildings. 	Low to Medium
TCA6 - Osterley Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed historic mansion (Grade I) and surrounded by gardens, park and farmland (Grade II* Registered Park and Garden); one of the last surviving country estates in London. One of the largest open spaces in west London and designated as Metropolitan Open Land. Despite being predominantly parkland and open space, the TCA includes over a dozen listed buildings. Marred by the M4 motorway, which cuts across the northern half of it, bringing high levels of traffic noise and creating a barrier to north-south movement. Formal recreation uses, including River Brent and Brent River Park to the east. 	High
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18th century parkland landscape with villas, palaces and riverside villages which includes Syon Park, the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew and the Old Deer Park. An historical landscape continuum between the two banks and across the land from Richmond to Kew – important visual links across the river. The gravel towpath from Richmond to Kew has a remote, rural character; the river is tidal. Includes Isleworth Ait, Brentford Ait and Lots Ait, which are wooded islands. Includes Brentford Lock and Brentford Dock Marina; at Brentford, the waterfront is a mixture of regeneration and former industrial areas, which though in need of regeneration, still retain significant elements of its dockland past. 	Exceptional

Visual Receptors

- 8.73. The assessment of the visibility of the Site is undertaken in two stages. The first is to manually establish the extent of the Site's Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) and identify visual receptor groups. The latter is defined in GLVIA3^{xxxi} as *"people who will be affected by changes in views or visual amenity at different places"*.
- 8.74. The ZTV of the Site and its built form is limited due to the low-rise nature of the built form currently present on the Site, the relatively level topography and intervening visual barriers. Short distance open to partial views can be gained from along the GWR, Syon Lane. Whilst short distance glimpsed views can be appreciated from Northumberland Avenue and Harlequin Avenue.
- 8.75. The upper extent of the Homebase central tower sign on the Site is visible in some short to medium distance views including from Brambles Close, Cherry Crescent and Acacia Avenue, along with limited sections of London Road to the southeast.
- 8.76. It is considered that views will be possible from the windows of residential and office buildings orientated towards the Site.
- 8.77. The following visual receptor groups have been identified:
- Residents in properties located adjacent to the Site and within 500 metre of its boundary, where associated windows are orientated towards the Site;
 - Users of public open space areas located within 2km of the Site; and
 - Users of public highways and rights of way located within 2km of the Site.
- 8.78. The second stage is to determine the broad visibility of the Site from the identified visual receptor groups, which is illustrated and supported through a series of representative views. In considering the visibility from visual receptors, entry has not been made to individual properties, but where relevant, an assumption has been made of the potential view based on publicly accessible areas such as roads or footpaths.
- 8.79. 26 representative views have been identified and agreed in consultation with LBH, as set out in Appendix 8.4, as an appropriate selection to demonstrate the visibility of the Site from the visual receptors and to illustrate how the Development would appear within views identified as sensitive. The locations of the representative viewpoints (RV) are shown in Figure 8.7 and the rationale for their selection is summarised in Table 8.5 below.

Table 8.5: Visual Receptors' Representative Views

RV	Location	Comment
1	Syon Lane Station	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. SS01). Includes the former Gillette Factory clock tower, identified in the LBH Urban Context and Character Study as a landmark.
2	Northumberland Avenue	Typical townscape view overlooking an Area of Special Character.
3	Grant Way roundabout	Typical townscape view overlooking the former Gillette Factory (Grade II).
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Typical townscape view from the east.
5	GWR outside no.772	Typical townscape view from the west.
6	GWR central reservation	Typical townscape view from the west.
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Osterley Park is a Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Osterley Park is a Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
9	Osterley House	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. OP1). Osterley Park House is a Grade I listed building and falls within a Registered Park and Garden and Osterley Park Conservation Area.
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Osterley Park is a Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
11	Boston Manor House	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. BM1). Boston Manor Park falls within the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area.
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	St Paul's Recreation Ground falls within St. Pauls Brentford Conservation Area.
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. SP3). Syon Park is a Registered Park and Garden and falls within the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area.
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. SP2) and within LBH Urban Context and Character Study (Isleworth district view). Syon Park is a Registered Park and Garden and falls within the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area and the Royal Botanic Gardens WHS Buffer Zone.
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. SP1). Syon Park is a Registered Park and Garden and falls within the Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area.
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Falls within Isleworth Riverside Conservation Area and the Thames Landscape Strategy as a vista.
17	Riverside walk Kew	Falls within Old Deer Park Conservation Area and identified within LBRuT Proposal Map and identified within LBH Urban Context and Character Study (Isleworth district view).
18	Old Deer Park	Falls within Old Deer Park Conservation Area and identified within LBRuT Proposal Map and the Thames Landscape Strategy as a vista.
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (Ref. BG11). Botanical Gardens Kew is a World Heritage Site, Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.

RV	Location	Comment
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (BG10) and within LBH Urban Context and Character Study (Isleworth district view). Botanical Gardens Kew is a World Heritage Site, Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (BG7). Botanical Gardens Kew is a World Heritage Site, Registered Park and Garden and a conservation area
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (BG9). Botanical Gardens Kew is a World Heritage Site, Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	Identified as a view within the GWC: Appendix View Assessment (BG4). Botanical Gardens Kew is a World Heritage Site, Registered Park and Garden and a Conservation Area.
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Typical, long distance, townscape view from the west.
25	Syon House	Syon House is a Grade I listed building and falls within a Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area.
26	GWR outside West Link House	Typical townscape view from the west.

8.80. The value of the representative views is summarised in Table 8.6. The criteria for defining value are provided in Table 8.2.2 in Appendix 8.2.

Table 8.6: Value of the Visual Receptors' Representative Views

RV	Location	Approximate Distance from the closest Site boundary	Visibility (Existing)	Value
1	Syon Lane Station	30m	Partial View	Medium
2	Northumberland Avenue	255m	Glimpsed View	Medium
3	Grant Way roundabout	250m	Glimpsed View	Low to Medium
4	GWR Firestone entrance	200m	Glimpsed View	Low
5	GWR outside no.772	625m	No view	Poor
6	GWR central reservation	1km	Glimpsed View	Poor
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	1.5km	No view	Medium
8	Osterley Park (centre)	1.6km	No View	Medium
9	Osterley House	1.9km	No View	High
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	1.5km	No View	Medium
11	Boston Manor House	1km	No View	Medium
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	1.4km	No View	Medium
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	920m	No View	Medium to High
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	1km	No View	Medium to High
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	1.1km	No View	Medium to High
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	1.5km	No View	Medium

RV	Location	Approximate Distance from the closest Site boundary	Visibility (Existing)	Value
17	Riverside walk Kew	1.3km	No View	High
18	Old Deer Park	2.3km	No View	Medium
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	2km	No View	Exceptional
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	1.4km	No View	Exceptional
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	2.1km	No View	Exceptional
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	2.3km	No View	Exceptional
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	2.2km	No View	Exceptional
24	GWR and Jersey Road	2.6km	No View	Poor
25	Syon House	1km	No View	High
26	GWR outside West Link House	400m	Glimpsed View	Low

Future Baseline

- 8.81. The Site is currently of low quality, appearance and condition and, where it is visible, does not make a positive contribution to views. If the existing uses and built form on the Site were to remain unchanged, it is likely to degrade, leading to an increase in adverse effects on the townscape receptors and views from visual receptors.

