

The construction of the [amended](#) proposed development would not affect the remaining representative views.

8.7.2 Completed Development

The [amended](#) proposed development falls within TCA2 - Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential. Upon completion and operation, the [amended](#) proposed development would result in a beneficial effect on TCA2 as the improvement delivered in respect of the existing townscape quality and condition through the replacement of an unattractive site with a well-designed development, creating a new, vibrant quarter and providing a focus for the community.

Glimpsed views to the [amended](#) proposed development 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. This would result in a beneficial or neutral effect to TCA2 - Osterley & Spring Grove non-residential, TCA4 - Brentford and South Ealing residential, TCA5 - Osterley, Spring Grove and Isleworth residential, TCA6 - Osterley Park and TCA7 - Arcadian Thames and historic landscapes. The [amended](#) proposed development would not affect TCA3 - Historic Brentford and Isleworth.

Due to the relatively flat landform in the area, the [amended](#) proposed development's visibility would extend beyond the immediate surroundings. Glimpsed views of the proposed development would be possible from areas of the surrounding public open space areas such as Goals Gillette Corner Sportsfield, Syon Park and Osterley Park. Linear views would also be possible from the roads orientated towards the proposed development such as Oaklands Avenue and Syon Lane itself. It is considered that views would also be possible from the surrounding properties that have windows which look towards the proposed development.

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

- RV4 Goals Gillette Corner Sportsfield – significant beneficial;
- RV1 Syon Lane Station; RV2 Junction of Syon Lane and Great West Road (A4); and RV6 Pavement of GWR – beneficial; and
- RV5 Oaklands Avenue; RV7 Osterley Park (footpath); RV8 Osterley Park (centre); RV10 Osterley Park (bridleway); RV13 Syon Park (Gate Lodge); RV14 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (north); RV15 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south); and RV25 Syon House [RV26 Old Isleworth Gate and RV27 Thames Path](#) – neutral.
- [Kew Gardens, Woodland Walk](#) – none.

The proposed development would not affect the remaining representative views and [there](#) would ~~not be limited glimpsed views of the built form~~ visible from the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew, ~~which are not considered significant~~.

Four verified views of the proposed developments are shown in Figure 8.1 - 8.4. ~~An illustrative render is provided in Figure 8.5, to show what the view could look like according to the design code.~~

Within the images, each parcel of the proposed development is shown in a different colour to differentiate them. Where the buildings fall behind built form, or significant vegetation, the proposed development's mass has been shown with a dash demonstrating that it is unlikely to be seen within the view.



Figure 8.1: View 01 Syon Lane Station View



Figure 8.2: View 02 Junction of Syon Lane and Great West Road (A4)



Figure 8.3: View 04 Goals Gillette Corner Sportsfield



Figure 8.4: View 08 Osterley Park (centre)

8.8 Built Heritage

8.8.1 Demolition and Construction

The setting of the identified heritage assets and the character and appearance of nearby Conservation Areas and townscape quality generally, would be affected to varying degrees by the demolition and construction stage. The works would have the potential impact of reducing the degree to which heritage and townscape character within the study area can be appreciated. However, as with the nature of demolition and construction effects (i.e. temporary), the character would not be permanently affected. The effects would vary considerably depending on the distance from the site and the sensitivity of the asset to change. As is typical of major development in an urban context, a CEMP would be implemented by the contractor during the demolition and construction stage, which would seek to prevent/minimise adverse impacts (e.g. dust, noise, visual appearances of the works) through appropriate mitigation measures.

Overall, it is considered that the demolition of the existing site and construction of the proposed development would result in a negligible to adverse effect on the identified heritage assets.

None of the reported effects would be significant.

8.8.2 Completed Development

The [amended](#) proposed development would replace an existing Tesco Extra Store which is of no particular architectural or heritage merit to the area. The [amended](#) proposed development is well-designed and provides new uses that are appropriate for the site and for the area. The design breaks down the overall volume of accommodation in a way that responds to the circumstances of the site and the sensitivity of its surroundings. The tallest part of the [amended](#) proposed development (Block H) is positioned towards the eastern side of the site and steps down towards the Gillette Building, Syon Lane and the Osterley Park Conservation Area – the areas that are most sensitive in heritage and townscape terms. This also ensures that the tower of the Former Gillette Factory is retained as a landmark within local views.

The proposed development is of considerable scale and density and would change the setting of heritage assets and the townscape character of the surroundings of the site by virtue of its visibility and presence. That visibility is not, by itself, adverse. The heritage significance of each of the heritage assets assessed does not inherently rely on no change occurring in their setting, nor is it necessarily harmed by the presence of new development in their setting that is highly visible.

The design of the proposed development has been carefully undertaken to incorporate embedded mitigation to prevent any adverse effect on nearby and more widely located heritage assets. As such, the resulting effects on heritage assets would be neutral.

[The additional three views that have been modelled and assessed would not change the reported effects, in particular the effects on Kew Gardens or Syon House.](#)

None of the reported effects would be significant.

9. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

9.1 Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

Intra-project cumulative effects from the [amended](#) proposed development itself on surrounding sensitive receptors and on-site receptors during construction works and also once the [amended](#) proposed development is completed, have been considered.

9.1.1 Demolition and Construction

There would be the potential for intra-project effect interactions during the demolition and construction stage, primarily in respect of noise, vibration, air quality and daylight, sunlight, and overshadowing. The combined cumulative effects have the potential to affect existing off-site residential occupants.

