9 Landscape, Townscape & Visual Impact

9.1 Introduction

9.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement has been produced by Savills Urban Design Studio. It has been prepared by Ruth Bishop (Savills), a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute and Recognised Practitioner of the Urban Design Group.

9.1.2 This Landscape, Townscape and Visual chapter (LTVIA) chapter appraises the baseline and impacts and effects on landscape character, landscape features and visual amenity. This section describes the policy background and how the methodology has been informed by the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment 3rd edition* ('GLVIA3', Landscape Institute & IEMA, 2013.)

9.1.3 It describes and evaluates any significant changes to landscape character, features and visual amenity that are predicted to arise due to the Proposed Development as set out in the Parameter Plans and described in Chapter 3. It also considers the potential additional mitigation as set out in the Illustrative Landscape Layout General Arrangement drawing (Appendix 9.2).

9.1.4 This chapter is supported by the following technical appendices:

- Appendix 9.1 International and National Landscape Policy
- Appendix 9.2 - AECOM Illustrative Landscape Layout GA - PGF-ACM-00-XX-DR-LA-20100
- Appendix 9.3 Savills LVIA Figures 9.1 – 9.8

9.1.5 Appendix 9.3 contains the following figures:

- Figure 9.1 Landscape & Townscape Designations
- Figure 9.2 Landscape/Townscape Character Areas
- Figure 9.3 Townscape Character Area Photographs
- Figure 9.4 Terrain
- Figure 9.5 Movement and Access
- Figure 9.6 Immediate Landscape Context
- Figure 9.7 Site Landscape Photographs
- Figure 9.8 Zone of Theoretical Visibility and Verified Views

9.1.6 The main objectives of this chapter are as follows:

- Review relevant landscape policies and designations relating to the Site;
- Establishment of the baseline landscape and visual conditions, including the sensitivity/value of receptors;
- Identification and assessment of the magnitude of any potential impacts and effects;
- Identify proposed additional mitigation;

- Appraise of the significance of any residual landscape and visual effects.

International and National Landscape Policy Context

9.1.7 International and National Policies are provided in Appendix 9.1. This includes the European Landscape Convention, *A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (HM Government, 2018, updated 2019)*, the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and Green Belt and Nature Conservation Planning Practice Guidance.

Local Planning Policy Context

London Plan (Adopted 2021)

9.1.8 The London Plan (2021) contains a number of policies that are directly relevant to landscape and visual amenity.

9.1.9 Policy D3: 'Optimising Site Capacity Through the Design-Led Approach' requires development to respond to the existing character of an area and provide space for urban greening.

9.1.10 Policy D9 'Tall Buildings' covers buildings over 6 storeys or 18m in height. Given that the main building proposed on the Site is 20m in height it is therefore covered by this policy. Relevant sections of Policy D9 include the consideration of visual and cumulative impacts:

"Development proposals should address the following impacts:

1) visual impacts

a) the views of buildings from different distances:

i long-range views – these require attention to be paid to the design of the top of the building. It should make a positive contribution to the existing and emerging skyline and not adversely affect local or strategic views

ii mid-range views from the surrounding neighbourhood – particular attention should be paid to the form and proportions of the building. It should make a positive contribution to the local townscape in terms of legibility, proportions and materiality

iii immediate views from the surrounding streets – attention should be paid to the base of the building. It should have a direct relationship with the street, maintaining the pedestrian scale, character and vitality of the street. Where the edges of the Site are adjacent to buildings of significantly lower height or parks and other open spaces there should be an appropriate transition in scale between the tall building and its surrounding context to protect amenity or privacy.

b) whether part of a group or stand-alone, tall buildings should reinforce the spatial hierarchy of the local and wider context and aid legibility and wayfinding

c) architectural quality and materials should be of an exemplary standard to ensure that the appearance and architectural integrity of the building is maintained through its lifespan

d) proposals should take account of, and avoid harm to, the significance of London's heritage assets and their settings. Proposals resulting in harm will require clear and convincing justification, demonstrating that alternatives have been explored and that there are clear public benefits that outweigh that harm. The buildings should positively contribute to the character of the area

e) buildings in the setting of a World Heritage Site must preserve, and not harm, the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, and the ability to appreciate it

f) buildings near the River Thames, particularly in the Thames Policy Area, should protect and enhance the open quality of the river and the riverside public realm, including views, and not contribute to a canyon effect along the river

g) buildings should not cause adverse reflected glare

h) buildings should be designed to minimise light pollution from internal and external lighting…

…4) cumulative impacts

a) the cumulative visual, functional and environmental impacts of proposed, consented and planned tall buildings in an area must be considered when assessing tall building proposals and when developing plans for an area. Mitigation measures should be identified and designed into the building as integral features from the outset to avoid retro-fitting.

9.1.11 Policy G1 'Green Infrastructure' requires development to incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into the city's wider green infrastructure network.

9.1.12 Policy G5 'Urban Greening' requires major development proposals to include urban greening. Measures may include high-quality landscaping; new tree planting; green roofs, green walls and nature based sustainable drainage features. The policy introduces the Urban Greening Factor (UGF), which provides a measurable assessment of the quantity and quality of greening within development proposals.

9.1.13 Policy G7 'Trees and Woodlands' seeks to ensure that existing trees of value are retained wherever possible. If development necessitates the removal of trees then there should be the adequate replacement of the trees. New developments should also include the planting of additional trees in new developments.

London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan(s)

9.1.14 The principal policies relating to landscape character, visual amenity, green infrastructure, open space, trees and biodiversity are contained within the *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies* (2012) and *Part 2 - Development Management Policies* (2020).

9.1.15 Part 1 Policy BE1: 'Built Environment' requires development to maintain and improve the quality of the built environment. Development proposals should:

"1. Achieve a high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations, extensions and the public realm which enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, contributes to community cohesion and a sense of place;

2. Be designed to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's buildings, townscapes, landscapes and views, and make a positive contribution to the local area in terms of layout, form, scale and materials and seek to protect the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential properties;…

…5. Improve areas of poorer environmental quality, including within the areas of relative disadvantage of Hayes, Yiewsley and West Drayton. All regeneration schemes should ensure that they are appropriate to their historic context, make use of heritage assets and reinforce their significance;…

…7. Improve the quality of the public realm and provide for public and private spaces that are

attractive, safe, functional, diverse, sustainable, accessible to all, respect the local character and landscape, integrate with the development, enhance and protect biodiversity through the inclusion of living walls, roofs and areas for wildlife, encourage physical activity and where appropriate introduce public art;"

9.1.16 Part 1 Policy EM2: 'Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains' seeks to maintain the extent and strategic functions of these areas. The policy states that any proposals for development within the Green Belt will be assessed against national and Local Plan policies, including the very special circumstances test.

9.1.17 Part 2 Policy DMHB 11 'Design of New Development' requires all development to:

"A)…be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including:"

"i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding:

- *scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures;*
- *…architectural composition and quality of detailing;*
- *local topography, views both from and to the Site; and*
- *impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.*

iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the Site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets…

v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure."

9.1.18 Part 2 Policy DMHB 14: 'Trees and Landscaping' requires that:

"A) All developments will be expected to retain or enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features of merit.

B) …provide a landscape scheme that includes hard and soft landscaping appropriate to the character of the area, which supports and enhances biodiversity and amenity particularly in areas deficient in green infrastructure."

9.1.19 Hillingdon Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan; however, as this remains at a scoping consultation stage, the adopted *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)* and *Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)* continue to form the relevant planning policy framework for the assessment of landscape and visual impacts and effects.

9.2 Assessment methodology

Guidance and Best Practice

9.2.1 The following guidance has been used:

- *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition* (Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013) ('GLVIA');
- *Technical Guidance Note LITGN-2024-01: Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition (GLVIA3)* (Landscape Institute, August, 2024);
- *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment* (Natural England, October 2014);
- *Landscape and Seascape Character Assessments Guidance* (Natural England & DEFRA, October 2014)
- *Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals* (Landscape Institute 2019);
- *Technical Guidance Note 08/19 Camera Auto Settings* (Landscape Institute 2019);
- *Technical Guidance Note 09/19 Earth Curvature* (Landscape Institute 2019);
- *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Sustainability & Environment Appraisal LA 107 Landscape and Visual Effects (formerly DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 5 Landscape Effects and IAN 135/10) Revision 2* (Highways England, Transport Scotland, Welsh Government, Department for Infrastructure An Rinn Bonnegair, February 2020).

Desk-based Review

9.2.2 Baseline data has been collected via a desk-based survey and Site visits.

9.2.3 The desk-based survey has comprised a review of:

- Aerial photography;
- OS mapping;
- GIS database of national and local landscape, ecology and heritage designations. This chapter does not comprise an ecological or heritage review, but considers whether any natural and heritage assets contribute to the landscape character of the Site;
- National and local planning policy relating to landscape and visual matters;
- National character assessments, comprising:
    - Natural England's *National Landscape Character Areas*

Site Visits

9.2.4 A Site visit was undertaken by a Chartered Landscape Architect and Urban Design Group Recognised Practitioner in August 2026. The Site visits confirmed the information arising from the desk study, produced a photographic record of the Site, highlighted any landscape features not already apparent from the desk study and enabled potential views into and out of the Site to be appraised. The proximity of the Holiday Inn to the immediate north of the Site was a useful local landmark to judge the location of the Site, given that the Holiday Inn is approximately 40m in height and is a visual landmark given the level nature of the surrounding landscape. It is

important to note that the proposed data centre buildings would rise to a maximum of 20m in height however and therefore would not be comparable to the height of the Holiday Inn building.

9.2.5 A further Site visit was undertaken by visualisation consultants, Rockhunter, to enable a series of visualisations to be prepared. These included Site photography and surveying and were undertaken in October 2026.

9.2.6 As there was no winter photography, a set of visualisations have been prepared using Vu.CITY modelling to demonstrate potential visibility with winter vegetation.

Geographical Scope

9.2.7 The Site visit covered the surrounding area, extending from West Drayton to the north-west of the Site and Hayes to the north-east, as well as Harlington to the east and Harmondsworth to the west. The study area shown on the figures in Appendix 9.3 extends to incorporate areas where there may be changes to views as shown on the Zone of Theoretical Visibility and during the Site survey. This extends to approximately 2km from the boundaries of the Site in each direction.

Key View Photography and Visualisations

9.2.8 Key View photographs have been taken by Rockhunter. A detailed methodology will be provided during determination.

Figures

9.2.9 The baseline surveys are summarised in Section 9.3, with accompanying figures in Appendix 9.3. These comprise:

- Landscape & Townscape Designations (Figure 9.1, Appendix 9.3);
- Landscape/Townscape Character Areas (Figure 9. 2, Appendix 9.3);
- Landscape/Townscape Character Photographs (Figure 9. 3, Appendix 9.3);
- Terrain (Figure 9.4, Appendix 9.3)
- Landscape and Movement context (Figure 9.5, Appendix 9.3);
- Immediate Landscape Context (Figure 9.6, Appendix 9.3)
- Site Landscape Photographs (Figure 9.7, Appendix 9.3)
- Zone of Theoretical Visibility and Verified Views Locations (Figure 9.8, Appendix 9.3)
- Existing Views and Verified Wireframe Visualisations (to be submitted during determination)

Landscape Assessment Methodology

9.2.10 The landscape character of the Site comprises a variety of components, as defined in the DMRB, namely:

- *"1) natural/physical (i.e. geology/soils, land form, river/drainage systems, land cover/vegetation, buildings);*
- *2) aesthetic/perceptual (i.e. appearance, architectural styles, scales, tranquillity), and*
- *3) cultural/social (i.e. human interaction, land use, heritage, open spaces, street patterns) that*

together inform the character of the area"

(source: DMRB Sustainability & Environment Appraisal LA 107 Landscape and Visual Effects paragraph 3.17)

9.2.11 The appraisals are based on an evaluation of the 'sensitivity' of the landscape/townscape and visual receptors and the 'magnitude' of the changes.

9.2.12 The overall 'sensitivity' of the landscape/townscape receptor (Table 9.3) is based on an evaluation of the combination of the 'value' of the visual receptors (Table 9.1) and their 'susceptibility to change' (Table 9.2) caused by the Proposed Development.

9.2.13 'Value' refers to the value that is attached to different landscapes by society, bearing in mind that a landscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a whole variety of reasons (GLVIA3 paragraph 5.19). The baseline review considers the individual elements and aesthetic and perceptual aspects of the landscape and the condition/quality and 'representativeness' of its elements and features. Given that the Site lies outside of a nationally designated landscape, this utilises the Landscape Institute's TGN 02/*21 'Assessing landscape value outside national designations*'. Table 1 of TGN02/21 sets out a range of factors that can be considered when identifying landscape value and effectively updates Box 5.1 from GLVIA3 (p.84). This considers examples of indictors of landscape value, namely natural heritage, cultural heritage, landscape condition, associations (with people, events & the arts), landscape distinctiveness/identity, recreational opportunities, perceptual (scenic) qualities (primarily visual appeal), (perceptual (wildness and tranquillity) and whether they have an identifiable and valuable function.

Table 9.1 Landscape Value Criteria

Landscape Value	Criteria
High	A landscape element or area of high scenic/ perceptual qualities in good condition. Highly valued for its quality and/or Landscape/Townscape character, and may be designated at a national or international level, such as World Heritage Sites, National Parks, National Landscapes and Registered Parks and Gardens.
Medium	A Landscape/Townscape element or area of medium scenic/ perceptual qualities, in at least moderate condition. May be designated at a regional or local level, for example, Conservation Areas and Valued Landscapes. Sites may be mentioned in landscape sensitivity or character assessments and/or have associations with literature, art or tourism. It may also include undesignated Landscapes with some of the following: • High scenic quality • Intact Landscape character • Presence of distinctive elements/ features in the landscape • Features of particular landscape or cultural heritage importance • Recreation value • Historical associations
Medium-Low	An undesignated landscape/townscape that has some landscape features that contribute to its sense of place and are of value to the local community, but that may be in mixed condition and include some detractors that weaken its overall character and scenic quality.
Low	An undesignated landscape/townscape of limited value and no protected features. Landscape in mixed condition and includes some detractors that weaken its overall character and scenic quality.

9.2.14 'Susceptibility to change' refers to the ability of the landscape/townscape receptor (the overall character or quality/condition of a particular landscape/townscape type or area, or an individual element and/or feature, or a particular aesthetic and perceptual aspect) to accommodate the Proposed Development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation and/or the achievement of landscape planning policies and strategies (GLVIA3 paragraph 5.40). The categorisation for 'susceptibility to change' is set out in Table 9.2.

Table 9.2 Landscape Susceptibility to Change Criteria

Landscape susceptibility to change	Criteria
High	An area where landscape character would be noticeably changed by the proposed scheme, either due to the loss of important landscape features, or due to the introduction of new features that are not typical of the area. The potential for intrusive development may also be due to a relatively open character with few elements that could screen the Proposed Development.
Medium	A landscape which is partially tolerant to change of the type proposed. This may be due to the presence of existing landscape detractors or the relative lack of a strong concentration of typical landscape characteristics. The capacity of the landscape to accept change may also be due to the presence of some elements that may screen the proposed scheme, such as vegetation, buildings or landform features.
Low	An area that is tolerant of substantial change of the type proposed. This may be due to a lack of existing distinctive landscape elements or characteristics, the presence of a number of landscape detractors, or the presence of elements that may screen the proposed scheme.