Emerging Context

- 8.82. The surrounding area is identified to undergo significant change with the implementation of the strategic objectives of the GWC Masterplan Plan.

Likely Significant Effects

Summary of Receptors and Sensitivity

Townscape Receptors

- 8.83. The sensitivity of the Development on townscape receptors is considered in light of their 'susceptibility to change' and their previously determined value. Townscape receptors comprise:
- TCA1 – GWR;
 - TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential;
 - TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth;

- TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential;
- TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential;
- TCA6 – Osterley Park; and
- TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes.

8.84. TCA1: GWR can accommodate the Development as it reflects the uses proposed as part of the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xxxii} and is tolerant to change of the type proposed. It is considered that it has a low susceptibility to change, as defined in the methodology Table 8.2.3 in Appendix 8.2, due to it having recognisable art-deco and suburban townscape characteristics, but limited distinctive townscape elements and a number of townscape detractors. Through assessing the 'value' and 'susceptibility to change' it is concluded that TCA1: GWR has a low sensitivity to the Development.

8.85. The remaining TCAs (townscape receptors) have a varying susceptibility to change and sensitivity to the Development and the Development will indirectly affect them to varying degrees. Table 8.7 presents the assessment of the 'value' and 'susceptibility to change' of each townscape character area together with their 'sensitivity'.

Table 8.7: Summary of Sensitivity of the Townscape Receptors

Townscape Receptor	Value	Susceptibility to Change	Sensitivity
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	Poor	Low	Low
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	Low	Low	Low
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	Medium to High	Medium	Medium to High
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	Low	Low	Low
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	Low	Low	Low
TCA6 - Osterley Park	High	High	High
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	Exceptional	High	High

Visual Receptors Representative view

8.86. How susceptibility to change and sensitivity is determined for each visual receptor's representative view to the Development is described in Appendix 8.3 and the findings are summarised in Table 8.8.

Table 8.8: Summary of Sensitivity of the Visual Receptor's Representative Views

RV	Location	Value	Susceptibility to Change	Sensitivity
1	Syon Lane Station	Medium	Low	Low to Medium

RV	Location	Value	Susceptibility to Change	Sensitivity
2	Northumberland Avenue	Medium	Medium	Medium
3	Grant Way roundabout	Low to Medium	Low	Low
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Low	Low	Low
5	GWR outside no.772	Poor	Low	Low
6	GWR central reservation	Poor	Low	Low
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Medium	High	Medium to High
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Medium	High	Medium to High
9	Osterley House	High	High	High
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Medium	High	Medium to High
11	Boston Manor House	Medium	High	Medium to High
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	Medium	High	Medium to High
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Medium to High	High	Medium to High
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Medium to High	High	Medium to High
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Medium to High	High	Medium to High
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Medium	High	Medium to High
17	Riverside walk Kew	High	High	High
18	Old Deer Park	Medium	Medium	Medium
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	Exceptional	High	High
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	Exceptional	High	High
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	Exceptional	High	High
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	Exceptional	High	High
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	Exceptional	High	High
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Poor	Low	Low
25	Syon House	High	High	High
26	GWR outside West Link House	Low	Low	Low

Construction Phase

- 8.87. Demolition and construction works typically relate to townscape character and visual impacts associated with the removal of existing on-site buildings and structures, and the visual impact of the enclosure of the site with hoarding and of construction plant. The latter would include scaffolding on any retained structures, tower cranes, piling drivers and other construction plant (refer to Chapter 5: Construction Methodology & Phasing for further information).
- 8.88. The impact of the demolition and construction works would be experienced throughout the entire construction period, with the peak near the end of the construction programme where the Development will almost be fully constructed. It is noted, however, that the completed Development's buildings are likely to obscure views of the elements still under construction in certain locations.

Townscape Character Area Receptors

- 8.89. The Development falls within 'TCA1: GWR Corridor'. The impact of the demolition and construction on the Site would be limited to the associated infrastructure related to the Development. Its demolition and construction would have a local, direct, temporary, short term, medium magnitude of impact on the area. This would lead to a minor to moderate adverse effect.
- 8.90. The Development's hoarding and cranes are likely to be partially visible from the immediate areas of 'TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential' close to the Site. The construction works would have a local, indirect, temporary, short term, medium magnitude of impact and minor to moderate adverse effect on this TCA.
- 8.91. A limited partial to glimpsed view to the Development's hoarding are likely to be visible from 'TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential' along with its associated cranes. The construction works would have a local, indirect, temporary, short term, low to medium magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect on this TCA.
- 8.92. Limited glimpsed views to cranes on the Site are likely to be visible from areas of 'TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential', 'TCA3: Historic Brentford and Isleworth', 'TCA6: Osterley Park' and 'TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes'. The visibility would vary within the latter three areas subject to the season with the mature trees present within these areas filtering views.
- 8.93. The construction works would have a local, indirect, temporary, short term, low magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect on TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential and a local, indirect, temporary, short term, very low magnitude of impact and minor adverse effect on TCA6: Osterley Park and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes.
- 8.94. It is considered that intervening built form would prevent the majority of views to cranes on the Site from 'TCA3: Historic Brentford and Isleworth'. It is therefore considered that it would have a local, indirect, temporary, short term, very low magnitude of impact and negligible neutral significance of effect.
- 8.95. Table 8.9 summaries the construction effect of the Development on the Townscape Character Area Receptors.

Table 8.9: Summary of Development's Demolition and Construction Effects on the Townscape Character Area Receptors

Townscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	Medium to High	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	Low	Low to Medium	Minor Adverse
TCA6 - Osterley Park	High	Very low	Minor Adverse
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	High	Very low	Minor Adverse

Visual Receptors Representative Views

- 8.96. The impact of the demolition and construction on the Site would be limited to the visibility to the associated cranes and scaffolding related to the construction of the Development. For a full description of the magnitude of impact and effect please revert to Appendix 8.3, which is summarised in Table 8.10.