It is generally accepted that as part of any construction works, receptors in close proximity would be affected to some degree by a combination of noise and dust disturbance. However, by minimising all of these effects at source through application of control measures in the CEMP; maintaining good housekeeping; undertaking monitoring where necessary; requiring just-in-time deliveries; and providing a public liaison whereby the public can communicate any complaints or unforeseen effects to the Applicant, it is expected that those combined effects that include noise and or air quality impacts would not be significant.

9.1.2 Completed Development

Although there are individual effects (both adverse and beneficial) resulting from the completed proposed development, there are no intra-cumulative cumulative effects that are likely to arise.

Due to the proximity of cumulative scheme construction sites, there construction activity associated with the cumulative scheme would be visible in several representative views. Dependent on phasing and timing, this may result in a change in effect from that reported for the [amended](#) proposed development for RV1 Syon Lane Station, RV13 Syon Park (Gate Lodge) and RV15 Syon Park southern entrance footpath (south) to be significant adverse.

Consistent with the effects of the [amended](#) proposed development, the cumulative schemes would deliver high quality new housing, generate significant local and borough employment and have a beneficial effect on the local economy through additional spending. The cumulative effect on borough deprivation would be significant beneficial.

The cumulative schemes would deliver high quality design and public realm improvements. The schemes would seek to promote more sustainable modes of transport and would be expected to make appropriate financial contributions towards community infrastructure, public transport capacity and highway works as necessary.

The cumulative schemes would contribute to the ongoing high-rise redevelopment of the study area and thereby significantly add to the changing townscape character and local views.

As in the completed developed scenario, the roof terrace amenity spaces around the [amended](#) proposed development would have unsuitable wind conditions for the intended use representing direct. These areas would also be expected to experience unsafe wind conditions and would require mitigation measures to be developed at the detailed design stage to ensure safe and suitable wind conditions for residents using these spaces.

No significant cumulative transport, air quality, daylight, sunlight and overshadowing effects would arise as a result of the [amended](#) proposed development and the cumulative schemes due to a combination of distance and timing of proposed works.

Overall, the EIA concludes that the inter-project cumulative effects would give rise to new significant environmental effects, over and above those reported for the [amended](#) proposed development, in respect of noise during the demolition and construction stage, as well as townscape and views during the completed development stage.



10. SUMMARY

The iterative nature of the design process has enabled the design of an appropriate development response at the **application** site. Overall, the **amended** proposed development would deliver a high quality residential led, mixed-use scheme that fits into the existing and emerging surrounding area.

The EIA process has concluded that there would be following significant environmental effects for the demolition and construction stage:

- Significant adverse effects:
 - Introduction of demolition and construction plant noise to residential properties along Macfarlane Way/Oaklands Avenue, the Sky Campus and new on-site noise sensitive receptors.
 - [Glimpsed views of construction plant from the Thames Path and Old Isleworth Gate views.](#)
- Significant beneficial effects:
 - None.

For the completed development stage there would be the following:

- Significant adverse effects:
 - Unsuitable wind conditions for roof level amenity use at the majority of locations (strong winds).
 - [Bus delay for the E1 service on a Saturday based on a worst-case design option.](#)
- Significant beneficial effects:
 - Provision of 1,677 new dwellings of varied sizes and tenures; and
 - Changes in level of deprivation.

The EIA process has identified the need for the following additional mitigation measures:

- CIL payments towards primary school provision based on worst-case child yield
- CIL payments towards additional GP provision based on worst-case population yield
- CIL payments towards dentist services
- CIL payments towards 1,670 m² play space shortfall based on worst-case child yield
- CIL payments towards additional community facilities
- During the reserved matters stage further design and assessment will be undertaken in respect of wind microclimate to ensure appropriate mitigation options are integrated within the detailed proposals.
- Design Code commitment that the detailed massing of the **amended** proposed development would be designed so as not to reduce the sunlight to neighbouring gardens to below 50 % receiving two hours sun on the ground on March 21st.

11. PROJECT TEAM

The Applicant has appointed a design team to assist in the development of the application and has concurrently appointed an EIA team to undertake the EIA and prepare the ES in accordance with Regulation 18(5)(a) of the EIA Regulations.

The team members and their respective roles are presented in Table 11.1.

Table 11.1: Design and EIA Team	
Company	Role
JTP	Architect
WSP	Planning Consultant
Waterman Structures Limited	Ground Conditions, Structural and Drainage Engineer
Buro Happold	Mechanical Engineer
Waterman Infrastructure and Environment	Geotechnical/Contamination and Drainage Consultant
Murdoch Wickham	Landscape Architect
RHDHV	EIA Technical Specialist: Transport and Accessibility
Point2	EIA Technical Specialist: Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing; and Internal Daylight Studies
KM Heritage	EIA Technical Specialist: Built Heritage
Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA)	EIA Technical Specialist: Archaeology
AVR London	EIA Technical Specialist: Visualisations
Rowan Williams Davies and Irwin Inc. (RWDI)	EIA Technical Specialist: Wind Microclimate
ARC	EIA Technical Specialist: Townscape and Visual
Hodkinson	Sustainability Consultant
Ramboll	EIA Project Manager Author of NTS Author of ES Volume 1/4 Chapters 1-5, 12-13 Author of Non-Technical Summary EIA Technical Specialist: Air Quality EIA Technical Specialist: Noise and Vibration EIA Technical Specialist: Ecology EIA Technical Specialist: Flood Risk