Table 9.3 Overall Landscape/Townscape Sensitivity

Overall Sensitivity	Criteria
High	• A landscape of **high value and** a **high susceptibility to change** – a landscape of high scenic quality, designated at a national or international level where development would result in notable changes to landscape features or character due to the absence of screening elements or detracting features.
Medium - High	• A landscape of **high value** and **medium susceptibility to change.** A landscape of high scenic quality, designated at a national or international level and where development would benefit from some existing elements that may partially screen it. or • A landscape of **medium value** and a **high susceptibility to change.** A landscape of medium scenic qualities that may be designated at a local level and where development would result in notable changes to landscape features or character due to the absence of screening elements or detracting features.
Medium	• A landscape of **high value** with a **low susceptibility to change.** A landscape of high scenic quality, designated at a national or international level that would be tolerant of substantial change due to the presence of a number of existing screening elements. or • A landscape of **medium value** and **medium susceptibility to change.** A landscape of medium scenic qualities that may be designated at a local level

Overall Sensitivity	Criteria
	and that would be partially tolerant of the development due to the presence of some detractors or screening elements. or • A landscape of **medium-low or low value** and **high susceptibility to change** where development would result in notable changes to landscape features or character due to the lack of screening features.
Medium-Low	• A landscape of **medium** or **medium-low value** and **low susceptibility to change.** A landscape of low or medium scenic qualities that may be designated at a local level and would be tolerant of substantial change due to the presence of a number of existing screening elements and/or already has its landscape character partially compromised by the presence of some detractors. or • A landscape of **medium-low** or **low value** and **medium susceptibility to change.** An undesignated landscape in mixed condition where the landscape is likely to be partially tolerant to change due to the presence of some detractors or benefit from some screening elements.
Low	• A landscape of **low value** and **low susceptibility to change.** An undesignated landscape in mixed condition where the landscape would be tolerant of substantial change, due to the presence of a number of existing screening elements and/or already has its landscape character partially compromised by the presence of some detractors.

9.2.15 The scale of the changes arising from the proposals has then been appraised. The potential effects are also judged according to whether they are:

- Adverse, beneficial or neutral;
- Direct or indirect;
- Temporary or permanent;
- Reversible or irreversible;
- Cumulative.

9.2.16 Definitions of the size/scale of the change are provided in Table 9.4.

Table 9.4 Scale of Landscape Effects

Landscape Scale/ Size of Change	Criteria
High (adverse/ beneficial/neutral)	The proposals would be at total variance (adverse) or totally accord (beneficial) with the key characteristics of the existing landscape/townscape, and/or there would be a very noticeable loss or change in landscape elements, features or characteristics. Beneficial effects would restore, recreate, or permanently benefit the condition or character of the landscape.
Medium (adverse/ beneficial/neutral)	The proposals would noticeably be at odds (adverse) or fit well (beneficial) with the key characteristics of the existing landscape/townscape, would noticeably improve or harm the condition or character of the landscape/townscape, and/or would result in the partial loss or alteration to one or more key landscape/townscape elements, features or characteristics.
Low (adverse/ beneficial/neutral)	The proposals would not quite fit (adverse) or have a degree of fit (beneficial) with the key characteristics of the existing landscape/townscape, and/or there would be minor loss or alteration of landscape elements, features or characteristics. Beneficial effects would go some way towards improving the condition or character of the landscape.
Negligible (adverse/ beneficial/neutral)	The proposals would create a just discernible loss/change, or improvement to the key characteristics of the existing landscape/townscape. The proposals may not be uncharacteristic of the existing landscape/townscape.
No change	The proposals would not cause any change to the key characteristics of the existing landscape/townscape.

9.2.17 The geographical scale of any effect is also considered as a ‘modifier’ to this judgement, as described in 3(3) and 5(11) of the LITGN-2024-01 (Landscape Institute, August 2024). This considers whether the effect is at the ‘Site level’, ‘Site setting’, ‘landscape character area’ or ‘larger scale’.

9.2.18 The assessment also considers the duration/reversibility of the effect as a ‘modifier’ to the judgement, as covered by 3(3) of the LITGN- 2024-01. Effects of zero to five years are judged to be ‘short-term’. Effects lasting five to ten years are ‘medium term’ and effects of over 15 years are ‘long term’.

9.2.19 The overall magnitude of the effect, including the considerations relating to geographical scale and duration of the effects is based on professional judgements and the definitions set out in Table 9.5, however, ultimately, the findings are subject to the judgements of the assessor.

9.2.20 Adverse landscape/townscape effects are undesirable and result from negative impacts. Beneficial effects are desirable and result from positive impacts. Neutral effects may be clearly apparent but are judged to be neither adverse nor beneficial.

9.2.21 It is assumed that all operational changes would be permanent and irreversible for this development.

Table 9.5 Overall Magnitude of Landscape/Townscape and Visual Effects

Magnitude	Criteria
High adverse/ beneficial	Effects of high scale/size affecting larger medium or Site Setting geographical extent over the long or medium term.
Medium adverse/ beneficial	Effects of high scale/size affecting the Site level geographical extent over the long or medium term; or Effects of high size/scale affecting a larger, medium, Site setting or Site level geographical extent over the short term; or Effects of medium scale/size affecting larger, medium, Site setting or Site level geographical extent over the long or medium term.
Low adverse/ beneficial	Effects of medium scale/size affecting larger, medium, Site setting or Site level geographic extent over the short term; or Effects of low size/scale affecting the larger, medium, Site setting or Site level over the long or medium term.
Negligible adverse/ beneficial	Effects of low scale/size affecting the larger, medium Site setting or Site level scale over the short term; or Effects of negligible scale/size affecting the larger, medium, Site setting or Site level geographical extent and over the long, medium or short term.

9.2.22 The overall significance of the effects is then derived by the overall magnitude of change and sensitivity of the receptor group as set out in Table 9.6. As recommended by the GLVIA3, the rationale for this process is described wherever possible, rather than relying solely on the matrix. For the purposes of the assessment, impacts of moderate and above are considered to be significant.

Table 9.6 Overall Significance of Landscape/Townscape and Visual Effects

Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Impact			
	High	Medium	Low	Negligible
High	Substantial	Major	Moderate	Negligible
Medium High	Major	Moderate	Moderate	Negligible
Medium	Major	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Medium Low	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
Low	Moderate	Minor	Minor	Negligible

Visual Assessment Methodology

9.2.23 The assessments are based on an initial appraisal of the 'sensitivity' of the key views/ visual receptors. These are selected as a representative selection of key views, as agreed with Hillingdon Borough Council. Initially the sensitivity of the visual receptors is appraised, (see Table 9.9) based on a combination of the 'value' of the receptor (see Table 9.7) and its 'susceptibility to accept change' (see Table 9.8).

Table 9.7 Visual Receptor - Value Criteria

Value	Criteria
High	Views with high scenic value, views to heritage assets or valued landscape features. Recognition of value shown through national planning designations or in relation to heritage assets. Views may be referenced in tourist guides or maps and accompanied by facilities to facilitate their enjoyment, such as parking or interpretation boards.
Medium	Views of medium scenic value. Views not necessarily promoted widely for their value, but may be appreciated by the local community as a popular place to walk/ visit. May have a local planning designation, such as a Country Park or Area of Great Landscape Value.
Low	Views are of mixed or low value, for example, due to landscape detractors, and may only be seen for periods of shorter duration such as visibility from roads or railways.

Table 9.8 Visual Receptor - Susceptibility to Change Criteria

Susceptibility to Change	Criteria
High	Residents at home. People engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is likely to be focused on the townscape and particular views. Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where views are an important contributor to the experience. Communities where views contribute to the townscape setting enjoyed by residents.
Medium	Travellers on road, rail or other transport, where travel involves recognised scenic routes. People at their place of work where views are an important contributor to the setting and quality of working life.
Low	Vehicle users on roads used principally for passage, where the attention is not necessarily focused on the view. People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation which does not involve or depend upon appreciation of views of the townscape. Occupants of places of work whose attention may be focused on the work and where the setting is not important to the quality of working life.

Table 9.9 Visual Receptor: Overall Sensitivity

Overall Sensitivity	Criteria
High	• A **high value view** that is seen by receptors with a **high susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a nationally designated landscape or at a specific viewpoint/attraction. Receptors could include residents at home or recreational users of public rights of way.
High - Medium	• A **high value view** that is seen by receptors with a **medium susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a nationally designated landscape or at a specific viewpoint/attraction. Receptors could include recreational users of roads for example. • A **medium value view** that is seen by receptors with a **high susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a locally designated landscape or area enjoyed by the local community. Receptors could include residents at home or users of public rights of way.
Medium	• A **high value view** that is seen by receptors with a **low susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a nationally designated landscape or at a specific viewpoint/attraction. Receptors could be users of major roads/rail routes for example. • A **medium value view** that is seen by receptors with a **medium susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a locally designated landscape or area enjoyed by the local community. Receptors could include recreational users of roads for example. • A low **value** view seen by receptors with a **high susceptibility to change.** The view would be of an undesignated landscape in poor or mixed condition seen by residents of houses or recreational users of public rights of way for example.
Medium - Low	• A **medium value view** that is seen by receptors with a **low susceptibility to change.** The view may be in a locally designated landscape or area enjoyed by the local community. Receptors could be users of major roads/rail routes for example. • A **low value view** that is seen by receptors with a **medium susceptibility to change.** The view would be of an undesignated landscape in poor or mixed condition seen by recreational users of roads for example.
Low	• A **low value** view seen by receptors with a **low susceptibility to change.** The view would be of an undesignated landscape in poor or mixed condition seen by users of major roads/rail routes for example.

9.2.24 The scale of the changes to visual amenity arising from the Proposed Development is then appraised according to the criteria set out in Table 9.10. The magnitude of the changes to visual amenity arising from the Proposed Development has then been appraised according to the matrix provided in Table 9.5. The potential effects are either negative, positive or neutral and direct or indirect. The following are also 'modifiers' to this judgement:

- Whether the view is full/partial/glimpse.
- The proportion of the development that would be visible.

- The distance of the viewpoint from the development and whether the scale of the development within the view.
- Whether the view is stationary or transient.
- The nature of the changes to the view.
- The geographic extent of the effect (taken as the extent of a path to which visual receptors may experience the effect for example)
- How many users may be affected in the location (e.g. how busy a path may be)

9.2.25 Adverse visual effects are undesirable and result from negative impacts. Beneficial effects are desirable and result from positive impacts. Neutral effects are neither adverse nor beneficial.

Table 9.10 Scale of Visual Impacts: Definitions

Size/ Scale of Effect	Criteria
High	Where the development would cause a dominant or complete change to the composition of the view, and the appreciation of landscape character, contrasting in terms of form, scale and mass, height, colour and/or texture. Views of the scheme are unlikely to be screened to any extent.
Medium	Where the development would cause a clearly noticeable change in the existing view, which would have some effects on its composition, and/or the appreciation of landscape character. It would not result in a dominant change to the view however and the overall effect is likely to be mitigated either due to distance from the viewer, complementary colours and textures, or the presence of some screening elements.
Low	Where the development would cause a perceptible change in the existing view, but would not materially affect its composition, or the appreciation of landscape character, either due to its distance from the viewer, the presence of screening elements or complementary colours and textures. Views of the proposals are more likely to be glimpsed rather than full.
Negligible	Where the development would cause a barely perceptible change in the existing view, either due to the presence of screening elements or distance from the viewer. Whilst the development would be visible, it would not result in a change to the overall composition of the view or landscape character of the area.
No change	No observable change to the view.

9.2.26 The overall significance of the effects is then judged by utilising the categories set out in Table 9.6. As recommended by the GLVIA3, the rationale for this process is described wherever possible, rather than relying solely on the matrix. For the purposes of the assessment, impacts of moderate and above are considered to be significant.

Temporal Scope

9.2.27 The magnitude of the changes has been assessed at three different points:

- During construction.
- Operational effects at Year 0 of occupation (assuming no vegetation planting in any phase is established). This is considered to be a ‘potential effect’.

- Operational effects at Year 15 after completion (when additional mitigation planting throughout the scheme is well established). This is considered to be a 'residual effect'.

Consultation

9.2.28 In addition to the EIA Scoping Request (Appendix 5.1) we have liaised with pre-application discussions with Hillingdon Borough Council Planning and Design Officers to gain agreement on which viewpoints should be assessed.

9.2.29 The EIA Scoping Opinion (Appendix 5.2) was received on 12 October 2026. The only substantive comment received was in relation to the differentiation between impacts and effects, which has been taken through this chapter.

Assumptions and Limitations

9.2.30 The baseline review has been undertaken based on information readily available at the time of the assessment, the published documents set out in this chapter, and on Site visits undertaken in 2026.

9.2.31 In undertaking the assessment of landscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development, the following assumptions have been made:

- This landscape and visual assessment does not consider the significance of heritage assets, or any potential direct or indirect impacts on these assets or their settings. This assessment is made in the separate Built Heritage assessment (Appendix 7.1).
- The establishment and growth rates of the landscape mitigation proposals are based on established forestry (Forestry Commission/Enterprise) methods and it is assumed that planting of new trees and shrubs would achieve a height of 7 to 10 m after 10 to 15 years, allowing for the local growing conditions/environment. This timescale could be shortened if semi-mature specimens are used.
- The Proposed Development is based on that set out in the Parameter Plans (see Chapter 3). In particular, as shown on the Building Heights Parameter Plan, the tallest buildings would be a maximum of up to 20m high above existing ground levels. The location of green space and buffer planting as shown on the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan.
- The visual assessment focusses on public views and visual amenity. Whilst the report does consider potential impacts on views from private residences, it is not a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment. No access was gained to private properties when undertaking the assessment.
- The assessment considers daytime visual effects only.
- Site visits and photography were undertaken in August and October 2026. Visualisations have been prepared using Vu.CITY modelling to demonstrate potential visibility with winter vegetation.

9.3 Baseline conditions

Current Baseline – Landscape

Landscape and Townscape Designations

9.3.1 Designations are shown on Figure 9.1.

9.3.2 The Site is not covered by any adopted landscape amenity designations. The Hillingdon Local Plan has been reviewed to identify any landscape-related designations affecting the Site and its surroundings. The Site itself is not covered by any national, regional, or local landscape or townscape designations. The closest designations relating to townscape amenity are Conservation Areas at Harmondsworth, Harlington and West Drayton. These are all over 1km away.

9.3.3 The Site is located within the London Metropolitan Green Belt as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan. The primary purpose of Green Belt is to control urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, rather than to recognise landscape quality or visual amenity. Whilst the openness of the Green Belt is a relevant planning consideration, Green Belt designation does not in itself constitute a landscape designation and is therefore not an indicator of landscape or visual amenity value for the purposes of this assessment.

9.3.4 There are four listed buildings and three locally listed buildings within 1 km of the Site. These are:

- the Grade II listed King William IV Public House and Lanz Farmhouse on Harmondsworth Lane, both located to the south-west within Sipson;
- the Grade II listed War Memorial at Cherry Lane Cemetery;
- the locally listed Former Baptist Church and Former Cottage Hospital (Sant Nirankari Bhawan), both on Sipson Lane to the south of the Site;
- the locally listed Plough Public House on Sipson Road to the north of the Site;

9.3.5 Collectively, these heritage assets contribute to the historic townscape character of Sipson. Effects on the setting of these assets is covered in the separate Built Heritage Assessment.

National Landscape Character Assessments

9.3.6 The Site and wider study area lies within National Character Area (NCA) 115: Thames Valley. The Thames Valley is described as a predominantly flat and low-lying landscape extending westwards from the London fringe, characterised by the River Thames and its tributaries, streams, canals, lakes and other waterbodies which provide a unifying influence across an otherwise diverse landscape.

9.3.7 NCA 115 is characterised by a varied mosaic of urban development, infrastructure networks, woodland, open grassland, parkland, wetlands and areas of Green Belt. Towards London, the character of the area is described as becomes increasingly influenced by urbanisation and major infrastructure, including the M25 corridor, extensive transport networks, mineral workings and Heathrow Airport. The area is described as having a strongly urban character, although significant areas of open land remain and provide important ecological, recreational and landscape functions.