Table 8.10: Summary of Development's Demolition and Construction Effects on the Visual Receptors Representative Views

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
1	Syon Lane Station	Low to Medium	High	Moderate to Major Adverse
2	Northumberland Avenue	Medium	Medium	Moderate Adverse
3	Grant Way roundabout	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Low	High	Moderate Adverse
5	GWR outside no.772	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
6	GWR central reservation	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
9	Osterley House	High	None	None
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
11	Boston Manor House	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Medium to High	Low to Medium	Moderate Adverse
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
17	Riverside walk Kew	High	Very low	Minor Adverse
18	Old Deer Park	Medium	Very low	None
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	High	None	None
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	High	None	None
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	High	None	None
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	High	None	None
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	High	None	None
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Low	Very low	Negligible Adverse
25	Syon House	High	Low	Moderate Adverse
26	GWR outside West Link House	Low	Low to Medium	Minor Adverse

Operational Phase

- 8.97. The Development falls within the GWC and LBH's draft Great West Corridor Local Plan Review^{xxxiii} has a vision to transform the corridor. It is located within the southern area of the GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study^{xxxiv} established Golden Mile Station Quarter, which provides two options for the Site subject to the relocation of the Tesco store. It recognises the Site as an important gateway location to the GWC.
- 8.98. The current building within the Site does little to contribute to the surrounding townscape. The Development's vision is to kick-start regeneration of the Great West Corridor with landmark architecture that celebrates the existing grand art deco factories and provide a much greener landscape. The supporting DAS establishes three key design principles that include:
- Public realm: improving connectivity and way-finding;
 - Retail podium: animating public realm; and

- A collection of buildings: reconciling the urban grain.

8.99. These principles are discussed further in Chapter 5 of the DAS.

8.100. The latter principles of providing a collection of building typologies to reconciling the large industrial grain with the finer residential grain of the townscape helps to break up the footprint of the proposed retail base. The Development celebrates the important junction it is located on and there are five building typologies that frame and sit above the new Tesco Store base:

- Building A – an Art Deco building that celebrates the corner of the GWR and Syon Lane;
- Building B1 – the tallest building that provides a marker from the surrounding townscape;
- Buildings B2 and B3 – a series of buildings that are articulated to provide a varied skyline;
- Building C - an arrival building that marks the location of Syon Lane Station; and
- Buildings D and E – provide a pair of palazzo buildings that address Syon Lane.

8.101. The Development includes a façade material palette that has been selected to provide a sympathetic relationship with the surrounding context. This is discussed in detail within Chapter 9 of the DAS and in summary includes brick cladding as the predominant façade material that ranges in colour depending on the building. The building typologies also use the white metal and brick banding and bronze coloured metal for the window frames and balcony balustrades throughout to unifying the Development. The five building typologies proposed are described in the following paragraphs.

8.102. Building A includes the podium base of the retail unit and a community room. It ranges between six and 12 storeys in height. The façade of the base is defined by a horizontal white brick frame and broken up by vertical elements of blue brick piers and subtle white metal banding. Above the podium the massing of the residential buildings terraces and steps back from the street frontage.

8.103. The upper stepping back floors of building A are defined by primary, secondary and tertiary horizontal banding. The primary banding used every other floor includes white brick, whilst the secondary includes further blue brick banding defining alternate floors and the tertiary includes the use of subtle white metal banding. The base of building A includes the main entrance to the retail unit and a secondary access to the residential apartments above. Bronze coloured metal is used for the window frames and balustrades.

8.104. Building B1's typology and façade material is similarly to building A and is also inspired by Art Deco architecture helping to celebrate the route of the GWR. This is further emphasised with

its height of 17 storeys. The lower ground floors include the back of house for the retail unit and include residential secondary access points. It's façade like building A includes blue brick, which is broken down with white metal that is used for the primary vertical and secondary horizontal banding. It also uses bronze coloured metal for the window frames and balustrades.

- 8.105. Creating an articulated skyline buildings B2 and B3 range in height with two 15 storey buildings and associated shoulder buildings that range between eight, nine and ten storeys in height. As with building B1, the lower ground floors of these buildings contain the back of house for the retail unit and include secondary residential access points.
- 8.106. The façade of buildings B2 and B3 includes red and cream brick helping to break up their perceived mass within the surrounding townscape. White brick provides a primary frame to these buildings and secondary horizontal cream brick banding contrast with vertical bronze coloured cladding panels. Bronze coloured metal is used for the window frames and balcony balustrades.
- 8.107. Marking the Syon Lane Station the ten storey arrival building C includes the main residential lobby for the Development. Brown brick is the predominant façade material for this building. White metal frames the window and balcony openings and bronze coloured metal is used for the window frames and balcony balustrades. A double horizontal row of white brick is used on every other floor and on the buildings base.
- 8.108. Addressing Syon Lane buildings D and E are conceived as a pair of palazzo buildings, with facades of cream and glazed green brick. They sit above the retail unit and include secondary residential access points and the vehicular access point. The massing is arranged perpendicular to Syon Lane and both buildings step down from eight to seven storeys in height to the route and the neighbouring properties.
- 8.109. Buildings D and E façade material is predominately cream brick with white brick frames providing vertical and secondary horizontal banding. White metal provides a subtle horizontal banding, with bronze coloured metal is used for the window frames and balcony balustrades.
- 8.110. The Development includes new public realm that surrounds its base that includes enhancements to the existing subway, new paving to footways, street tree re-planting and a new off-road cycleway to GWR. Above the Development's base is a large communal podium garden that is split into different themed destinations. The landscape proposals are described in Chapter 7 of the DAS.

Townscape Character Area Receptors

The Development falls within 'TCA1: GWR Corridor' and provides a new built form that improves the character of the Great West Corridor. It would have a local, direct, permanent, long term, medium magnitude of impact on the area. The Development will improve the townscape situation of TCA1: GWR Corridor through providing a new perimeter block that provides a transition between the large industrial grain present within the character area and the finer residential grain of the adjacent 'TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential'. This is demonstrated in the representative views 1, 4 and 5 set out in Appendix 8.3.

- 8.111. Buildings A and B1 that address the GWR reflect the Art Deco buildings that address the route and mark this important gateway location into the GWC, whilst buildings C, D and E ensure that heights decrease down to Syon Lane. The Development provides a new public realm and positively improves the situation along Syon Lane with sections of active frontages and access points. It's building typologies would help to define and animate the section of the GWR and Syon Lane that pass it.
- 8.112. Overall, the Development would provide an appropriate and high quality response that would enhance the Site's contribution to a currently highway dominated townscape. It would lead to minor to moderate beneficial effect on TCA1: GWR Corridor.
- 8.113. Partial to glimpsed short to medium distance views are likely to be visible to the upper floors of the Development's Buildings B1, B2, B3 and C from within 'TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential'. The differing façade material and application of the architectural treatment between the various building typologies results in a layered and varied built form that helps to break the perceived mass of the Development within this surrounding townscape. The Development would have a local, indirect, permanent, long term, medium magnitude of impact and minor to moderate beneficial effect on TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential.
- 8.114. Limited partial to glimpsed short to medium distance views are likely to be visible to the upper floors of the Development's buildings from 'TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential'. The variation in the proposed buildings massing would create a varied skyline in this view and the taller building B1 would act as a marker denoting the route of the Great West Corridor, as illustrated in representative views 2 and 3 in Appendix 8.3. The Development would have a local, indirect, permanent, long term, medium to low magnitude of impact and minor beneficial effect on TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential.

- 8.115. Limited glimpsed views to the upper floors of the Development's taller buildings are likely to be visible from areas of 'TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential', 'TCA6: Osterley Park' (illustrated in representative views 7, 8 and 10) and 'TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes' (demonstrated in representative views 13, 14 and 15). The visibility would vary within the latter two areas subject to the season with the mature trees present within these areas filtering views.
- 8.116. Where visible, within these TCAs the Development would mark the western entrance to the Great West Corridor, aiding with legibility within the study area. The visibility of such built form from within this TCAs would not be an uncharacteristic feature within the townscape. The Development will have an indiscernible effect on the TCAs.
- 8.117. The Development would have a local, indirect, permanent, long term, very low magnitude of impact and negligible neutral effect on TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential and TCA6: Osterley Park. It would have a local, indirect, permanent, long term, very low magnitude of impact and minor neutral effect on and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes.
- 8.118. It is considered that intervening built form would prevent the majority of the views to the Development from 'TCA3: Historic Brentford and Isleworth', as shown in representative views 12 and 16. It is therefore considered that it would have no magnitude of impact and no significance of effect.

Table 8.11: Summary of Development's Operational Effects on the Townscape Character Area Receptors

Townscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Effect
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	Low	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	Low	Low to Medium	Minor Beneficial
TCA6 - Osterley Park	High	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	High	Very low	Minor Neutral

Visual Receptors Representative Views

- 8.119. The Development's ZTV would extend beyond the existing situation, due to the relatively flat

landform present within the study area. The visual effect on the surrounding visual receptors are summarised below and the assessment of each individual representative view is set out in Appendix 8.3 and summarised in Table 8.12.

Visual receptors to the north (including northeast and northwest)

- 8.120. Open views would be gained to the north of the Development from the immediate section of the GWR where it passes the Site. This visibility is reduced travelling to the northeast and northwest to the upper floors of Building A and B1, along with glimpses to buildings B2 and B3. The Development comes in and out of visibility along this wide road corridor subject to the orientation of this route (as shown in representative views 4, 5, 6 and 24).
- 8.121. Partial to glimpsed views would also be gained from a section of the northern end of Syon Lane to Building A and B1 (as shown in representative view 3) and the southern end of Harlequin Avenue, where the routes are orientated towards the Site. As soon as they turn in orientation, built form screens the visibility of the Development.
- 8.122. It is considered that views would be possible from the south facing windows on the upper floors of the residential, office and industrial properties associated with Harlequin Avenue and the Sky Isleworth Campus in the short distance. The associated built form of these areas prevents further medium distance views. The upper floors of Buildings B1, B2 and B3 are, however, likely to have limited glimpsed long distance views from large areas of open space such as Boston Manor Park, to the northeast (representative view 11) and Osterley Park to the northwest (representative views 7, 8 and 10). The Development's visibility would be seasonal.
- 8.123. Intervening built form and vegetation prevents further views from the north from the residential area of Northfields. However, vantage points such as the raised section of the M4 that passes over Boston Manor Road before it merges with the GWR would have fleeting and glimpsed views of the Development. Within these views the Development would act as marker to the western end of the GWC.

Visual receptors to the east

- 8.124. Partial to glimpsed views would be gained from the surface car parks of the industrial and retail park to the east of the Development. This built form, it is considered, would prevent a view from the Capital Ring footpath where it follows the River Brent.
- 8.125. The upper floors of Buildings B1, B2 and B3 are, however, considered to be visible from the

windows orientated towards the Site from the mid-rise to tall office buildings a long distance away, including Great West House and GSK Office. Beyond these buildings the tight urban grain of Brentford would prevent views to the Development (as illustrated in representative view 12).

8.126. The Development is considered not to be visible from the majority of the large area of open space of Gunnersbury Park (outside the study area). Where the landform rises to the north of the park a glimpsed view maybe gained, however, the Development would be read in conjunction with 1000 Great West Road, Great West House and GSK Office.

Visual receptors to the south (including southeast and southwest)

8.127. The school playing field of the Green School, along with roads and residential properties situated a short distance to the south of the Site within Brentford End would gain open to glimpsed views to the Development.

8.128. To the southeast, the upper floors of Buildings B3 and C would be glimpsed from the kinetic view of the western Thames Path and Capital Ring as it passes through Syon Park. These buildings are read in the context of the existing buildings within the GWC and their visibility will vary (as shown in representative views 13, 14 and 15) depending on the season and tree cover the frames Syon Park. Building B3 will also be visible from the portico of Syon House (representative view 25).

8.129. It is considered that the Development would not be visible from the majority of the eastern route of the Thames Path (representative view 17). However, a limited glimpsed view would be afforded through gaps in the intervening vegetation along the river and adjacent areas of open space associated with Syon Park.

8.130. Beyond the River Thames, vegetation prevents a view from the Royal Botanic Gardens (representative views 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23) and the Old Deer Park (representative view 18).

8.131. Intervening built form and vegetation would prevent long distance views from the south and southwest from the residential areas of Isleworth (representative view 16) and Woodlands. However, raised vantage points such as Richmond Park, the Royal Botanic Garden's Pagoda and the windows of tall towers orientated towards the Site would be likely to be able to glimpse the Development in the context of other taller buildings along the GWC.