9.3.8 Key characteristics of the Thames Valley described in the assessment that are relevant to the Site and adjacent study area are:

- *"Flat and low-lying land"*
- *"The underlying geology is dominated by the London Clay which, over much of the area, is overlain by river-lain sands and gravels."*
- *"Although densely populated and developed, pockets of woodland, open grassland, parkland, wetlands and intimate meadows provide escape and tranquillity…"*
- *"the natural character of the area is overtaken by urban influences: a dense network of roads (including the M25 corridor), Heathrow Airport, railway lines, golf courses, pylon lines, reservoirs, extensive mineral extraction and numerous flooded gravel pits."*
- *"The area has an urban character, and there are very few villages of more traditional character, although almost half of the area is greenbelt land…"*

Local Landscape Character Assessments

Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment (LUC, May 2012)

9.3.9 The Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment (LUC, May 2012) comprises an assessment of both the landscape and townscape character of the Borough. The Site lies within the western part of **LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'**. This extends from Sipson in the west to Harlington in the east and south and the southern boundaries of West Drayton and Hayes to the north. Relevant key characteristics for LCA K2 are:

- *"A flat, open landscape, underlain with London Clay Formation, and pockets of superficial Taplow Gravel Formation and Lynch Hill Gravel Formation. The gravel deposits have frequently been worked and ground infilled.*
- *A mixed landscape, predominantly arable farmland occupying large scale fields, with a large area of gravel and sand extraction, recreation sports grounds and playing fields, plus Heathpark golf course and a large burial ground.*
- *Limited tree cover, with the exception of relatively large area of scrub and trees in the west. Hedgerows and scrubby grassed boundaries provide an important linear corridor connecting fragmented habitats throughout the character area.*
- *Modern edge settlement surrounds the character area, although there is limited settlement within the character area itself. Heathrow Airport and associated infrastructure feature prominently along the southern boundary.*
- *A number of main roads pass through the character area, with the M4 in the north and west, and several other A and B roads.*
- *Few public footpaths with limited access.*
- *Open, long views south across farmland and with Heathrow notable in many vistas.*
- *A strong horizontal and geometric form, with straight field boundaries and roads, and the flat landform."*

9.3.10 Potential landscape and visual sensitivities for the area are listed as:

- *Openness and long views, particularly to the south, could be interrupted by further development.*
- *Network of hedgerows, which provide wildlife corridors and visual continuity.*

- *Areas of stillness and limited overt human impact, away from the busy M4 and other development, such as Heathrow Airport.*
- *Open agricultural landscape which has been retained within largely settled and urban surroundings."*

9.3.11 Whilst this character area has rural traits and plays a part in retaining the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt, the impact of the M4, Heathrow Airport, settlement edges and gravel extraction have significantly eroded its landscape character. Based on the definitions set out in Table 9.1, this character area is therefore judged to have a 'low' landscape value. Based on the definitions in Table 9.2, the area is judged to have a 'medium' susceptibility to change resulting from the Proposed Development. There is already a large building to the north (Holiday Inn), wide motorway corridors to the north and east and suburban development to the east and south. There are however some more open areas of fields further within this area which are currently undeveloped. Overall, the area has a 'medium-low' landscape/townscape sensitivity according to the definitions in Table 9.3.

9.3.12 Between Sipson and Harmondsworth to the west, land is within **Area K1 'Harmondsworth 'Open Gravel Terrace'**. Relevant key characteristics comprise:

- *"Flat open landscape, predominately underlain by Langley Silt Formation with pockets of Taplow Gravel Formation. Areas of worked and infilled ground evident.*
- *Predominately large-scale fields of arable farmland, with smaller interspersed fields of paddock along settlement edges.*
- *A network of hedgerows and hedgerows trees primarily delineate field boundaries, and scrubby and grass verges and ditches provide wildlife corridors within the arable landscape.*
- *Presence of a waste landfill Site, area of gravel extraction and several clusters of industrial and commercial buildings.*
- *Several ponds are located in the north, occupying former gravel pits.*
- *Small blocks of trees add biodiversity interest, and additionally screen industrial and commercial activity in places.*
- *Modern edge settlement filters in from Harmondsworth and Sipson, however settlement is limited elsewhere. Heathrow Airport and associated infrastructure feature prominently along the southern boundary.*
- *The M4 and A4 run along the north and south boundaries, and several other main roads cut through the character area.*
- *Open, long views south across farmland and with buildings and infrastructure of Heathrow Airport noticeable in many vistas.*
- *A simple and uniform character, as a result of limited land cover, land use, and the flat topography.*
- *Retains a farmland landscape character, despite being surrounded by settlement and urban development."*

9.3.13 The assessments lists the following potential landscape and visual sensitivities for LCA K1:

- *"Long views across farmland which could be interrupted by further development.*
- *Simple and uniform character, which could be interrupted by further development.*

- *The flat landform, in which development often appears prominent and highly visible.*
- *Hedgerows and scattered hedgerow trees, road side ditches and grass verges, provide valuable wildlife corridors connecting patches of trees and other fragmented habitats, and providing visual continuity.*
- *Open agricultural landscape which has been retained within largely settled and urban surroundings."*

9.3.14 Like LCA K2, this character area therefore has rural traits and plays a part in retaining the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt as well as the settings of Sipson and Harmondsworth, however the impact of the M4, Heathrow Airport, settlement edges and gravel extraction have significantly eroded its landscape character. Based on the definitions set out in Table 9.1, this character area is therefore also judged to have a 'low' landscape value. Based on the definitions in Table 9.2, the area is judged to have a 'medium' susceptibility to change resulting from the Proposed Development. There would be no direct impacts on the area as the Site is not situated within it, and whilst there could be indirect views of the Proposed Development, these would be seen alongside the existing Holiday Inn and benefit from a degree of screening by existing buildings within Sipson. Overall, the area has a 'medium-low' landscape/townscape sensitivity according to the definitions in Table 9.3.

9.3.15 Further to the west, **LCA A4 Lower Colne Floodplain – Frays Island to Stanwell Moor** focusses on the River Colne. The southern part of this area, close to the Site is less rural than other parts, its flat landscape is associated with gravel pits, a landfill Sites, busy roads and settlement edges. The ZTV drawing (Figure 9.8) demonstrates that there is limited intervisibility between the Proposed Development and this area and impacts on this area does not therefore form part of the Landscape Character Assessment.

9.3.16 The Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment also categorises areas of townscape. The northern part of Sipson, Harmondsworth to the west and the centre of Harlington to the east are all categorised as Townscape Character Type **(TCT): 'Historic Core**'. Relevant characteristics listed in the Assessment comprise:

- *"..historic core of settlement, usually associated with a church, green or common…*
- *"…considerable time depth is apparent with built development having evolved from the medieval period to the present day…"*
- *"…tight urban grain created by relatively high density development with buildings often drawn close to street frontages."*
- *"…variety of land uses...creates an active and vibrant townscape*
- *Greens and commons provide important open spaces…*
- *Variety and rhythm created by varying building lines and roof heights, and texture created by the varied materials palette and façade detailing, contribute to a colourful and vibrant environment.*
- *Attractive views between buildings and around corners to reveal interesting rooflines and building angles.*
- *Beyond the historic core 20th century residential development dominates"*

9.3.17 Whilst the northern part of Sipson falls within this Landscape Type category, it has a relatively weak historic character and unlike Harmondsworth and Harlington for example, has no Conservation Areas. The character of the village is further compromised by the A408 corridor

which runs through the village and the M4 link to Heathrow immediately to the east. The value of this area is therefore judged to be 'low' based on the definitions set out in Table 9.1. This area is judged to have a 'medium' susceptibility to change based on the definitions set out in Table 9.2. Whilst the village is predominantly low-rise and domestic in scale/usage, the existing buildings provide a degree of screening to the Site, meaning that from some areas the building would not impact on character. Overall, the area has a 'medium-low' landscape/townscape sensitivity according to the definitions in Table 9.3.

9.3.18 Other townscape character types nearby comprise TCT 'Inter War Suburb/Metroland' which includes the southern part of Sipson, the outer areas of Harlington and much of Hayes and West Drayton. The Zone of Theoretical Visibility drawing (Figure 9.8) demonstrates that there is limited intervisibility between the Site and these areas and they do not form part of the wider assessment.

9.3.19 Similarly, the northern fringe of Heathrow Airport, to the south of Sipson, ('TCT: Commercial Airport) has very limited intervisibility between the Proposed Development and this area is also excluded from the character assessment.

9.3.20 The airport itself is categorised as LCA L1 'Heathrow'. This area would have some degree of intervisibility with the Proposed Development from its runways, as shown on Figure 9.8. Key characteristics for this area are listed as:

- *"Flat landform, underlain by London Clay with superficial gravel deposits (Taplow Gravel Formation) and occupied by Heathrow Airport.*
- *Dominated by hardstanding (runways and access roads), buildings and other airport infrastructure. Vegetation is limited to open grass areas, and shrub/climber planting around perimeter walls and fences.*
- *There is little ecological interest in this built landscape.*
- *…Surrounded on all sides by perimeter roads, security fencing and blast walls.*
- *The airport extends more than 12km2 across the south of the borough with prominent visual and audible impacts; including road and air traffic, lighting and security fencing. There is a strong sense of movement, both on the ground and in the air."*

9.3.21 The value of LCA L1 Heathrow area is judged to be 'low' based on the definitions set out in Table 9.1, given the dominance of runways, buildings and roads and associated structures, which have totally eroded the original agricultural land. This area is also judged to have a 'low' susceptibility to change based on the definitions set out in Table 9.2. The Proposed Development would not be visible from large parts of the character area, and even if visible, would reflect the existing character of the built form here. Overall the area has a 'low' landscape/townscape sensitivity according to the definitions in Table 9.3.

Hillingdon Townscape Character Study (Urban Initiatives, November 2023)

9.3.22 The Hillingdon Townscape Character Study categorises Harmondsworth, Harlington and Sipson as 'Southern villages', with Heathrow Area covering a large urban area to the south. These villages are described as having little growth over the past fifty years due to the Green Belt designation and impact of the airport (page 136). Sipson is described as focused around Sipson Road, immediately to the west of the M4 connection to Heathrow. It has 'predominantly suburban' homes with 'no significant centre to the village' (page 136).

9.3.23 The route through Sipson is also illustrated as a ‘corridor’ (page 105). These are described as ‘major traffic routes’ with a ‘poor walking and cycling environment’ and often associated with a ‘fragmented and incoherent character’; (page 104)

9.3.24 The Character Study does not describe the wider landscape or visual context in detail and has not informed the following Assessment.

Summary of Baseline Landscape and Townscape Character Sensitivity

9.3.25 In summary, the Site is situated within the London Metropolitan Green Belt, adjacent to the 'washed over' village of Sipson. The surrounding area is characterised by a varied urban fringe landscape, influenced by a mix of residential development, transport infrastructure, open land and former industrial land uses. Nearby settlements include Sipson, West Drayton, Hayes, Harmondsworth and Harlington.

9.3.26 The surrounding landscape exhibits a heterogeneous and fragmented character, comprising a mixture of open land, former mineral workings, unmanaged land parcels, transport infrastructure, agricultural land, recreational spaces and scattered development.

9.3.27 Former and active mineral extraction Sites are a defining characteristic of the surrounding area, with the former Sipson Quarry located east of the Site beyond the M4 Spur Road and numerous sand and gravel workings occurring within the wider landscape. These extraction and restoration activities have influenced historic landscape patterns and contributed to a fragmented and evolving land use character.

9.3.28 The area includes pockets of agricultural land, notably associated with Home Farm, Harmondsworth, and Poultry Farm, Harlington. Remnant parcels of agricultural land are also present throughout the surrounding landscape.

9.3.29 The area exhibits minimal topographical variation, with no distinctive hills, valleys or notable water features, resulting in a landscape character that is influenced primarily by patterns of land use, vegetation and built development rather than landform.

9.3.30 The surrounding area includes a number of disused and previously developed land parcels, often characterised by unmanaged vegetation, hardstanding and former operational uses. These features contribute to a degraded and transitional landscape character within the urban fringe. The Site itself reflects these characteristics, comprising the former Sipson Garden Centre and associated areas of hardstanding, vacant land, remnant structures and scrub vegetation.

9.3.31 Sports and recreational facilities form a component of the local landscape character, including Sipson Recreation Ground and the sports pitches associated with Imperial College, located west of Harlington.

9.3.32 The most detailed published Landscape/Townscape Character Assessment is the Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment (2012). Table 9.11 sets out the character areas within the study area which may be affected by the Proposed Development and summarises the capacity of the areas to accept change as described above.

Table 9.11 Landscape Character Receptor: Baseline Overall Sensitivity

Landscape Receptor	Value	Susceptibility to Change	Overall Sensitivity
National Landscape Character Areas			
NCA 115 Thames Valley	Not assessed – local character assessment provides more detail/relevance.		
Landscape Character Areas (Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment)			
LCA K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'	Low	Medium	Medium - Low
LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'	Low	Medium	Medium - Low
LCA L1 'Heathrow'	Low	Low	Low
Historic Core TCA - Sipson	Low	Medium	Medium - Low

Landscape/Townscape Features: Site and Immediate Context

Landform and Water Features

9.3.33 Landform is shown on Figure 9.3. This demonstrates the level nature of the landscape here, with its floodplain influence of the River Colne to the west. The land gradually rises at West Drayton to the north, however to the south, Heathrow Airport benefits from the flat nature of this wider area.

9.3.34 The terrain of the Site is level and is located at approximately 30m Above Ordnance Datum.

9.3.35 There are no apparent water features within the Site.

Land Use and Vegetation

9.3.36 The Site and its immediate context are shown on Figure 9.6.

9.3.37 The former Sipson Garden Centre is in the northern part of the Site. This includes disused sheds and areas of hardstanding featuring a car park, and areas understood to formerly be used for the external display and storage of goods associated with the former garden centre use. Further ad hoc buildings and areas of hardstanding are located within the southern-western part of the Site.

9.3.38 The Site is characterised by large areas of modified grassland that is regularly mowed (Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, AECOM, July 2026), submitted as part of the suite of documents supporting the application. The majority of this is judged to be in 'good' condition (Grassland 1) however an area in the north-west corner is judged to be in 'poor' condition (Grassland 2) in the Ecological Appraisal. With regards to landscape character, this area of modified grassland is judged to be of 'medium-low' value according to the definitions in Table 9.2, providing a semi-rural characteristic to the Site.

9.3.39 The *AECOM Arboricultural Impact Assessment* indicates that trees within the site make a limited contribution to its landscape character. Those present comprise areas of scattered trees and boundary vegetation which provide a degree of containment and filtering of views. The eastern boundary of the Site includes areas of elm trees which are showing some signs of disease. Only 27.6% of the trees within the site are mature however many of the species within the site are short-lived and small-scale, including apple, wild cherry, cherry plum, goat willow, elder and rowan. Some are not native, including sycamore, Lawson cypress, Monterey cypress, Swedish whitebeam and Leyland cypress.

9.3.40 The western and southern boundaries support denser shrub vegetation with occasional trees, including along the rear boundaries of residential properties on Sipson Road and Russell Gardens. Further pockets of small trees (lime, cherry and crab apple) are situated along the northern boundary, adjoining the Holiday Inn hotel, and along the eastern boundary adjacent to the M4 corridor.

9.3.41 Four individual Lawson cypress in the northern part of the Site (south of the current access drive) are judged to be of 'moderate' ecological condition in the Ecological Appraisal however as non-native trees planted in the mid 20th century these are judged to be of 'low' value in terms of their contribution to the landscape character of the Site.

9.3.42 There is also some evidence of ornamental plants such as buddleya within the Site, potentially reflecting its historic use as a garden centre.