Visual receptors to the west

- 8.132. Where the roads and upper floors of windows of residential properties to the west are orientated towards the Development in the short to medium distance, partial to glimpsed views would be likely to be gained to the upper floors of the Development (as demonstrated in representative view 2). Beyond these buildings the tight urban grain of Osterley, Spring Grove and Lampton would prevent views to the Development.
- 8.133. Raised vantage points and upper floors of the mid-rise to tall office and residential buildings associated with Hounslow are considered to gained limited views of the upper floors of Buildings A, B1, B2 and B3. These buildings would be read in conjunction with 1000 Great West Road, Great West House and GSK Office and mark the western entrance to the GWC.
- 8.134. The Development would have a local, direct, permanent, long term effect on the visual receptors and their supporting representative views. For a full description of the magnitude of impact and effect of the representative views please revert to Appendix 8.3, which is summarised in Table 8.12.

Table 8.12: Summary of Development's Operational Effects on the Visual Receptors Representative Views

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
1	Syon Lane Station	Low to Medium	Medium to High	Moderate to Major Beneficial
2	Northumberland Avenue	Medium	Medium	Moderate Beneficial
3	Grant Way roundabout	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Low	Medium to High	Moderate Beneficial
5	GWR outside no.772	Low	Low	Minor Beneficial
6	GWR central reservation	Low	Low	Minor Beneficial
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Medium to High	None	None
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Neutral
9	Osterley House	High	None	None
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Medium to High	None	None
11	Boston Manor House	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Neutral
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	Medium to High	None	None
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Neutral
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Neutral
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Medium to High	Low to Medium	Moderate Neutral
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
17	Riverside walk Kew	High	None	None
18	Old Deer Park	Medium	None	None

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	High	None	None
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	High	None	None
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	High	None	None
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	High	None	None
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	High	None	None
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Low	Very low	None
25	Syon House	High	Very low	Minor Neutral
26	GWR outside West Link House	Low	Low to Medium	Minor Beneficial

Mitigation Measures

- 8.135. The demolition and construction works would implement best practice construction methods and housekeeping (i.e. tidy site) to reduce visual clutter, as specified within a project specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). An Outline Design & Construction Method Statement and CEMP is submitted with the planning application. A detailed CEMP would be secured by planning condition.
- 8.136. Given that no further mitigation has been proposed as part of this assessment, the residual effects of the demolition and construction stage of the Development on both the townscape character receptors and visual receptor's representative views would remain as outlined in Tables 8.9 and 8.10.
- 8.137. This also applies to the operational stage of the Development and its residual effects on both the townscape character receptors and visual receptor's representative views would remain as outlined in Tables 8.11 and 8.12.
- 8.138. No monitoring measures are required.

Cumulative Effects

- 8.139. Eight cumulative schemes have been identified within the study area. These are described Chapter 2 for further information. In summary seven of the cumulative schemes are relevant to this assessment and include:

- Former Syon Gate Service Station, Land at South of Gillette Corner, Great West Road,

- Isleworth TW7 5NP (Ref: 00505/AF/P28);
- New Horizons Court, Ryan Drive, Brentford TW8 9EP (Ref: 02912/A/P1)
 - 891 Great West Road, Isleworth London TW7 5PD (Ref: 00505/891/P4 & 00505/891/P5);
 - 4 and 8 Harlequin Avenue, Brentford, TW8 9EW (Ref: P/2017/5358);
 - Sky, Sites 6 & 7, Grant Way, Isleworth TW7 5QD (Ref: 00558/A/P69);
 - Bolder Academy, 1 MacFarlane Lane, Isleworth, TW7 5PN (Ref: 01106/W/P9);
 - 1 Commerce Road, Brentford, London, TW8 8LE (Ref: P/2018/2011); and
 - Tesco Superstore, Syon Lane, Isleworth (Ref: 1106/B/SCOPE1).

Construction Phase

Townscape Character Area Receptors

- 8.140. Subject to the construction programme, the construction of the Development could have a potential effect in combination with the identified cumulative schemes within TCA1: GWR Corridor and, to a limited extent, TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential. There will be no change in effects are established to the remaining townscape character area receptors, as set out in Table 8.9, during the demolition and construction stage of the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes identified.
- 8.141. The cumulative scheme New Horizons Court, Ryan Drive, Brentford TW8 9EP (Ref: 02912/A/P1) is not relevant to this assessment as there is no change to its built form.
- 8.142. Table 8.13 summaries the construction effect of the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes on the Townscape Character Area Receptors.

Table 8.13: Summary of Cumulative Schemes and Development's Demolition and Construction Effects on the Townscape Character Area Receptors

Townscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	Low	Medium to High	Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	Medium to High	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	Low	Low to Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA6 - Osterley Park	High	Very low	Minor Adverse
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	High	Very low	Minor Adverse

Visual Receptor's Representative Views

- 8.143. Subject to the construction programme, the construction of the Development could have a potential effect in combination with the cumulative schemes Former Syon Gate Service Station, Land at South of Gillette Corner, Great West Road, Isleworth TW7 5NP (Ref: P/2018/4691) and 891 Great West Road, Isleworth London TW7 5PD (Ref: P/2017/5079) in short to medium distance views from the GWR at its associated properties from the east and west to the Site. It could also have a potential effect in combination with the construction of Tesco Superstore, Syon Lane, Isleworth TW7 5NZ (Ref: 1106/B/SCOPE1) from the surrounding visual receptors.
- 8.144. It is considered that the remaining cumulative schemes 891 Great West Road, Isleworth London TW7 5PD (Ref: 00505/891/P4 & 00505/891/P5), 4 and 8 Harlequin Avenue, Brentford, TW8 9EW (Ref: P/2017/5358), Sky, Sites 6 & 7, Grant Way, Isleworth TW7 5QD (Ref: P/2020/0272), Bolder Academy, 1 MacFarlane Lane, Isleworth, TW7 5PN (Ref: 01106/W/P9) and 1 Commerce Road, Brentford, London, TW8 8LE (Ref: P/2018/2011) and would have limited to no changes on the previously identified construction effects of the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes on the visual receptors and the supporting representative views.
- 8.145. The cumulative scheme New Horizons Court, Ryan Drive, Brentford TW8 9EP (Ref: 02912/A/P1) is not relevant to this assessment as there is no change to its built form.
- 8.146. For a full description of the cumulative effect of the combination of the construction of the Development at the identified cumulative schemes please revert to Appendix 8.3, which is summarised in Table 8.14.

Table 8.14: Summary of Cumulative Schemes and Development's Demolition and Construction Effects on the Visual Receptors Representative Views

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
1	Syon Lane Station	Low to Medium	High	Moderate to Major Adverse
2	Northumberland Avenue	Medium	Medium	Moderate Adverse
3	Grant Way roundabout	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Adverse
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Low	Medium to High	Moderate Adverse
5	GWR outside no.772	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
6	GWR central reservation	Low	Low	Minor Adverse
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
9	Osterley House	High	None	None
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
11	Boston Manor House	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Adverse
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Adverse
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Medium to High	Low to Medium	Moderate Adverse
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
17	Riverside walk Kew	High	Very low	Minor Adverse
18	Old Deer Park	Medium	Very low	None
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	High	None	None
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	High	None	None
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	High	None	None
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	High	None	None
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	High	None	None
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Low	Low	Negligible Adverse
25	Syon House	High	Low	Moderate Adverse
26	GWR outside West Link House	Low	Low	Minor Adverse

Operational Phase

Townscape Character Area Receptors

8.147. It is considered that the majority of the physical fabric that contributes to the characteristics of 'TCA1: GWR Corridor' would remain once the Development and cumulative schemes are implemented and operational. This would result in no change in effects on the townscape character area receptors, as set out in Table 8.15, during the operational stage for the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes identified.

Table 8.15: Summary of Cumulative Schemes and Development's Operational Effects on the Townscape Character Area Receptors

Townscape Receptor	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
TCA1 – GWR Corridor	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA2 – Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential	Low	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA3 – Historic Brentford and Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
TCA4 – Brentford and South Ealing residential	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA5 – Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential	Low	Low to Medium	Minor Beneficial
TCA6 - Osterley Park	High	Very low	Negligible Neutral
TCA7 – Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes	High	Very low	Minor Neutral

Visual Receptor's Representative Views

- 8.148. The Development could have a potential effect in combination with the cumulative schemes of Former Syon Gate Service Station, Land at South of Gillette Corner, Great West Road, Isleworth TW7 5NP (Ref: P/2018/4691) in short to medium distance views from the GWR at its associated properties from the east and west to the Site. This is demonstrated in representative views 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.
- 8.149. The Development would also have a potential effect in combination with the construction of the Osterley Gate, Syon Lane, Isleworth TW7 5NZ (Ref: Ref: 1106/B/SCOPE1) from the surrounding visual receptors. As illustrated in representative views 1, 6, 8, 14 and 15.
- 8.150. It is considered that the remaining cumulative schemes of 891 Great West Road, Isleworth London TW7 5PD (Ref: 00505/891/P4 & 00505/891/P5), 4 and 8 Harlequin Avenue, Brentford, TW8 9EW (Ref: P/2017/5358), Sky, Sites 6 & 7, Grant Way, Isleworth TW7 5QD (Ref: P/2020/0272), Bolder Academy, 1 MacFarlane Lane, Isleworth, TW7 5PN (Ref: 01106/W/P9) and 1 Commerce Road, Brentford, London, TW8 8LE (Ref: P/2018/2011) and would have limited to no changes on the previously identified effects of the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes on the visual receptors and the supporting representative views.
- 8.151. For a full description of the magnitude of impact and effect of the Development in combination with the cumulative schemes please revert to Appendix 8.3, which is summarised in Table 8.16.

Table 8.16: Summary of Cumulative Schemes and Development's Operational Effects on the Visual Receptors Representative Views

RV	Location	Sensitivity	Magnitude of impact	Likely Significance of Effect
1	Syon Lane Station	Low to Medium	High	Moderate to Major Beneficial
2	Northumberland Avenue	Medium	Medium	Moderate Beneficial
3	Grant Way roundabout	Low	Medium	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
4	GWR Firestone entrance	Low	Medium to High	Moderate Beneficial
5	GWR outside no.772	Low	Low	Minor Beneficial
6	GWR central reservation	Low	Low	Minor Beneficial
7	Osterley Park (footpath)	Medium to High	None	None
8	Osterley Park (centre)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Neutral
9	Osterley House	High	None	None
10	Osterley Park (bridleway)	Medium to High	None	None
11	Boston Manor House	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Neutral
12	St Paul's Recreation Ground	Medium to High	None	None
13	Syon Park (Gate Lodge)	Medium to High	Very low	Minor Neutral
14	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north)	Medium to High	Low	Minor to Moderate Neutral
15	Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south)	Medium to High	Low to Medium	Moderate Neutral
16	Riverside Walk Isleworth	Medium to High	None	None
17	Riverside walk Kew	High	None	None
18	Old Deer Park	Medium	None	None
19	Botanical Gardens Kew, Cedar Vista east	High	None	None
20	Botanical Gardens Kew, Syon Vista/ Cedar Vista west	High	None	None
21	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of the Palm House	High	None	None
22	Botanical Gardens Kew, close to 'the Botanical' building	High	None	None
23	Botanical Gardens Kew, west of Elizabeth Gates	High	None	None
24	GWR and Jersey Road	Low	Very low	None
25	Syon House	High	Very low	Minor Neutral
26	GWR outside West Link House	Low	Low	Minor Beneficial

Residual Effects

Demolition and Construction

8.152. Given that no further mitigation has been proposed over and above the CEMP as part of this assessment, the residual effects of the demolition and construction stage of the Development on both the townscape character receptors and visual receptor's representative views would remain as outlined in Tables 8.9 and 8.10 and in conjunction with cumulative schemes Tables 8.13 and 8.14. No monitoring measures are required.

Completed Development

8.153. Given that no further mitigation has been proposed over and above the detailed design as part of this assessment, the residual effects of the demolition and construction stage of the Development on both the townscape character receptors and visual receptor's representative views would remain as outlined in Tables 8.11 and 8.12 and in conjunction with cumulative schemes Tables 8.15 and 8.16. No monitoring measures are required.

Summary

8.154. The TVIA has been founded on a thorough study of the Site and its townscape setting, and through understanding these features and resources, a robust impact assessment of the Development has been undertaken. It has been undertaken through desktop research and field studies to identify and record the character of the townscape and understand the Development's visibility.

8.155. Within the Chapter the townscape impact assessment effects have assessed its interaction with the existing townscape character areas (townscape receptors). Whilst the visual impact assessment has considered the effect of it on the visual amenity experienced by people (visual receptors) and how this will change through a series of representative views.

8.156. It has established the sensitivity of the townscape receptors and visual receptors' representative views and their capacity to accommodate the Development. The likely significant effects associated with both the construction and operational stages of the Development have been identified, along with the assessment of any potential mitigation measures included to determine the likely significance of any residual effects.