9.3.43 Overall, the quantum and value of the trees and scrub around the Site are judged to be of 'low' landscape value. They generally appear to result from self-set seeds and do not comprise historic hedgerows. The overall size and health of the trees and shrub species appear to reflect a long-term lack of overall management and does not contribute to an agricultural character.

9.3.44 The 'susceptibility to change' of the grassland is judged to be 'high' given that much of it is likely to be removed to accommodate new development. The 'susceptibility to change' of the trees and scrub is judged to be 'low', given that they are primarily located around the Site boundaries, away from the Proposed Development areas. The overall value of the Site landscape features is summarised in Table 9.13.

9.3.45 Within the wider area there are small woodland blocks which contribute to a semi-rural character of the area despite the influence of adjacent urban development and major transport infrastructure. These also provide a degree of screening and visual enclosure.

9.3.46 Areas of unmanaged open land immediately south and north-west of the Site comprise rough grassland, scrub and previously disturbed land. Land south of the Site appears to include potentially unmanaged pony paddocks.

9.3.47 Located immediately to the north of the Site, the Holiday Inn Heathrow hotel comprises a large building that is currently vacant and boarded up. This rises to approximately 40m in height. It is understood that this is due to be refurbished. The building is a noticeable component of the local townscape, and the associated car park continues to accommodate vehicle movements and activity including a car hire company.

9.3.48 Immediately to the east of the Site, beyond the M4 Spur Road the Sipson Quarry is a former mineral extraction Site that reflects the area's historic association with sand and gravel working. The quarry forms a notable component of the local landscape context and contributes to the varied and transitional character of the wider urban fringe landscape.

9.3.49 Residential development lies adjacent to the western and south-western boundaries of the Site. Boundary vegetation along these edges provides a degree of visual containment, although there are views of rear garden fencing in places.

Access and Movement

9.3.50 There is no public access to the Site. Sipson Road adjoins the western boundary and provides the existing vehicular access point to the Site, while Sipson Lane runs along the southern boundary.

9.3.51 Visual effects on its users of Public Rights of Way and streets in the wider area are covered in the Visual Assessment section below.

Table 9.12 Site Landscape Features: Baseline Overall Sensitivity

Landscape Receptor	Value (Table 9.1)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.2)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.3)
Water Features	None apparent within the Site		
Modified Grassland	Medium-Low	Medium	Medium-Low
Hedgerows and Scrub Vegetation	Low	Low	Low
All other trees	Low	Low	Low
Movement	No public access within the Site		

Future Baseline - Landscape

9.3.52 Should the Proposed Development not proceed, the Site would remain in its existing condition, with boundary vegetation retained and the open rough grassland continuing to contribute to the baseline landscape character as set out in Table 9.13.

Current Baseline – Visual Amenity

9.3.53 The Site visits and computer-generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Figure 9.8) showed that the Site is relatively well concealed from the north, west and south, with screening provided by:

- Housing along Sipson Road to the west
- Roadside vegetation and Sipson Lane to the south (summer)
- The Holiday Inn building to the north.

9.3.54 There are clear views into the Site from Sipson Lane to the south-east (where it crosses over the M4) as well as the M4 Heathrow Spur Road itself immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Site.

9.3.55 Visual receptors that could experience change are described in Table 9.14, with representative photographs and visualisations to be provided during determination. Table 9.13 also evaluates their sensitivity according to the definitions set out in Tables 9.7 and 9.8.

9.3.56 The value of all views are predominantly ‘low’. They are all either dominated by suburban housing and highways (around Sipson) or flat urban fringe fields including detractors such as telephone masts, landfill Sites and the upper storeys of the Holiday Inn building adjacent to the Site. The only areas where views are of ‘medium’ value are in some small areas of open fields to the west of Harlington and east of Harmondsworth.

9.3.57 With regards to the viewers ‘susceptibility to change’, the most sensitive receptors are residents to the immediate west and south of the Site living on Sipson Road, Sipson Lane, Russell Gardens and The Vineries. Whilst effects on views have been considered, no access was gained to these private properties. Other receptors with the most susceptibility to change are users of public rights of way to the east of Harmondsworth (Y8 and Y19) and one public right of way to the west of Harlington (H68).

9.3.58 Other potential public views of the Proposed Development would be from sports pitches to the east (Little Harlington Playing Fields, a public facility) and Imperial College Harlington Sports

Ground/Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground, a private facility) and from Sipson Recreation Ground to the south. Users of the playing fields and recreation ground are judged to have a 'medium' susceptibility to change whilst users of the sports ground would have a 'low' susceptibility to change.

9.3.59 The majority of visual receptors would be users of nearby highways and judged to have a 'low' susceptibility to change. These include glimpsed views from Sipson Road, Russell Gardens and the Vineries to the west, the M4 Spur Road to the east, Sipson Lane to the south and south-east and Harmondsworth Lane and Holloway lane to the west.

9.3.60 Other low-sensitivity receptor groups include users of nearby employment Sites such as the Holiday Inn to the north, small parts of the waste transfer Site off Harmondsworth lane to the west and the minerals workings to the east of the M4 spur (Sipson Sand and Gravel Quarry).

Table 9.13 Visual Receptor Baseline Summary

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
Views from the North						
Private View	50m	Users of car park on the Holiday Inn Site (currently a car rental company)	Assumed Low (not accessed)	Low	Low	Close-range south-easterly view from the visitor car park of the Holiday Inn plot, located north of the Site. Intervening tree cover and existing boundary vegetation partially filter and break up views towards the Site, although limited glimpses of the existing built form remain visible. Users are only in the area for car parking/rental purposes.
Private View	50m	Users of Holiday Inn Upper Storeys (currently closed)	Assumed Low (not accessed)	Low	Low	The Holiday Inn is currently closed for refurbishment. Assuming that it will re-open during the construction or operational phase of the Proposed Development there would be elevated views from the south-facing windows of the hotel. Views are likely to be panoramic and of an urban fringe landscape, including the existing buildings/hard standing on the Site, the M4 spur road and more distant views towards Heathrow. Occupiers will be in the rooms on to facilitate travel associated with the Heathrow Airport rather than for longer holidays.
-	500m	Users of the eastern end of Holloway Lane to the west of the Holiday Inn	Low	Low	Low	Views towards the Proposed Development are extremely restricted and largely seasonal in nature. Tree planting along Holloway Lane, together with intervening vegetation, substantially limits visibility towards the Site. Foreground views dominated by highway and include the existing Holiday Inn hotel. Receptor group comprises road users.
-	400m	Users of the M4 to the north of the Holiday Inn	Low	Low	Low	Glimpsed views from the M4. Intervening vegetation and the Holiday Inn building provide partial screening, although there remains potential for filtered views of the Site from this viewpoint. Foreground views are dominated by the motorway infrastructure.

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
						Receptor group comprises road users.
-	Approx. 0.4 – 1.2km	Users of Shepiston Lane and Stockley Road (A408) to the north of the M4.	Low	Low	Low	Glimpsed views of the Holiday Inn but not the Site itself. Foreground context dominated by highway infrastructure. Receptor group comprises road users.
Views from the North-east and East						
1,3	5m	Users of the M4 Spur Road	Low	Low	Low	Close-range westerly view towards the Site. Boundary vegetation in the western part of the Site provides some filtered screening, although there are still clear views from this stretch of road. The current view is dominated by the M4 infrastructure and views of the Holiday Inn when looking north and the Sipson Lane bridge when looking south. Receptor group comprises road users.
2	1.2km	Users of Shepiston lane, Hayes, to the north of the M4	Low	Low	Low	Foreground dominated by highway infrastructure of Shepiston Lane and the M4 beyond. The Holiday Inn can be glimpsed in the distance although foreground roadside vegetation provides some screening, especially in the summer.
4	20 - 50m	Sipson Lane to the east of the Site, including the bridge over M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Low	Low	Close-range north-westerly view from the highway and footway along Sipson Lane. Adjacent to the Site mature vegetation provides a good degree of screening, especially in the summer however where it crosses the M4 Spur the elevated nature of the receptor location, combined with sparse intervening vegetation, affords predominantly open views towards the Site.

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
						Receptor group are road users.
Private view	60+m	Workers/visitors to Sipson Sand and Gravel Quarry and Wall Garden Farm (commercial units)	Low	Low	Low	Gravel extraction Site and commercial Site. Low value views due to extraction, vehicle parking and warehouse uses in the foreground. Views of the upper storey of the Holiday Inn Site further detract from visual amenity.
-	70m – 570m	Users of Sipson Lane between M4 Heathrow Spur Road and Imperial College Sports Ground	Low	Low	Low	Views focus on Sipson Lane in the foreground. Glimpsed views of the Holiday Inn hotel demonstrate that there may also be glimpses of the Proposed Development, however the area benefits from dense clipped roadside hedgerows. Receptor group comprises road users.
-	325+m	Users of Little Harlington Playing Fields	Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Users of public playing fields, including sports and informal dog walking etc. Mature hedgerows provide screening around the fields however there are views of the upper storeys of the Holiday Inn adjacent to the Site.
Private view	600+m	Users of Imperial College Harlington Sports Ground/ Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground	Low	Low	Medium-Low	Users of private playing fields, including sports and informal dog walking etc. Mature hedgerows provide screening around the fields however there are distant views of the upper storeys of the Holiday Inn adjacent to the Site.
5	500 – 770m approx	User of Footpath H68 south of Sipson Lane.	Medium	High	High - Medium	Flat agricultural landscape with views of detractors such as the former Holiday Inn and buildings at London Heathrow Airport. Vegetation around the Site provides some filtering however views are generally uninterrupted.

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
Views from the South and South-west						
6	0km - 0.17km	Users/ residents of Sipson Lane to the west of the M4 (Heathrow Spur Road), including Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls	Low	High (residents) Low (road and school users)	Medium (residents) Low (road and school users	View is urban fringe in nature, including a detached house occupied by a charity; highway infrastructure, roadside hedges and glimpses of a vehicle storage yard and across the Site towards the Holiday Inn. Boundary and roadside vegetation provides a degree of screening.
7	0km -	Users/ residents of Sipson Road and the Vineries, to the north of the junction with Sipson lane	Low	High (residents) Low (road users)	Medium (residents) Low (road users	View is urban fringe in nature, including a detached house occupied by a charity; highway infrastructure, roadside hedges and glimpses of a vehicle storage yard and across the Site towards the Holiday Inn. Boundary and roadside vegetation provides a degree of screening.
-	100m – 450m	Users/residents of Vincent Close and Sipson Road to the south of its junction with Sipson Lane	Low	High (residents) Low (road users)	Medium (residents) Low (road users	Junction of Sipson Road and Sipson Lane includes views of the locally listed converted Baptist Church, however the value of views on this road corridor are generally compromised by the foreground highway infrastructure and ad hoc buildings. No current views of the Site. Views dominated by domestic gardens, garage courts and scrub on land to the south of Sipson Lane. Some housing on the western side of Sipson Lane have glimpsed views of the Holiday Inn and therefore may have views of new buildings.

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
8	695m	Users of Sipson Recreation Ground	Low	Medium	Medium-Low	Views from the recreation ground include existing large commercial units to the west as well as the distant Holiday Inn to the north. Mature trees around the western side of Sipson and buildings along Sipson Road screen the Site, however there may be views of the Proposed Development beyond, given its proposed height.
9	1400m	Users of PRoW Y19, east of Hardmondsworth	Medium	High	High - Medium	Long-distance north-easterly view from Footpath Y19 across a large flat arable field and the (closed) Harmondsworth Landfill Site to the west of Sipson. The rural character of the area is partially eroded by the landfill Site and the large field with its flat terrain is of limited scenic value. This is the proposed location of part of Heathrow's third runway. The Holiday Inn can be seen in the distance further eroding the rural character of the view.
10,11	9m+	Users of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the western end of the Site (adjacent to the listed King William IV Public House)	Low	Low	Low	Glimpsed views of the Site through gaps between houses. View dominated by mid twentieth century two storey suburban housing, garage blocks and cul-de-sac road.
Private views	0+ m	Residents of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the south-western end of the Site	Low	High	Medium	Views from the western houses are dominated by mid twentieth century two storey suburban housing, garage blocks and cul-de-sac road with glimpsed views of the Site beyond. Views from housing on the eastern side of the road have domestic gardens in the foreground and clear views of the Site beyond.
Views from the west						

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
-	600m	Users of Harmondsworth Lane	Low	Low	Low	Flat narrow road enclosed by agricultural hedges. Pavement and kerbs detract from rural character. Views towards Sipson generally screened by roadside hedges however there are views through gaps in the hedges as well as over the top of the hedgerow/winter views to the east of the Harmondsworth Landfill Site. The Site itself isn't visible in these views, however the Holiday Inn building can be glimpsed. Whilst the ZTV indicates some low-level potential for visibility of the development from points further west along the lane, Site survey findings established that intervening bunding and vegetation surrounding the waste transfer station effectively prevent such views. Receptor group are road users.
Private	0km	Residents of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Low	High	Medium	Views across the Site from the rear gardens and elevations of 7 no. homes on the eastern side of Sipson Road. Garden vegetation and scrub within the Site provide a degree of screening. Glimpsed views of the Site beyond other houses and Sipson Road from the upper storeys of 11 no. homes on the western side of Sipson Road
12	65m	Users of Sipson Road at the junction with Russell Gardens	Low	Low	Low	Suburban view including two storey late 20th century brick-built housing and highways with small trees. The site is screened by foreground buildings.
13	22m	Users of Russell Gardens	Low	Low	Low	Glimpsed views of the Site through gaps between houses. View dominated by mid twentieth century two storey suburban housing, garage blocks and cul-de-sac road.
Private view	0m	Residents of Russell Gardens	Low	High	Medium	Views from the western houses are dominated by mid twentieth century two storey suburban housing, garage blocks and cul-de-sac road with glimpsed

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
						views of the Site beyond. Views from housing on the eastern side of the road have domestic gardens in the foreground and clear views of the Site beyond.
14	40m	Users of Sipson Road to the north of Russell Gardens and west of the Site	Low	Low	Low	Suburban view including mid storey late 20th century brick-built housing, a concrete garage court and highways with small trees. The site can be glimpsed beyond the garage court.
15	1.4km	Users of PRoW Y8 to the north of Harmondsworth	Low	High	Medium	Glimpsed views from footpath between Harmondsworth and its crossing with the M4. Views are across open flat fields, The Site is screened by mature field boundaries however the upper storeys of the Holiday Inn can be seen in the distance, eroding the rural character.
16	0km	Users of the northern end of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Low	Low	Low	Close-distance view from Sipson Road looking through the Site access. Representative views are available along approximately 90m of the Site frontage, where the combination of palisade fencing and a lack of substantial vegetation screening allows views into the northern part of the Site. The visual context is strongly influenced by the foreground highway, and glimpses of twentieth century housing and the large-scale Holiday Inn building to the north.
17	25m	Users of Sipson Road at The Plough public house and Holiday Inn to the	Low	Low	Low	Views dominated by road carriageway and include Holiday Inn hotel and/or The Plough public house. Susceptibility to change is 'low' given that these are road users and benefit from a degree of screening from the Site by hedgerows around the garden and field boundaries.

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Value of View (Table 9.7)	Susceptibility to Change (Table 9.8)	Overall Sensitivity (Table 9.9)	Description of View/ Rationale for Judgement
		north-west of the Site				
18	0.8km	Users of Harmondsworth Road	Low	Low	Low	View from Harmondsworth Road at its crossing over the M4 and a short section to the south. Views from the road crossing are dominated by the M4, whilst to the south the view is across an open flat field, including a telephone mast. The Site is screened by mature vegetation along the M4 embankments and the A3044 Holloway Lane however the upper storeys of the Holiday Inn are a clear distant landmark which erodes the rural character. To the south, intervening roadside vegetation substantially filters views towards the Site, especially during the summer months.