8.157. The methodology for undertaking this assessment follows GLVIA3 and consultation has been undertaken with LBH Officers regarding the approach to the representative views used to

inform the townscape and visual impact assessments

8.158. The Site falls within TCA1: GWR Corridor and the demolition and construction of the Development would result in a minor to moderate adverse effect. Glimpsed views to the Development's cranes and construction hoarding are likely to be visible from TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential and TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential and to a limited extent from TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential, TCA6: Osterley Park and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes. Resulting in a minor adverse effect to TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential, TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential, TCA6: Osterley Park and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes and a negligible adverse effect on TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential. The construction of the Development will result in a negligible neutral effect on TCA3: Historic Brentford and Isleworth. No mitigation measures are proposed.

8.159. The impact of the demolition and construction on the Site would be limited to the visibility to the associated cranes and scaffolding related to the Development. This would lead to the following effects on the representative views:

- Moderate to Major Adverse (significant) – RV1 Syon Lane Station;
- Moderate Adverse (significant) – RV2 Northumberland Avenue, RV4 GWR Firestone entrance, RV15 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south) and RV25 Syon House;
- Minor to Moderate Adverse – RV3 Grant Way roundabout, RV13 Syon Park (Gate Lodge) and RV14 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north);
- Minor Adverse – RV5 GWR outside no.772, RV6 GWR central reservation, RV7 Osterley Park (footpath), RV8 Osterley Park (centre), RV11 Boston Manor, RV12 St Paul's Recreation Ground, RV17 Riverside Walk and RV26 GWR outside West Link House; and
- Negligible to Minor Adverse – RV24 GWR and Jersey Road.

8.160. The construction of the Development would not affect the remaining representative views. No mitigation measures are proposed.

8.161. The Development falls within TCA1: GWR Corridor and at the operational stage would result in a minor to moderate beneficial effect. This is due to it improving the existing townscape situation through providing a new perimeter block, improved public realm and architecture that reflects and builds on the existing Art Deco buildings that currently address the GWR.

8.162. Glimpsed views to the Development are likely to be visible and lead to indirect effects on TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential and TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth

residential and to a limited extent from TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential, TCA6: Osterley Park and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes. Resulting in a minor beneficial or neutral indirect effect to TCA4: Brentford and South Ealing residential, TCA5: Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential, TCA6: Osterley Park and TCA7: Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes and a negligible and neutral indirect effect on TCA2: Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential. The Development will not affect TCA3: Historic Brentford and Isleworth. No mitigation measures are proposed.

- 8.163. Due to the relatively flat landform present Development's ZTV would extend beyond the existing situation. Within the immediate context the Development would provide a clearly defined, improved, edge to the surrounding roads of Syon Lane and GWR. Variation in the colour of the brick façade and approach to architectural treatment would provide a high level of visual interest. It would form a new backdrop to views, which would result in an improvement to the visual receptor's view, the townscape along the GWR and the emerging Great West Corridor character.
- 8.164. The Development's proposed massing provides a step-in height away from the lower built form present within the residential townscape to the south and west of the Site. It also retains views to the former Gillette Factory's clock tower from Syon Lane Station.
- 8.165. Linear views would also be possible from the roads orientated towards the Development such as the GWR, Northumberland Avenue and Syon Lane itself. These would vary subject to the viewers proximity to the Site. From sections of the GWR the Development's Building A and B1 would terminate the wide, open, linear view and positively mark the western entrance to the Great West Corridor.
- 8.166. The potential effect of views from within publicly accessible areas of open space were also considered. This established that glimpsed kinetic views would be possible from sections of Park Road and the public right of way within Syon Park to the upper floors of the Development. Where visible the differing approach to the façade material and application of the detailed architectural treatment on the Development's building typologies would result in a layered and modulated built form in the background of the view. The Development would fall behind the trees that frame the park and would not detract the visual receptor's appreciation of the features within the fore and middle ground of the view.
- 8.167. Further views were considered within Boston Manor and Osterley Park, which concluded that the Development would result in a very minor alteration to the views within these areas and mark the western entrance to the Great West Corridor. Importantly the Development would not detract the visual receptor's appreciation of the pasture field's associated with Osterley

Park or the formal lawns and evergreen specimen conifers associated with Boston Manor.

8.168. It is considered that views would also be possible from the surrounding properties that have windows that overlook the Development and raised vantage points. Within these views the Development would mark the western gateway of the Great West Corridor.

8.169. The Development would not be visible within the formal or designed views and vistas within the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew WHS. Also the identified vistas set out within the Thames Landscape Strategy.

8.170. This would lead to the following effects on the representative views:

- Moderate to Major Beneficial (significant) – RV1 Syon Lane Station;
- Moderate Beneficial or Neutral (significant) – RV2 Northumberland Avenue, RV4 GWR Firestone entrance and RV15 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south);
- Minor to Moderate Neutral – RV14 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north);
- Minor to Moderate Beneficial – RV3 Grant Way roundabout;
- Minor Neutral – RV7 Osterley Park (footpath), RV8 Osterley Park (centre), RV11 Boston Manor, RV13 Syon Park (Gate Lodge) and RV25 Syon Park House; and
- Minor Beneficial– RV5 GWR outside no.772, RV6 GWR central reservation and RV26 GWR outside West Link House.

8.171. The Development would not affect the remaining representative views. No mitigation measures are proposed.

8.172. Table 8.17 contains a summary of the likely significant effects of the Development.

Table 8.17: Table of Significance – Townscape and Visual Effects

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
Construction											
TCA1	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA2	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
TCA3	Temporary	Negligible	Measures within the CEMP		x						Negligible Neutral
TCA4	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA5	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
TCA6	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP		x						Minor Adverse
TCA7	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP	x							Minor Adverse
RV1	Temporary	Moderate to Major Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Moderate to Major Adverse
RV2	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Moderate Adverse
RV3	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV4	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Moderate Adverse
RV5	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV6	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV7	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV8	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV9	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP						x		None
RV10	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV11	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
RV12	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV13	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV14	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV15	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Moderate Adverse
RV16	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP						x		None
RV17	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
RV18	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP						x		None
RV19	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP	x							None
RV20	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP	x							None
RV21	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP	x							None
RV22	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP	x							None
RV23	Temporary	None	Measures within the CEMP	x							None
RV24	Temporary	Negligible Adverse	Measures within the CEMP							x	Negligible Adverse