Future Baseline – Visual Amenity

9.3.61 If the Proposed Development were not to go ahead, the visual amenity of the Site is likely to remain the same, comprising open grassland set within the context of the urban edge of Sipson, the M4 and the Holiday Inn building.

9.4 Inherent design mitigation

9.4.1 Measures to mitigate the potential landscape and visual effects of the development have been considered and integrated throughout the design of the parameter plans. These involve measures to compensate for the loss of vegetation, the protection of existing landscape elements and creation of new landscape features. These seek to provide visual enclosure of the Proposed Development where possible.

9.4.2 The inherent mitigation measures are those committed to on the Parameter Plans. As this is an Outline application, the detailed design of some of these features would be subject to Reserved Matters applications, however the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan demonstrate how these elements can be incorporated within an emerging detailed design for the Proposed Development.

9.4.3 The Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan identifies a strong green infrastructure framework around the Site boundaries, with the aim of retaining and enhancing existing boundary vegetation and substantially increasing areas of available for tree and shrub planting. Buffer planting around the Site boundaries would be approximately 15m+ in width.

9.4.4 These embedded landscape measures form part of the proposed design mitigation and include:

- The Parameter Plan has been developed to facilitate the retention of the majority of existing trees and boundary vegetation, with vegetation loss focussed on the grassland in the central parts of the Site. Existing boundary vegetation would be retained and enhanced to strengthen the screening of the Proposed development as well as soften the landscape;
- Attenuation ponds to be incorporated into the Site, adjacent to proposed car parking areas on the west of the Site. These can be designed as positive landscape features, potentially incorporating wetland/wet meadow planting;
- Buildings would be positioned at least 40m from the boundaries of the closest residential garden, providing a generous space for planting and sustainable drainage basins.
- Two areas of publicly accessible amenity space would be provided, one adjacent to the vehicular entrance off Sipson Road and one off Sipson Lane in the south-eastern part of the Site.

9.5 Potential and Residual Effects: Landscape Designations, Character and Features

9.5.1 This section assesses the potential effects on the landscape character and features within the Site during its construction and operational phases. Potential effects during the operational phase are taken at Year 0 following completion of the final phase of development. The residual landscape effects assume that strategic landscape planting has taken place and is well established (at 15 years after planting). The specific location and design of the planting would be covered by a future Reserved Matters planning application(s).

Construction Phase

9.5.2 A description of the construction works is set out in Chapter 3. It is anticipated that the demolition and construction would start by 2027/2028 and completion of development in 2028/2029.

9.5.3 The landscape and visual assessment is based on the following assumed activities/features during construction:

- the demolition of a small number of buildings in the northern part of the Site
- the use of the existing vehicular access off Sipson Road
- excavations/soil stripping activity;
- presence of Site hoardings/fencing, including protective fencing to vegetation to be retained;
- removal of, or remedial works to, vegetation at the Site boundaries;
- presence and operation of temporary cranes and other tall construction plant associated with the construction of the Proposed Development;
- presence of fixed and mobile vehicles;
- presence of materials stockpiles;
- presence of Site compound/huts, and temporary utilities;
- presence of completed and partially completed buildings;

9.5.4 The potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the landscape character and feature receptors identified in the section above are assessed according to the 'sensitivity' of the landscape receptor and the 'magnitude' of the landscape effect. These are then combined to assess the significance of the landscape Impact during the construction period. The results are summarised in Table 9.14.

Potential Effects on Landscape Designations During Construction

9.5.5 The Site is not subject to any landscape designations or Tree Preservation Orders.

9.5.6 The Zone of Theoretical Visibility drawing (Figure 9.8) shows that the proposed buildings would not be visible from the Hayes and West Drayton Green Conservation Areas to the north, the Harmondsworth Village Conservation Area to the west and the Harlington Village Conservation Area to the east.

9.5.7 Impacts on the settings of listed buildings within Sipson are covered by the separate Built Heritage Assessment.

Potential Effects on Landscape Character During Construction

9.5.8 The Proposed Development would be constructed in an area of low value landscape character, comprising disused buildings, hardstanding, rough grassland and a limited number of trees. A high proportion of the Site would be replaced by a construction site, including the elements set out in paragraph 9.5.3. Given the level nature of the Site, which is predominantly covered by grass, this would result in a noticeable change to the character of the Site. The Site forms a relatively small part of Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment Character Area K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'. The relatively short-term nature of the impact of the Site's landscape combined with its existing medium-low sensitivity means that the overall effect on the character of the site would be 'minor adverse'. Impacts on the adjacent part of Area K2 would be 'negligible adverse indirect' only given that the main changes to the landscape would be the short-term introduction of the construction site into a landscape that is already comprised by the presence of the adjacent Holiday Inn to the north and gravel extraction areas to the east. Sports pitches closer to Harlington and the M4 trunk road and motorway corridors to the north and east also reinforce the urban fringe character of this wider area.

9.5.9 To the west of Sipson, the landscape is defined as Area K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'. Impacts of the construction would be indirect and 'negligible adverse', given that many parts of this area benefit from screening by existing vegetation. The construction site would not be seen its entirety and whilst the upper levels of the data halls and associated cranes would be seen from some parts of the character area, this would be in conjunction with the existing Holiday Inn.

9.5.10 Immediately adjacent to the west and south of the Site, the village of Sipson is classified as an 'Historic Core' townscape type within the Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment. Our baseline assessment judges this to have a 'low-medium' landscape/townscape sensitivity given that the village is not covered by a Conservation Area and comprises dominant highways and a high proportion of mid-century 20th century suburban housing. The construction site would be glimpsed from some public parts of this area, however intervening housing would provide a good degree of screening. Any impacts on this townscape are therefore judged to be 'indirect', short-term and of **'minor adverse'** significance.

Potential Effects on Landscape Features During Construction

9.5.11 With regards to the effects of construction on specific landscape features within the Site, the construction would result in the removal of approximately 5.20ha of modified grassland to facilitate the construction of the new buildings and access roads and restored landscape features. Overall, the construction would therefore have a significant (moderate adverse) impact on the existing modified grassland.

9.5.12 Hedgerows, trees and other vegetation around the perimeter of the site would generally be retained and form part of a new landscape setting. In the early stages of the construction the impact on hedgerow, trees and scrub will be negligible adverse, however this will diminish as new planting takes place in the final stages of the construction process.

9.5.13 There are no PRoWs within the Site so there would be no impacts on public access during construction.

9.5.14 There are no water features within the Site and whilst new sustainable drainage (SuDS) features would be constructed these would not result in a positive or negative change to the landscape during the construction period.

9.5.15 The overall terrain of the Site would not change during construction, other than the localised levelling/stockpiling of soil to facilitate the creation of a level site and limited cut and fill to accommodate the flat development platform.

Table 9.14 Potential Landscape Effects during Construction

Potential Landscape Receptor	**Overall Sensitivity** (Table 9.12)	**Size/ Scale of Effect** (Tables 9.4 and 9.12)	**Direct/ Indirect**	**Duration**	**Geog. Extent**	**Overall Magnitude** (Table 9.5)	**Overall Significance** (Table 9.6)
Landscape Character Areas (Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment)							
LCA K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Low - Negligible adverse (where visible only)	Indirect	Short Term	Landscape Character Area	Negligible adverse indirect	Negligible adverse indirect
LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Medium adverse (Site level) Negligible adverse (Landscape Character Area, where visible only)	Direct	Short Term	Site-Level & Landscape Character Area	Low adverse direct (within the Site) Negligible adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries)	Minor adverse direct (within the Site) Negligible adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries)
LCA L1 'Heathrow'	Low	Negligible adverse landscape impact (where visible only)	Indirect	Short Term	Landscape Character Area	Negligible adverse indirect	Negligible adverse indirect
Historic Core TCA - Sipson	Medium - Low	Medium adverse landscape impact (where visible only)	Indirect	Short Term	Site Setting	Low adverse indirect	Minor adverse indirect
Landscape Features							
Modified Grassland	Medium-Low	High adverse landscape impact	Direct	Short Term	Site level	Medium adverse direct	Moderate adverse direct
Hedgerow and Scrub Vegetation	Low	Negligible adverse landscape impact	Direct	Short Term	Site level	Negligible adverse direct	Negligible adverse direct
All other trees	Low	Negligible adverse landscape impact	Direct	Short Term	Site level	Negligible adverse direct	Negligible adverse direct

Potential Effects on Landscape Receptors during Operation

9.5.16 The potential effects of the Proposed Development on the landscape character and feature receptors are assessed according to the 'sensitivity' of the landscape receptor and the 'magnitude' of the landscape impacts. These are then combined to assess the significance of the landscape effect. The assessments assume that Green Infrastructure areas will accommodate new planting including trees, as described out in Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameter 'Green Buffer' typology. It is assumed that trees would be strategically placed around all boundaries to minimise views into the Site. The precise location of these can be secured at the Reserved Matters applications stage. The results are summarised in Table 9.15 below.

9.5.17 References to Year 15 effects take into account the 'best case' scenario for screening based on mitigation tree planting within the landscape buffers to have to have matured and be vegetated during the Summer and Autumn months (approximately May – November)

Potential and Residual Effects on Landscape Designations During Operation

9.5.18 The Site is not subject to any landscape designations or Tree Preservation Orders.

9.5.19 Impacts on heritage assets are covered in the accompanying Built Heritage Assessment report.

Potential and Residual Effects on Landscape Character During Operation

9.5.20 The introduction of a new data centre building would inevitably change the character of the Site, however the only potential significant effects on landscape character at Year 0 would be on the parts of the Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment **Area K2 Harlington Open Gravel Terrace** that are located within and immediately adjacent to the Site (up to moderate adverse impact at worst). This reflects the existing 'medium-low' sensitivity of the landscape here, which has been impacted by the previous garden centre land uses, the adjacent M4 spur road to the east and the 40m tall Holiday Inn to the north, as well as twentieth century housing to the west and south.

9.5.21 As the mitigation planting around the site boundaries establishes this would integrate the new building within the wider landscape setting as well as create areas of native woodland and meadow planting that are of higher quality than the existing modified grassland. Whilst there would be a net reduction in the grassland, this would help mitigate the overall impact on the landscape caused by the introduction of the new building. At Summer Year 15, the residual impact on the landscape character within and adjacent to the Site would reduce to 'minor adverse'.

9.5.22 Other impacts on landscape character would all be indirect, relating to the introduction of views of the new data centre from the wider **K2 Harlington Open Gravel Terrace** Area to the east and the **K1 Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace** to the west. The presence of existing mature hedgerow trees to the west of Sipson would help screen the buildings from the outset and whilst the taller buildings would be glimpsed from some areas, the existing 'medium-low' value of this landscape with its existing urban fringe structures (see paragraph 9.5.21) would also diminish the significance of these effects. At most these impacts on **Area K1 Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace** would be 'negligible' indirect adverse' from the outset. Indirect effects on Area K2 immediate to the east of the Site would be greater, with clear views of the new buildings adjacent to the M4 Heathrow Spur Road, however given the low value of this part of the character area, at most the effects on landscape character here would be 'minor adverse indirect'. These would diminish to 'negligible adverse' by the summer of Year 15.

9.5.23 The ZTV (Figure 9.8) shows that the Proposed Development might be glimpsed from parts of the London Heathrow Airport runway **Landscape Character Area L1: Gravel Terrace Infrastructure – Heathrow.** Given the low sensitivity of this landscape and limited visibility due to distance from the Site, at most the Proposed Development would have a 'negligible adverse indirect' impact at Year 0 with 'no change' to this character area by the Summer of Year 15.

9.5.24 To the south and south-west of the Site, the **'Historic Core'** townscape type covers the village of Sipson. The Proposed Development would not directly affect this area but would indirectly affect glimpsed views. Given that the views would be screened by intervening housing in the foreground from the outset and benefit from further screening by proposed vegetation by Year 15, the proposed buildings would not dominate the visual setting of this landscape area (also see Visual Assessment in Section 9.6 below). Given that this area has a low sensitivity, with its townscape context already affected by glimpses of the Holiday Inn to the north and a mixture of twentieth century housing throughout, the overall effect would be 'minor adverse indirect' at Year 0, diminishing to 'negligible adverse indirect' at the summer of Year 15 when mitigation planting around the site boundaries establishes.

Potential and Residual Effects on Landscape Features During Operation

9.5.25 With regards to the effects of specific landscape features within the Site, the Proposed Development would result in:

- the removal of approximately 5.2ha of modified grassland;
- the planting of over of new Green Infrastructure to include the following as shown on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan:
    - 0.83 ha of 'Soft Landscaping' around the buildings, to include low-level native hedge, shrub and bulb planting
    - 2.40 ha of 'Green Buffer', between security line and site boundary to include dense, high-level planting and trees, species-rich grass and wildflowers, and attenuation ponds with wet wildflower mix.

9.5.26 The landscape will include a minimum 12.5m buffer around the Site boundary to provide screening to adjacent land uses.

9.5.27 The replacement of up to 5.2ha of modified grassland with a variety of newly established green infrastructure and building infrastructure would have a 'direct minor adverse' effect on this land use. The existing grassland makes a limited contribution to the landscape character of the site and wider area, however it is acknowledged that its replacement with the data centre buildings and associated access routes and parking will have an adverse impact on land use generally. The Proposed Development will also introduce new sustainable drainage basins into the landscape buffer areas. These would benefit from a wet wildflower mix into an area that currently has no water features. Whilst these may not be permanently wet, this will also enhance the meadow diversity of the Site. The replacement of the modified grassland with restored meadow grassland in the areas that are not developed or planted with trees will result in a 'minor beneficial' effect on the overall quality of grassland vegetation within the Site once this has established however.

9.5.28 Trees, hedgerow and scrub vegetation would be planted around the wide periphery of the built form, in conjunction with the retention of existing trees and hedgerows wherever practical. The only tree removals, as set out in the *AECOM Arboricultural Impact Assessment* (September 2026) would be one Category B tree (T19 goat willow) and three Category C tree groups (G10 Buddleja, G46 young sycamore and G49 2 no. elder with young holly, ash and sycamore). In

addition, 6 no. Category U trees would be removed. The few trees to be removed are therefore generally in poor quality, comprise self-set non-native species (Buddleya and sycamore) and/or are small in size (buddleja, elder, goat willow and holly) and contribute little to the screening or landscape character of the Site.

9.5.29 In addition to the wide areas of structural planting, the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan shows a commitment to low-level shrub and hedgerow, shrub and bulb planting adjacent to the proposed buildings. These could be a mixture of native and ornamental species and would contribute to the landscape character and amenity of the Site.

9.5.30 At Year 0, the proposed planting would be immature and would provide only limited screening of the development. However, new tree planting would enhance the green infrastructure framework surrounding the Site. By Year 15, as the planting matures, it would provide a good degree of screening and greater integration of the development into its surroundings, contributing to the visual setting of the Site as well as its biodiversity and semi-rural character. The net increase and diversity of the native scrub and hedgerow would have a 'minor beneficial' effect on this landscape typology within the Site. There would be a 'moderate beneficial' effect on trees within the Site, reflecting the significant visual presence they would have as well as their net increase in numbers in a site that otherwise has few mature trees.

9.5.31 In addition to the enhanced planting, the Proposed Development would enhance public access with a new area off Sipson Road available to the public. This would provide an area of accessible green space into an area that is currently inaccessible, having a further beneficial landscape effect.

Table 9.15 Potential Landscape Effects during Operation

Note: All effects are judged to be permanent

Potential Landscape Receptor	**Overall Sensitivity** (Table 9.12)	**Size/ Scale of Effect** (Tables 9.4 and 9.12)	**Direct/ Indirect**	**Geog. Extent**	**Overall Magnitude** (Table 9.5)	**Overall Significance** (Table 9.6)
Landscape Character Areas (Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment)						
LCA K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	• Negligible adverse (where visible only) (Years 0 and 15)	Indirect	Landscape Character Area	• Negligible adverse indirect	• Negligible adverse indirect (Years 0 and 15)
LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	• Medium adverse (Year 0) – Low adverse (Summer, Year 15) (Site level) • Negligible - Medium adverse (Site setting and Landscape Character Area, where visible only) (Year 0) • Negligible - Low adverse (Site setting and Landscape Character Area, where visible only) (Summer, Year 15)	Direct	Site-Level & Site Setting/ Landscape Character Area	• Medium (Year 0) - Low (Year 15) adverse direct (within the Site) • Negligible-Medium adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries) (Year 0) • Negligible-Low adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries) (Year 15)	• Moderate (Year 0) – Minor adverse direct (Year 15) (within the Site) • Negligible – Moderate adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries) (Year 0) • Negligible – Minor adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries) (Year 15)
LCA L1 'Heathrow'	Low	• Negligible adverse landscape impact (Years 0 and 15) (where visible only)	Indirect	Landscape Character Area	• Negligible adverse indirect (Years 0 and 15) (where visible only)	• Negligible adverse indirect (Years 0 and 15) (where visible only)

Potential Landscape Receptor	**Overall Sensitivity** (Table 9.12)	**Size/ Scale of Effect** (Tables 9.4 and 9.12)	**Direct/ Indirect**	**Geog. Extent**	**Overall Magnitude** (Table 9.5)	**Overall Significance** (Table 9.6)
Historic Core TCA - Sipson	Medium - Low	• Low adverse landscape impact (Year 0) – Negligible adverse (Summer Year 15) (where visible only)	Indirect	Site Setting	• Low adverse indirect (Year 0) – Negligible adverse (Summer Year 15) (where visible only)	• Minor adverse indirect (Year 0) – • Negligible adverse (Summer Year 15) (where visible only)
Landscape Features						
Modified Grassland	Medium-Low	• Low adverse impact (Year 0) • Low beneficial (Summer Year 15)	Direct	Site level	• Low adverse direct (Year 0) • Low beneficial (Summer Year 15)	• Minor adverse direct (Year 0) • Minor beneficial (Summer Year 15)
Hedgerow and Scrub Vegetation	Low	• Negligible adverse landscape impact (Year 0) • Medium beneficial (Year 15)	Direct	Site level	• Negligible adverse direct (Year 0) • Minor beneficial (Summer Year 15)	• Negligible adverse indirect (Year 0) • Minor beneficial (Summer Year 15)
Trees	Low	• Negligible adverse landscape impact (Year 0) • Medium beneficial (Year 15)	Direct	Site level	• Negligible adverse direct (Year 0) • Medium beneficial (Summer Year 15)	• Negligible adverse indirect (Year 0) • Minor beneficial (Summer Year 15)
Water Features	N/A	• Introduction of new SuDS features	Direct	Site level	• Low beneficial (Years 0 and 15)	N/A
Public Access	N/A	• Introduction of a new publicly accessible open space	Direct	Site level	• Low beneficial (Years 0 and 15)	N/A

9.6 Effects on Visual Amenity

9.6.1 The assessment of the visual impacts during the construction and operational periods are summarised in Table 9.16. The assessment is based on initial visualisations produced by VU.CITY software, the ZTV and the site visit. The conclusions will be confirmed by the verified visualisations once available.

9.6.2 All construction effects are judged to be 'short-term'. Assumptions on what the construction will include is set out in the Section 9.5 above.

9.6.3 All operational effects are judged to be 'long-term'. The visualisations indicate both the Illustrative scheme and the maximum parameter heights.

9.6.4 The effects at the operational stage judged at two points in time. The first, 'worst case' scenario, is either at Year 0 or during the winter of Year 15, when proposed vegetation is of limited height or is more mature but has limited vegetation due to leaf loss. Throughout this following assessment, references and judgements relating to Year 0 also, at worst, reflects the effects during Winter Year 15.

9.6.5 The second point is during the summer of Year 15, when proposed vegetation is more mature and has full degree of foliage. At this stage, mitigation is therefore greater and visual impacts would be less. Both points in time are allowed for by the 'inherent mitigation' provided within the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan, which includes a generous buffer of trees, shrubs and meadow vegetation.

9.6.6 An indicative landscape scheme is provided in Appendix 9.2 and is shown on the verified visualisations. This indicates how the inherent mitigation principles could be delivered; however the precise location and species of plants would be subject to Reserved Matters planning application(s).

9.6.7 The assessments show that the main adverse effects would be on private views from residential properties immediately to the west of the Site during construction and the early years following completion. As proposed vegetation around the Site boundaries matures, these views would be screened during the summer months. Whilst there would also be clear views of the Proposed Development from the M4 Heathrow Spur Road to the east of the Site, the low sensitivity of these visual receptors mean that the changes to views would not be significant.

Effects on Views from the North

9.6.8 Directly to the north of the Site, the 40m high **Holiday Inn Heathrow** building and associated vegetation provides a good degree of screening. The main visual receptors from here would therefore be the private views from the Holiday Inn and associated car park, which includes a car hire company. The Holiday Inn is currently closed for refurbishment, but when this reopens there would be some clear (albeit private views from some bedrooms towards either the construction site or completed data centre buildings and associated landscape), especially during the winter months and from the more elevated rooms. As this area is private we did not access the land and there are no photographs. Using VU.CITY software to make judgements it is likely that the proposed construction site and development would have a 'medium' scale of visual change (see definitions in Table 9.10), either benefitting from some screening by vegetation when viewed from the car park/lower storeys or being elevated above the Site (upper storeys). The short-term nature of the construction impact would have an overall impact of 'low' adverse magnitude whilst the long-term nature of the Year 0 operational impacts would result in a 'medium adverse' magnitude. Views from the car park would diminish to 'low adverse' at Summer Year 15. Given the 'low' sensitivity of these visual receptors and Low or Medium

magnitude of the operational effects, the potential and residual impacts would therefore also be of 'minor' significance.

9.6.9 From the north-east, views from **the eastern end of Holloway Lane** (to the west of the Holiday Inn) are restricted by foreground roadside vegetation and buildings to the west of the Site, on Sipson Road. During construction there would be glimpses of cranes from the eastern end of the lane, whilst during operation there could be glimpses of the new buildings during the winter of Year 0 (see ZTV, Figure 9.8). This might diminish by Year 15 as mitigation planting establishes on the western boundary of the site. Overall, these changes to the views would not be a dominant element from much of this lane, and given the low sensitivity of the receptors, the scale and magnitude of the impacts would range at worst from 'negligible adverse' to 'low adverse' depending on how close to the site the viewer is and whether they are short-term (during construction) or long-term (during operation). Given the low sensitivity of the visual receptors, the overall significance would range from 'negligible adverse' to 'minor adverse', with the greatest degree of impact being at Year 0 of operation at the eastern end of the lane.

9.6.10 There would be glimpses of the construction cranes and emerging buildings during construction when seen from short stretches of **the M4, between Junctions 4B and 2**, however these would generally be glimpsed at speed from some distance and often screened by roadside vegetation and cuttings. At most, these changes to views would be of 'negligible adverse' scale and magnitude. Similarly, once complete, the new buildings would be scarcely seen from this highway (see ZTV, Figure 9.8), having a 'negligible adverse' magnitude and significance of effects on these 'low sensitivity' receptors.

9.6.11 Further to the north-east of the M4, vegetation along the motorway provides a good degree of screening, however there would be glimpsed views from the eastern end of **Shepiston Lane**, Hayes (see Visualisation 2). Given the distance from the Site, and screening of much of the building, at most these effects would be of negligible adverse scale, both during construction and at Year 0. Given that only the upper parts of the buildings would be visible the mitigation planting would not make a difference to the view, and the effects would remain the same at Year 15 as Year 0. Overall, the significance of effects on these low sensitivity receptors would be 'negligible adverse'.

9.6.12 To the north of the M4, users of **Shepiston Lane and Stockley Road (A408)** may have glimpsed views of the construction cranes and emerging/final buildings. Given the distance from the site, and screening by foreground roadside vegetation and the Holiday Inn north of the site, the changes to these views would be of 'negligible adverse' magnitude and significance at most.

Effects on Views from the East

9.6.13 To the north-east and immediate east of the Site, users of a short stretch of the **M4 Heathrow Spur Road** and the bridge over this road where **Sipson Lane** crosses it would have clear views into the construction site and early years following completion. This road runs immediately adjacent to the Site's eastern boundary. Visualisations 1, 3 and 4 indicate the likely changes to the views at completion and Year 15 with and without vegetation. These are not verified views given that they were taken from moving vehicle on the Spur Road which could not be surveyed. During construction and following completion, the changes to the views would be clear, however the existing visual presence of the M4 highway in the foreground and the Holiday Inn beyond the site would reduce the overall effects on the views. The scale of the effect during construction is likely to be 'high adverse', with an overall magnitude of 'medium adverse' once the short-term nature of the effect is taken into account. The scale of the effect at Year 0 of operation would also be 'high adverse' and given the long-term nature of the effect this would remain at 'high adverse magnitude'. Given the 'low sensitivity' of users of this section of the M4 Heathrow Spur, the significance of the visual effect during construction would be 'minor

adverse' and at Year 0 of operation this would be 'moderate adverse'. By the Summer of Year 15, with appropriate tree planting along the eastern boundary of the Site, the buildings would be almost screened, having a 'negligible adverse magnitude' effect.

9.6.14 To the east of the M4 Heathrow Spur there would be glimpsed views from the **Sipson Sand and Gravel quarry and Wall Garden Farm,** which are both located to the north of Sipson Lane. This is a private commercial area and it was not accessed as part of this survey, however Vu.CITY modelling was used to gain an idea of likely effects. This area benefits from existing boundary hedgerow vegetation, however given the size of the proposed buildings, the uneven and associated construction cranes there would be some views of the Proposed Development adjacent to the Holiday Inn. These are all 'low' sensitivity receptors, with the foreground views compromised by commercial and gravel extraction activities, with users of the land present for work or commercial purposes. Whilst some of the changes to the views in this area during construction and early after completion will at worst be of 'medium' scale and magnitude, the overall significance of the effects would be 'minor adverse'. As mitigation planting along the eastern boundary of the Site matures, this could diminish to 'negligible adverse' by the summer of Year 15 as the new buildings are screened.

9.6.15 Beyond the Quarry and Wall Garden Farm, **Sipson Lane** extends towards Harlington. Views from this lane towards the Site benefit from screening by mature roadside hedgerows however there may be glimpsed views of the new buildings and construction cranes, especially during the winter months or through breaks in the hedgerow, especially at the western end of the lane. The magnitude and significance of both construction and operational effects here would at most be negligible adverse due to these screening elements.

9.6.16 To the north of Sipson Lane there is an area of sports pitches. The westernmost of these is **Little Harlington Playing Fields**, an area of public sports pitches whilst to the east, the Imperial College Harlington Sports Ground/Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground is private. The ZTV (Figure 9.8) and VU.CITY shows that the upper parts of the proposed buildings would be glimpsed from parts of these pitches, however existing hedgerow vegetation will provide a good degree of screening. The proposed mitigation planting around the eastern boundary of the Site would make little difference to these views at either Year 0 or Year 15, and for both periods the magnitude of change would at most be 'low adverse'. The magnitude of change during construction would be 'negligible adverse', reflecting the short-term nature of the effect. Users of these sports pitches are judged to be of 'medium-low' sensitivity and overall, the significance of the effects on these users would be 'negligible adverse' during construction, and 'minor adverse' during Year 0 and Year 15.

9.6.17 To the south of Sipson Lane, a **public footpath, reference H68**, connects Sipson Lane with the southern part of Harlington. This crosses an area of flat open arable fields with gravel extraction works beyond to the east (see Visualisation 5). The Proposed development will be visible beyond these foreground fields sitting alongside the existing Holiday Inn building as well as domestic scale buildings within Sipson. Whilst it will be a new element in the view, it will not significantly affect it. Views during Year 0 are likely to have a 'medium adverse' impact, whilst during construction these would be of 'low' impact, reflecting the short-term nature of the effect. By the Summer of Year 15, mitigation planting along the eastern boundary of the Site will have diminished the magnitude of the visual effect however given the 'medium-high' sensitivity of the receptor group, the significance of the visual effects would remain 'moderate adverse'.

Effects on Views from the South and South-West

9.6.18 To the immediate south of the Site, buildings on the **western end of Sipson Lane** provide a good degree of screening and ultimately this will be further screened by proposed tree planting (see View 6). The proposed buildings will be glimpsed beyond these buildings from short stretches of this lane as well as more clearly from the converted former chapel and the Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls, given their proximity to the site boundary. Views from the residential properties and school are private and access was not gained, however it is likely that effects during the construction period the visual effects would be of 'medium adverse' magnitude, rising to 'high adverse' following completion, due to the long-term nature of the changes. As proposed vegetation to the south of the buildings matures, this would help screen views of the new building sand diminish the significance of visual effects to 'moderate adverse' for residents and 'minor adverse' for school users (reflecting their lower sensitivity). Road users would benefit from screening by the buildings from the outset, with glimpsed views of the construction site and finished building have a 'minor adverse' significance from the outset.

9.6.19 Slightly to the west of View 6, there is a further glimpsed view towards the Site from **Sipson Road close to its junction with Sipson Lane**. Views from this stretch of Sipson Road would also include the locally listed Former Baptist Chapel (see View 7). As with View 6 the proposed buildings would benefit from screening by existing vegetation and buildings and due to their distance from the viewer would not form a dominant element in the view when seen from Sipson Road. The glimpsed views would have a 'minor adverse' effect during construction and following completion and as proposed vegetation matures this would diminish to 'negligible adverse' during the summer of Year 15.

9.6.20 To the **south of its junction with Sipson Lane, views from Sipson Road** are further screened by intervening properties on the eastern side of Sipson Road. Views from these properties would also be very limited due to their orientation, with views being oblique. Private views from **Vincent Close** off Sipson Road may be clearer due to the orientation of the properties here, however would benefit from screening by housing and vegetation to the north. Visual impacts from this stretch of Sipson Road are therefore likely to be of negligible adverse scale and magnitude during construction and at all years of operation, at most comprising glimpsed views of the new buildings between existing properties and vegetation. Views from the upper storeys of properties on Vincent Close would include cranes during the construction phase as well as the upper parts of the proposed buildings following completion. These effects would be of 'low' magnitude, having a 'minor adverse' visual impact. Due to the distance from the site and existing screening of the lower parts of the buildings, the proposed mitigation planting would do little to reduce the overall effects between Year 0 and Year 15.

9.6.21 Beyond Sipson, there would be glimpsed views of the construction cranes and proposed buildings from **Sipson Recreation Ground** (see View 8). The majority of the Proposed Development and construction would be screened by existing vegetation and buildings within the western part of Sipson, and the overall changes to the views would be scarcely appreciated, either during construction or operation, with effects being of 'negligible adverse' significance.

9.6.22 Within the countryside on the eastern side of Harmondsworth, there are open views across the countryside to the south-west of Sipson from a **public footpath ref Y19** (see View 9). From here, the Holiday Inn is visible on the horizon, however the adjacent data centre buildings would be half the height of this and benefit from screening by vegetation and buildings on the western side of Sipson as well as the effects of perspective, being over 1.4km from the Site. Whilst the upper parts of the buildings would be visible, they would not form a dominant part of the view and effects during construction and following completion would be 'negligible adverse'.

9.6.23 Adjacent to the south-western side of the Site, there would be further glimpsed view towards the Site from **Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the western end of the Site** (see Views 10 and 11). These views are taken close to the Grade II listed King William IV Public House. The foreground includes the Sipson Road infrastructure (including a pedestrian crossing) and mid 20th century housing on the western side of Sipson Road. Whilst the new buildings and construction site would be visible from parts of this stretch of road the lower parts of the buildings would benefit from screening by the existing buildings and vegetation. The overall magnitude of change during construction and at completion, would be 'low adverse' magnitude and of 'minor adverse' significance. As new planting along the western side of the Site matures, the summer impacts would be 'negligible adverse' by Year 15.