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L		
RV25	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Measures within the CEMP								x	Moderate Adverse
RV26	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Measures within the CEMP								x	Minor Adverse
Completed Development												
TCA1	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA2	Permanent	Negligible Neutral	Integrated as part of the design								x	Negligible Neutral
TCA3	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design		x							None
TCA4	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA5	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
TCA6	Permanent	Negligible Neutral	Integrated as part of the design		x							Negligible Neutral
TCA7	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design	x								Minor Neutral
RV1	Permanent	Moderate to Major Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Moderate to Major Beneficial
RV2	Permanent	Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Moderate Beneficial
RV3	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L		
RV4	Permanent	Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Moderate Beneficial
RV5	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
RV6	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
RV7	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV8	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Neutral
RV9	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design							x		None
RV10	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV11	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x		Minor Neutral
RV12	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV13	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x		Minor Neutral
RV14	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x		Minor to Moderate Neutral

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV15	Permanent	Moderate Neutral	Integrated as part of the design						x		Moderate Neutral
RV16	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV17	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV18	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV19	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV20	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV21	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV22	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV23	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV24	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design							x	None
RV25	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor Neutral

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L		
RV25	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
Cumulative Effects - Construction												
TCA1	Temporary	Minor Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA2	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Minor Adverse
TCA3	Temporary	Negligible Neutral	Integrated as part of the CEMP		x							Negligible Neutral
TCA4	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
TCA5	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Minor Adverse
TCA6	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP		x							Minor / Adverse
TCA7	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x								Minor / Adverse
RV1	Temporary	Moderate to Major Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Moderate to Major Adverse
RV2	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Moderate Adverse
RV3	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP								x	Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV4	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x		Moderate Adverse
RV5	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP								x	Minor Adverse
RV6	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP								x	Minor Adverse
RV7	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP								x	Minor Adverse

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV8	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV9	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		None
RV10	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV11	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
RV12	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
RV13	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV14	Temporary	Minor to Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		Minor to Moderate Adverse
RV15	Temporary	Moderate Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		Moderate Adverse
RV16	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		None
RV17	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		Minor Adverse
RV18	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP						x		None
RV19	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x							None
RV20	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x							None
RV21	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x							None
RV22	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x							None
RV23	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP	x							None

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV24	Temporary	None	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	None
RV25	Temporary	Negligible Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	Negligible Adverse
RV26	Temporary	Minor Adverse	Integrated as part of the CEMP							x	Minor Adverse
Cumulative Effects - Completed											
TCA1	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA2	Permanent	Negligible / Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x	Negligible Neutral
TCA3	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design		x						None
TCA4	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
TCA5	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor Beneficial
TCA6	Permanent	Negligible Neutral	Integrated as part of the design		x						Negligible Neutral
TCA7	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design	x							Minor Neutral
RV1	Permanent	Moderate to Major Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Moderate to Major Beneficial
RV2	Permanent	Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Moderate Beneficial

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L		
RV3	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor to Moderate Beneficial
RV4	Permanent	Moderate Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Moderate Beneficial
RV5	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
RV6	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor Beneficial
RV7	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV8	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Neutral	Integrated as part of the design								x	Minor to Moderate Neutral
RV9	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design							x		None
RV10	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV11	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x		Minor Neutral
RV12	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design								x	None
RV13	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x		Minor Neutral

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV14	Permanent	Minor to Moderate Neutral	Integrated as part of the design						x		Minor to Moderate Neutral
RV15	Permanent	Moderate Neutral	Integrated as part of the design						x		Moderate Neutral
RV16	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV17	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV18	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design						x		None
RV19	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV20	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV21	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV22	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV23	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design	x							None
RV24	Permanent	None	Integrated as part of the design							x	None

Potential Effect	Nature of Effect (Permanent/Temporary)	Significance (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)	Mitigation / Enhancement Measures	Geographical Importance*							Residual Effects (Major/Moderate/Minor/Negligible) (Beneficial/Adverse/Neutral)
				I	UK	E	R	C	B	L	
RV25	Permanent	Minor Neutral	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor Neutral
RV25	Permanent	Minor Beneficial	Integrated as part of the design							x	Minor Beneficia

*** Geographical Level of Importance**

I = International; UK = United Kingdom; E = England; R = Regional; C = County; B = Borough; L = Local

REFERENCES

- ⁱ CLG (February 2019) *National Planning Policy Framework*
- ⁱⁱ CLG, *Planning Practice Guidance*, <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/>, accessed on-line 2014
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government (2019) *National Design Guide*
- ^{iv} Greater London Authority (2015) *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (Adopted March 2015) (Further Alterations to the London Plan)*
- ^v Greater London Authority (2019) DRAFT *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London*
- ^{vi} Greater London Authority (2014) *Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context Supplementary Planning Guidance*
- ^{vii} Royal Botanic Gardens (2020) *Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew World Heritage Site Management Plan*
- ^{viii} The Thames Landscape Strategy (1994; reviewed 2012) *The Thames Landscape Strategy Hampton to Kew*
- ^{ix} London Borough of Hounslow (2015) *London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030*
- ^x London Borough of Hounslow (2017) *Draft Great West Corridor Local Plan Review (Volume 4)*
- ^{xi} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xii} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xiii} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study Appendix: Views Testing*
- ^{xiv} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xv} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xvi} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xvii} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study Appendix: Views Testing*
- ^{xviii} Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (Third Edition)
- ^{xix} Natural England (2014), *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment*
- ^{xx} Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (Third Edition)
- ^{xxi} Natural England (2014), *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment*
- ^{xxii} Greater London Authority (2014) *Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context Supplementary Planning Guidance*
- ^{xxiii} London Borough of Hounslow (2014) *Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study*
- ^{xxiv} London Borough of Hounslow (2014) *Urban Context and Character Study*
- ^{xxv} London Borough of Hounslow (2014) *Urban Context and Character Study*
- ^{xxvi} Natural England (2013) (web based) *National Character Area Profile: 112 Inner London (NE476)*
- ^{xxvii} Natural England (2011) (web based) *London's Natural Signatures: Hounslow Gravels*
- ^{xxviii} Greater London Authority (2014) *Shaping Neighbourhoods: Character and Context Supplementary Planning Guidance*
- ^{xxix} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *GWC Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xxx} London Borough of Hounslow (2014) *Urban Context and Character Study*
- ^{xxxi} Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (Third Edition)
- ^{xxxii} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *Masterplan and Capacity Study*
- ^{xxxiii} London Borough of Hounslow (2017) *Draft Great West Corridor Local Plan Review (Volume 4)*
- ^{xxxiv} London Borough of Hounslow (2019) *Masterplan and Capacity Study*