9.6.24 From this area there would also be private views from residents on Sipson Road and Vineries Close. These are 'medium' sensitivity receptors. Whilst they are private views and were not visited as part of the assessment, it is likely that impacts would primarily be from the upper storeys of the properties and would benefit from screening by existing vegetation and buildings. During construction there would be oblique and partially screened views of the construction site, of 'high adverse' scale and 'medium adverse' magnitude. This would be of 'major adverse' significance at Year 0 during operation, diminishing to 'moderate adverse' by the summer of Year 15 as new vegetation matures.

Effects on Views from the West and North-West

9.6.25 To the west of the Site there would be short, glimpsed views from short stretches of **Harmondsworth Lane** between Sipson Road and Harmondsworth (see ZTV, Figure 9.8) Generally the construction cranes and buildings would be screened by existing roadside vegetation and buildings/vegetation on the western side of Sipson however. Given the low sensitivity of the visual receptors here, the overall impacts would be negligible adverse at both Year 0 and Year 15.

9.6.26 To the immediate west of the Site there would be glimpsed views towards the site from housing on both the western and eastern side of **Sipson Road**. Whilst these houses are in close proximity to the Site (approximately 65m) they would benefit from screening by existing properties on Sipson Road and/or Russell Gardens. These are private views and were not accessed as part of the survey however based on the visualisations provided for Views 2 and 13 it is likely that effects would be low adverse at construction and at Year 0, given that the proposed buildings would sit below the rooflines of existing houses on Russell Gardens and the eastern side of Sipson Road. By the Summer of Year 15, proposed tree planting along the western boundary of the Site would further reduce the visibility of the buildings, resulting in 'negligible adverse' effects.

9.6.27 From the **junction of Russell Gardens with Sipson Road** (see View 12), the intervening housing would screen views of the proposed buildings and construction site, resulting in a 'low adverse' effect during construction and early years of operation, diminishing to 'negligible adverse' during the summer of Year 15 as proposed vegetation matures.

9.6.28 From the highway within **Russell Gardens** (View 13) there would be closer views of the proposed buildings to the east, however these would be partially concealed by existing housing on the eastern side of Russell Gardens. Depending on the location of the viewer, the impacts of the construction site would range from 'low' to 'medium adverse' magnitude and 'minor adverse' significance. Once operational, the longer term nature of these visual effects would mean that impacts would range from 'minor' to 'moderate' adverse depending on the degree of foreground screening. As new vegetation on the western side of the site matures this will provide a degree of screening, reducing visual impacts on road users to 'minor adverse' significance.

9.6.29 Impacts on residential properties in **Russell Gardens** would be greater, due to their closer proximity to the Site, higher sensitivity and more elevated views. As access was not obtained, impacts on these receptors is gauged based on the visualisations in View 13. Effects would depend on the location of the housing, with the housing immediately adjacent to the site boundary experiencing 'moderate adverse' effects during construction and 'major adverse' effects at Year 0, with the proposed buildings clearly visible, albeit over 40m from the closest houses. As proposed vegetation matures along the western edge of the Site, this visual impact would diminish, and by Summer Year is likely to be 'Moderate adverse'. Housing on the western sides of Russell Gardens will be less affected, having oblique and/or partially screened views of the Proposed buildings. These visual impacts on these properties would at most be 'moderate adverse' at Year 0, diminishing to 'minor adverse' by Summer Year 15.

9.6.30 Further north on **Sipson Road** there would be several glimpsed views towards the Proposed Development between gaps in the existing housing on the eastern side of Sipson Road (see View 14). From here, the proposed buildings would sit below the roofline of existing housing on Sipson Road and would not dominate views. Given the screening benefits of the properties here and the low sensitivity of the visual receptors, the effects during construction would be 'minor adverse' and at most 'moderate adverse' once completed. Once vegetation has matured, the visual effects would diminish to 'minor adverse' by Summer Year 15.

9.6.31 Further to the west there would be distant views towards the Site from **public footpath ref Y8 to the north of Harmondsworth** (see View 15). At 1.4km away, the Proposed Development would benefit from screening by existing mature trees to the west of Sipson, however there may be views of the new building during the winter months. At most, effects would be negligible adverse both during construction and the operational periods.

9.6.32 To the north-west of the Site there would be some clear views into the Site from **Sipson Road adjacent to the existing/proposed vehicular entrance** (see Views 16 and 17), including the stretch close to the locally listed Plough public house. Here there are no existing houses, and the original Sipson Garden Centre was accessible from Sipson Road. Some existing mature trees soften views into the Site however security fencing diminishes the value of the view. During construction there would be clear views of hoardings and the construction works beyond, however the existing low sensitivity of the visual receptors mean that impacts will be 'minor adverse'. As this part of the Site will be retained as a public open space with new tree planting, the visual impacts will initially be 'minor adverse', with views of the proposed buildings beyond young vegetation. By Year 15, the maturing planting would be beginning to screen the more distant buildings and also creating a new area of local parkland. This would be of 'minor beneficial' significance.

9.6.33 To the north-west, there would also be more distant views from a short stretch of **Harmondsworth Road, immediately to the south of the M4 crossing** (see View 18). From here, the roadside vegetation generally screens views, especially during the Summer and Autumn months however there are short stretches where there are views across an open field towards the Holiday Inn hotel. From here, the Proposed Development and associated construction cranes would be visible beyond existing mature trees, however given the low sensitivity of the visual receptors (road users) and existing screening the impacts would at most be 'minor adverse'. Mitigation planting would have limited benefit given the presence of existing vegetation closer to the viewer.

Table 9.16 Effects on Visual Receptors During Construction and Operation

Notes:

- *All visual effects during construction are judged to be short-term and direct. All operational visual effects judged to be long-term and direct.*
- *The assessment of **potential visual effects** assumes there will be buffer planting, including trees, as shown on the Green Infrastructure and Landscape parameter plan. It is assumed that trees can be located around the Site boundaries similar to that shown on the Illustrative Landscape Layout General Arrangement drawing (see Appendix 9.2) however precise locations will be secured through Reserved Matters applications.*
- *Year 0 judgements present the 'worst case scenario' (which would be similar in significance to effects during Winter Year 15) whilst the Summer Year 15 assessment presents the 'best case scenario'.*

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
Views from the north					
Private View	50m	Users of car park on the Holiday Inn Site (currently a car rental company)	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse
Private View	50m	Users of Holiday Inn Upper Storeys (currently closed)	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse
-	500m	Users of the eastern end of Holloway lane to the west of the Holiday Inn	Low	Construction: Negligible to Low adverse Year 0: Negligible to Low adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible to Low adverse	Construction: Negligible to Minor adverse Year 0: Negligible to Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible to Minor adverse
-	400m	Users of the M4 to the north of the Holiday Inn	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
2	1.2km	Users of Shepiston lane, Hayes, to the north of the M4	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
-	Approx. 0.4 – 1.2km	Users of Shepiston Lane and Stockley Road (A408) to the north of the M4.	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
Views from the East					
1,3	5m	Users of the M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Construction: Medium adverse Year 0: High adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
4	20 - 50m	Sipson Lane to the east of the Site, including the bridge over M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Construction: Medium adverse Year 0: High adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
Private view	60+m	Workers/visitors to Sipson Sand and Gravel Quarry and Wall Garden Farm (commercial units)	Low	Construction: Medium adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
4	70m – 570m	Users of Sipson Lane between M4 Heathrow Spur Road and Imperial College Sports Ground	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
-	325+m	Users of Little Harlington Playing Fields	Medium-Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
Private view	600+m	Users of Imperial College Harlington Sports Ground/ Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground	Medium-Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse
5	500 – 770m approx	User of Footpath H68 south of Sipson Lane.	Medium - High	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Moderate adverse Year 0: Moderate adverse Summer Year 15: Moderate adverse
Views from the South and South-west					
6	0km - 0.17km	Users/ residents of Sipson Lane to the west of the M4 (Heathrow Spur Road) including Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls and the locally listed former Baptist chapel	Low (road and school users) Medium (residents)	**Views from the road** Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse **Views from Residential Properties and Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls** Construction: Medium adverse Year 0: High adverse Summer Year 15: Medium adverse	**Road Users** Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse **Residents** Construction: Major adverse Year 0: Major adverse Summer Year 15: Moderate adverse **School Users** Construction: Moderate adverse Year 0: Moderate adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse
7	0km -	Users of Sipson Road to the north of the junction with Sipson lane	Low (road users	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
-	100m – 450m	Users/residents of Sipson Road to the south of its junction with Sipson Lane, including properties on Vincent Close	Medium (residents) Low (road users	**Views from Residential Properties on Sipson Road** Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse **Views from Residential Properties on Vincent Close** Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse **Views from the Sipson Road** Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Year 15: Negligible adverse	**Views from Residential Properties on Sipson Road** Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse **Views from Residential Properties on Vincent Close** Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse **Views from the Sipson Road** Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Year 15: Negligible adverse
8	695m	Users of Sipson Recreation Ground	Medium-Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
9	1400m	Users of PRoW Y19, east of Hardmondsworth	Medium-High	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Year 15: Negligible adverse

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
10,11	9m+	Users of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the western end of the Site (adjacent to the listed King William IV Public House)	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Year 15: Negligible adverse
Private views	0+ m	Residents of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the south-western end of the Site	Medium	Construction: Medium adverse Year 0: High adverse Summer Year 15: Medium adverse	Construction: Moderate adverse Year 0: Major adverse Summer Year 15: Moderate adverse
Views from the West					
-	600m	Users of Harmondsworth Lane to the west of Sipson	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
Private	65m	Residents of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Medium	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
12	65m	Users of Sipson Road at the junction with Russell Gardens	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse
13	22m	Users of Russell Gardens	Low	Construction: Low - Medium adverse Year 0: Medium - High adverse Summer Year 15: Low - Medium adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor - Moderate adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse

View Ref.	Approx. distance	Potential Visual Receptor	Receptor Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Overall Significance of Effect
Private view	0m	Residents of Russell Gardens	Medium	Construction: Low- Medium adverse Year 0: Medium – High adverse Summer Year 15: Low – Medium adverse	Construction: Minor - Moderate adverse Year 0: Moderate – Major adverse Summer Year 15: Minor - Moderate adverse
14	40m	Users of Sipson Road to the north of Russell Gardens and west of the Site	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse
15	1.4km	Users of PRoW Y8 to the north of Harmondsworth	Medium	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Summer Year 15: Negligible adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Negligible adverse Year 15: Negligible adverse
16	0km	Users of the northern end of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Medium beneficial	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor beneficial
17	25m	Users of Sipson Road at The Plough public house and Holiday Inn to the north-west of the Site	Low	Construction: Low adverse Year 0: Medium adverse Summer Year 15: Medium beneficial	Construction: Minor adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor beneficial
18	0.8km	Users of Harmondsworth Road to the south of the M4 crossing.	Low	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Low adverse Summer Year 15: Low adverse	Construction: Negligible adverse Year 0: Minor adverse Summer Year 15: Minor adverse

9.7 Additional Mitigation

9.7.1 No Additional Mitigation is proposed. Strategic planting will help mitigate some of the visual effects, and this is shown as inherent mitigation as a 'Green Buffer' on the Landscape and Green Infrastructure parameter plan which will include 'high level planting and trees'.

9.7.2 The precise location and quantum of trees is not shown on the parameter plans and can be secured at the Reserved Matters application stage to ensure that the maximum practical levels of screening can be achieved. The Illustrative Landscape Layout General Arrangement demonstrates how the final design could appear and this is shown in the illustrative verified visualisations. These are judged to be achievable as part of the emerging 'inherent mitigation' rather than 'additional' mitigation.

9.8 Residual effects

9.8.1 The landscape and visual assessments have been based on the assumption that the proposed areas of Green Infrastructure will incorporate a variety of vegetation features as an inherent part of the spaces as set out on the Landscape and Green Infrastructure parameters plan. These will include trees.

9.8.2 The 'Residual Effects' for the scheme are therefore judged to be the same as the 'Potential Effects, as shown in Tables 9.15 and 9.16.

Summary of Significant Residual Landscape Effects

9.8.3 Given the relatively low value of the landscape character and features within and around the Site, residual landscape impacts would be limited. The only significant adverse residual landscape effects would be on the character of a small part of the Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment Area K2 Harlington Open Gravel Terrace. This will experience a 'direct moderate adverse' effect within the Site and similar 'indirect' effect adjacent to its eastern boundary, especially during the early years before mitigation planting has matured and during the winter months. During the Summer months once trees have matured this effect would not be significant.

Summary of Significant Residual Visual Effects

9.8.4 With regards to the visual assessment in Section 9.6, the significant residual effects would be on the following visual receptors:

- Users of footpath H68 to the south of Sipson Lane during the early years of the establishment of the mitigation planting and during the winter months once mitigation trees are mature.
- Residents of Sipson Lane and users of Lady Nafisa Secondary School to the south of the Site, during the early years of the establishment of the mitigation planting and during the winter months once mitigation trees are mature.
- Residents of Vineries Close and Sipson Road to the south-west of the Site
- Residents of Russel Gardens to the west of the Site

9.8.5 Other than the footpath, these are all private views that have not been visited as part of the Site survey. The effects are instead based on judgements using VU.CITY and GoogleEarth software and a computer-generated Zone of Theoretical Visibility as well as verified views from nearby locations.

9.8.6 All other visual effects are not judged to be significant either due to partial screening by intervening buildings and vegetation or due to the low sensitivity of the visual receptors, either due to the low value of the existing views or the relatively low susceptibility to change of the user group, including users of the M4 Heathrow Spur Road and Sipson Road.

9.9 Implications of Climate Change

9.9.1 The impact of climate change has been considered based upon UKCP18 Climate Change Projections. This indicates a move towards warmer, wetter winters and hotter, drier summers. However, natural variations mean that some cold winters, some dry winters, some cool summers and some wet summers will still occur.

9.9.2 It is unlikely that these predicted changes will lead to wholescale change to the future landscape baseline within the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Changes might include certain tree species or grasslands becoming more dominant/prevalent, although it is unlikely that these changes would have a prominent impact on landscape of the area. The impact of climate change on the existing and proposed tree and shrub species within the Site is also covered in Chapter 8.

9.9.3 Similarly for visual effects, it is unlikely that this climate change scenario would lead to any greater, or different, effects to those predicted, given that the screening effects currently provided by topography, and any changes relating to tree and hedgerow species composition can still continue to include specimens that provide a suitable level of screening.

9.10 Cumulative effects

Consideration has been given to the potential for residual negative effects of the Proposed Development to act cumulatively with other committed schemes as set out above. This identified that due to the distance and lack of intervisibility between the Proposed Development and the other data centre, residential and commercial sites that are consented/under planning consideration, there would be no cumulative landscape or visual impacts associated with the Proposed Development.

9.11 Summary

9.11.1 This impact assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Appraisal 3rd edition* (The Landscape Institute & IEMA, 2013). It assesses the effects that the Proposed Development would have on landscape designations, landscape character and features and visual amenity.

9.11.2 Potential significant landscape and visual effects have been identified through a desktop study and Site surveys undertaken by Savills during 2026.

9.11.3 The Proposed Development incorporates inherent mitigation measures to help avoid impacts on key landscape characteristics and sensitive views. This has included the retention of wide areas of landscape buffers surrounding the building and retaining existing hedges and trees

9.11.4 The Site is not covered by any adopted landscape designations. There are no trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders within the Site.

9.11.5 The Proposed Development would result in an inevitable significant change to landscape character, with an area of modified grassland, hardstanding and buildings being replaced by a data centre with associated parking and landscape buffers. This would have a residual 'moderate adverse' effect on the small area of the Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment Area 'K2 Harlington Open Gravel Terrace' in which the Site is located.

9.11.6 Whilst the proposals will result in the loss of modified grassland, there will be some minor benefits to other landscape features across the Site, including the introduction of a public open space, water features and a diverse buffer including trees and meadow. Existing boundary trees would also be retained unless they are unsafe or of poor health.

9.11.7 Whilst the data centre would include buildings up to 20m in height, this would be much lower than the adjacent Holiday Inn which rises to approximately 40m. It would also benefit from a degree of screening by adjacent buildings and vegetation within the village of Sipson to the west and south and the Holiday Inn and M4 corridor to the north. The flat nature of the surrounding landscape means that there are no elevated views towards the Site other than private views from the upper storeys of the adjacent Holiday Inn. The most visually open public views of the Proposed Development would be from a short stretch of the M4 Heathrow Spur Road immediately to the east of the Site however due to the existing low value of these view and low sensitivity of the road users visual effects would not be significant.

9.11.8 The only significant residual changes to public views would be from a public right of way to the east of the Site, to the south of Sipson Lane (reference H68) during the winter months only. Other significant residual visual effects would be on views on the relatively small number of residents on the eastern and southern parts of Sipson that would have views towards the new buildings. These would include residents of Russell Gardens, Vineries Close and Sipson Road to the west of the Site. There would also be moderate residual effects on residents of Sipson Lane to the south during the winter months when mitigation trees are not in leaf. During the Summer months these impacts would not be significant due to the softening provided by the mitigation planting.

9.11.9 When considered in conjunction with other data centres with planning consent or under consideration, the Proposed Development would not result in any landscape or visual effects due to lack of proximity and intervisibility.

9.11.10 A summary of the assessment is set out in Table 9.18 below.

9.12 References

- *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition* (Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013) ('GLVIA').
- *Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition (GLVIA3) (Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 2024-01, August 2024)*
- *An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment* (Natural England, October 2014)
- *Technical Guidance Note 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals* (Landscape Institute 2019)
- *Technical Guidance Note 08/19 Camera Auto Settings* (Landscape Institute 2019)
- *Technical Guidance Note 09/19 Earth Curvature* (Landscape Institute 2019)
- *National Landscape Character Areas (*National England, 2013)
- *Hillingdon Landscape Character Assessment (2012)*
- *Hillingdon Townscape Character Study (2023)*
- https://www.gov.uk/guidance/landscape-and-seascape-character-assessments (2014)
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC): Available at: http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk/magicmap.aspx

9.13 Assessor information

Table 9.17 Assessor Information

Chapter	Responsibility	Name	Qualifications	Assessor information
Landscape and Visual Assessment	Savills	Ruth Bishop	• BSc. Hons Geography • Diploma Landscape Architecture • Master of Arts, Landscape Design • Master of Arts, Urban Design • Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute	Ruth is a Director at Savills and leads the company's Landscape team. She has over 30 years' experience in Landscape Design, Impact Assessment and Masterplanning. She has been responsible for managing and undertaking a assessments and landscape-led masterplanning and Green Infrastructure design for development proposals at all scales including major road schemes and housing developments. She has a thorough understanding of the UK planning process and has undertaken many Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments for a variety of schemes and provided evidence on landscape and visual matters at planning inquiries.

Table 9.18 Summary of effects

Note: All mitigation is assumed to be inherent, comprising a generous landscape buffer around all sides of the building including trees and meadow planting as shown on the Landscape and Green Infrastructure Parameters Plan. Residual effects are judged to be same as Potential effects and include judgements at Summer and Winter Year 15 when mitigation planting has established.

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
CONSTRUCTION PHASE: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AREAS					
LCA K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Views of construction site including crane will reduce rural character.	None (at construction stage)	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant
LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Construction of new building and grassland removal within the Site.	None (at construction stage)	Minor adverse direct (within the Site) Negligible adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries)	Not significant
LCA L1 'Heathrow'	Low	Views of cranes.	None (at construction stage)	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant
Historic Core TCA - Sipson	Medium - Low	Glimpsed views of cranes and construction of buildings.	None (at construction stage)	Minor adverse indirect	Not significant
CONSTRUCTION PHASE: LANDSCAPE FEATURES					
Modified Grassland	Medium-low	Removal of approximately 5.2ha of modified grassland	None (at construction stage)	Moderate adverse direct	Significant
Hedgerow and Scrub Vegetation	Low	Removal of limited areas of scrub	None (at construction stage)	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Trees	Low	Negligible adverse landscape impact	None (at construction stage)	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant
CONSTRUCTION PHASE: VISUAL EFFECTS					
Users of car park on the Holiday Inn Site (currently a car rental company)	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site through existing vegetation	Inherent mitigation: Retained vegetation around northern boundary.	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Holiday Inn Upper Storeys (currently under refurbishment)	Low	Elevated views of construction site with panoramic views towards Heathrow Airport beyond.	Inherent mitigation: Retained vegetation around northern boundary.	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of the eastern end of Holloway Lane to the west of the Holiday Inn	Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	Inherent mitigation: Retained and vegetation around north-eastern site boundary.	Negligible to Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of the M4 to the north of the Holiday Inn	Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	Inherent mitigation: Retained vegetation around northern and eastern boundaries.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Shepiston lane, Hayes, to the north of the M4	Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Shepiston Lane and Stockley Road (A408) to the north of the M4.	Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of the M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Clear views of construction site from short stretch of road adjacent to the eastern side of the site.	Inherent mitigation: Retained vegetation along eastern boundary.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Sipson Lane to the east of the Site, including the bridge over M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Clear views of construction site from short stretch of road adjacent to the eastern side of the site.	Inherent mitigation: Retained vegetation along eastern boundary.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Workers/visitors to Sipson Sand and Gravel Quarry and Wall Garden Farm (commercial units)	Low	Clear views of construction site from short stretch of road adjacent to the eastern side of the site.	Inherent mitigation: Retained limited vegetation along eastern boundary.	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Sipson Lane between M4 Heathrow Spur Road and Imperial College Sports Ground	Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	Inherent mitigation: Retained limited vegetation along eastern boundary.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Little Harlington Playing Fields	Medium-Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Imperial College Harlington Sports Ground/ Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground	Medium-Low	Glimpsed distant views of cranes and emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
User of Footpath H68 south of Sipson Lane.	Medium - High	Views of cranes	N/A	Moderate adverse	Significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users/ residents of Sipson Lane to the west of the M4 (Heathrow Spur Road) including Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls and the locally listed former Baptist chapel	Low (road and school users) Medium (residents)	Clear views of construction site from residential properties and school. Glimpsed views from Sipson Lane.	Inherent mitigation: Retained limited vegetation along southern boundary.	Road users: Minor adverse Residents: Major adverse School users: Moderate adverse	Road users: Not significant Residents: Significant School users: Significant
Users of Sipson Road to the north of the junction with Sipson lane	Low (road users	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users/residents of Sipson Road to the south of its junction with Sipson Lane, including properties on Vincent Close	Medium (residents) Low (road users	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Residential Properties on Sipson Road: Negligible adverse Residential Properties on Vincent Close: Minor adverse Users of Sipson Road: Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Sipson Recreation Ground	Medium-Low	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of PRoW Y19, east of Hardmondsworth	Medium-High	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the western end of the Site (adjacent to the listed King William IV Public House)	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site including emerging buildings and cranes.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Residents of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the south-western end of the Site	Medium	Glimpsed views of construction site including emerging buildings and cranes.	Retention of existing vegetation on western side the Site where practical.	Moderate adverse	Significant
Users of Harmondsworth Lane to the west of Sipson	Low	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Residents of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Medium	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Sipson Road at the junction with Russell Gardens	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Russell Gardens	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Residents of Russell Gardens	Medium	Glimpsed and clear views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor - Moderate adverse	Significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of Sipson Road to the north of Russell Gardens and west of the Site	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of PRoW Y8 to the north of Harmondsworth	Medium	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of the northern end of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Low	Glimpsed views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Sipson Road at The Plough public house the north-west of the Site	Low	Glimpsed and clear views of construction site including cranes above.	N/A	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Harmondsworth Road to the south of the M4 crossing.	Low	Distant glimpsed views of cranes and upper parts of emerging buildings.	N/A	Negligible adverse	Not significant
OPERATION PHASE: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER					
LCA K1 'Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Glimpsed views of new buildings in a semi-rural area, albeit in conjunction with taller Holiday Inn building.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species.	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant
LCA K2 'Harlington Open Gravel Terrace'	Medium - Low	Within Site: New buildings, hard standing and landscape buffer in an area currently predominantly	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries,	Minor adverse direct (within the Site)	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
		open grassland with some hard standing and temporary buildings in the northern area. Beyond Site boundaries: Glimpsed views of new buildings in a semi-rural area, albeit in conjunction with taller Holiday Inn building.	including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species.	Negligible - Minor adverse indirect (beyond the Site boundaries)	
LCA L1 'Heathrow'	Low	Glimpsed views of tops of new buildings from limited parts of the Heathrow Airport area. Existing foreground context dominated by airport associated land uses.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species.	Negligible adverse indirect	Not significant
Historic Core TCA - Sipson	Medium - Low	Glimpsed views of new trees and buildings beyond existing highways and buildings in the foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species.	Negligible - Minor adverse indirect (depending on season)	Not significant
OPERATION PHASE: LANDSCAPE FEATURES					
Modified Grassland	Medium-low	Removal of approximately 5.2ha of modified grassland and replacement with new buildings and a wide 2.4ha landscape buffer and 0.83ha soft landscaping.	Inherent mitigation: 2.40ha landscape buffer including meadow grassland (quantum to be confirmed at Reserved Matters application)	Minor beneficial direct	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Hedgerow and Scrub Vegetation	Low	Removal of limited areas of poor-quality vegetation around Site boundaries and replacement with and a wide 2.4ha landscape buffer and 0.83ha soft landscaping including hedgerow and shrub species.	Inherent mitigation: 2.40ha landscape buffer including meadow grassland. Further 0.83ha of soft landscaping around buildings to include shrubs. (quantum to be confirmed at Reserved Matters application)	Minor beneficial direct	Not significant
Trees	Low	One Category B tree (T19 goat willow) and three Category C tree groups (G10 Buddleia, G46 young sycamore and G49 2 no. elder with young holly, ash and sycamore) to be removed (as well as 6 no. Category U trees). Comprehensive tree planting strategy will more than compensate for the loss of these	Inherent mitigation: 2.40ha landscape buffer including long-lived tree species in strategic locations (quantum to be confirmed at Reserved Matters application)	Minor beneficial direct	Not significant
OPERATION PHASE: VISUAL EFFECTS					
Users of car park on the Holiday Inn Site (currently a car rental company)	Low	Glimpsed views of Proposed Development through existing/proposed vegetation, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species, especially along northern Site boundary.	Minor adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of Holiday Inn Upper Storeys (currently closed)	Low	Elevated views of Proposed Development as part of a wider panorama.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees/hedgerow species, especially along northern Site boundary.	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of the eastern end of Holloway Lane to the west of the Holiday Inn	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees and retained trees in north-eastern area of Site.	Negligible to Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of the M4 to the north of the Holiday Inn	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer including trees, around all site boundaries,	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Shepiston Lane, Hayes, to the north of the M4	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Shepiston Lane and Stockley Road (A408) to the north of the M4.	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of the M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Clear views of Proposed Development as part of low value view, in winter months, partially screened during summer.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Sipson Lane to the east of the Site, including the bridge over M4 Heathrow Spur Road	Low	Clear views of Proposed Development as part of low value view, in winter months, partially screened during summer.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Workers/visitors to Sipson Sand and Gravel Quarry and Wall Garden Farm (commercial units)	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Users of Sipson Lane between M4 Heathrow Spur Road and Imperial College Sports Ground	Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Little Harlington Playing Fields	Medium-Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Minor adverse	Not significant
Users of Imperial College Harlington Sports Ground/	Medium-Low	Glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries,	Minor adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Wycombe Wanderers FC Training Ground			including trees along the eastern area of the Site.		
User of Footpath H68 south of Sipson Lane.	Medium - High	Clear views of Proposed Development in middle distance.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees along the eastern area of the Site.	Moderate adverse	Significant
Users/ residents of Sipson Lane to the west of the M4 (Heathrow Spur Road) including Lady Nafisa Secondary School for Girls and the locally listed former Baptist chapel	Low (road and school users) Medium (residents)	Filtered views of Proposed Development in winter, partially screened in the summer.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the southern area of the Site.	Road users: Minor adverse Residents: Moderate - Major adverse, depending on season School users: Minor - Moderate adverse, depending on season	Road users: Not significant Residents: Significant School users: Significant, depending on season
Users of Sipson Road to the north of the junction with Sipson lane	Low (road users	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western area of the Site.	Negligible adverse - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Users/residents of Sipson Road to the south of its junction with Sipson Lane,	Medium (residents) Low (road users	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of emerging buildings beyond other buildings/highways in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries,	Users & Residential Properties on Sipson Road: Negligible adverse	Not significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
including properties on Vincent Close			including trees within the southern area of the Site.	Residential Properties on Vincent Close: Minor adverse	
Users of Sipson Recreation Ground	Medium-Low	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the southern and western areas of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of PRoW Y19, east of Harmondsworth	Medium-High	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the western end of the Site (adjacent to the listed King William IV Public House)	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Negligible adverse - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Residents of Vineries Close and Sipson Road close to the south-western end of the Site	Medium	Clear/glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer depending on the season and location of property.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Moderate - Major adverse, depending on season	Significant

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Users of Harmondsworth Lane to the west of Sipson	Low	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Residents of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Medium	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor – Negligible adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Users of Sipson Road at the junction with Russell Gardens	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Negligible - Minor adverse, depending on season	Not significant
Users of Russell Gardens	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor - Moderate adverse, depending on season	Significant, d depending on season
Residents of Russell Gardens	Medium	Clear/glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer depending on the season and location of property.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor – Moderate adverse depending on season	Significant, depending on season
Users of Sipson Road to the north of Russell	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer,	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries,	Minor – Major adverse depending on location and season	Significant, depending on season

Receptor	Receptor sensitivity	Description of potential impact	Proposed mitigation	Residual effect	Significant / not significant
Gardens and west of the Site		beyond existing buildings in foreground.	including trees within the western side of the Site.		
Users of PRoW Y8 to the north of Harmondsworth	Medium	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Negligible adverse	Not significant
Users of the northern end of Sipson Road to the west of the Site	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor beneficial	Not significant
Users of Sipson Road at The Plough public house and Holiday Inn car park to the north-west of the Site	Low	Glimpsed views of buildings and adjacent landscape buffer, beyond existing buildings in foreground.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor beneficial	Not significant
Users of Harmondsworth Road to the south of the M4 crossing.	Low	Distant glimpsed views of upper parts of buildings, primarily in winter months.	Inherent mitigation: Landscape buffer around all site boundaries, including trees within the western side of the Site.	Minor adverse	Not significant

9.14 Mitigation commitments Summary

Table 9.19 Summary for Securing Mitigation

Identified receptor	Type and purpose of additional mitigation measure (prevent, reduce, offset, enhance)	Means by which mitigation may be secured (e.g. planning condition / legal agreement)	Delivered by	Auditable by
Construction Phase				
Trees	Root protection areas (prevent)	Planning condition	Contractor	LPA
Operation Phase				
Access routes	Provision of publicly accessible open space	Planning condition	Developer	LPA
Landscape character and features	Enhancements to green infrastructure (enhance)	Planning condition	Developer	LPA
Strategic screen planting	Detailed planting strategies to reduce visual impact & compensate for lost plants (prevent, offset)	Planning condition	Developer	LPA