Heathrow West



Environmental Impact Assessment

Scoping Report – Volume III: Appendices

October 2026

Contents

Appendix 1.1 Statement of Expertise

Appendix 4.1 Transboundary Screening

Appendix 5.1 Air Quality and Odour: Monitoring Data and Dispersion Modelling Methodology

Appendix 6.1 Biodiversity: Baseline Condition

Appendix 10.1 Community Baseline

Appendix 12.1 Recreation Baseline

Appendix 14.1 Local Planning and Health Policy

Appendix 14.2 Health Baseline

Appendix 15.1 Landscape, Townscape, and Visual Methodology

Appendix 15.2 Published Landscape Character

Appendix 16.1 Ground Condition Policy

Appendix 18.1 Material and Waste Policy

Appendix 19.1 Major Accidents and Disasters: Long List

Appendix 22.1 Groundwater Modelling Method Statement

Appendix 24.1 Cumulative Long List

Appendix 1.1

Statement of Expertise

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 1.1 Statement of Expertise

Contents

Appendix 1.1 – Statement of Expertise..... 1
1.1 Individual Pen Profiles..... 1
1.2 Organisational Pen Profiles..... 68

Tables

Table 1-1: Individual Pen Profiles 1
Table 1-2: Organisational Pen Profiles 68

Appendix 1.1 – Statement of Expertise

1.1 Individual Pen Profiles

Table 1-1: Individual Pen Profiles

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Chapters 1-4 Chapters 24 - 27	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is an Environmental Planner with over 20 years of experience in environmental assessment. Specialisms include major infrastructure project management, renewable energy, linear infrastructure, transport and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Extensive experience of successfully delivering multimillion pound, multidisciplinary projects for a range of sectors and clients. Experienced in a broad variety of consenting regimes across the UK including TCPA, DCO, DNS and ECU applications.	Environmental Planning Director
Chapters 1-4	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Environmental Planning Director

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Chapters 24 - 27			**Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Director of Environmental Planning with 18 years' experience in the industry and is currently part of the leadership team for Environmental Planning services at Stantec. Day to day [redacted] also currently directs project teams and provides specialist advice to clients to deliver environmental assessment of major infrastructure and development projects and plans. His UK project experience covers a diverse range of projects in different markets including highway and energy infrastructure, residential led mixed-use, urban regeneration, storage & distribution, flood risk management and water distribution and treatment. [redacted] has a thorough understanding of the various environmental issues that affect a development from its inception through to planning and implementation.	
Chapters 1-4 Chapters 24 - 27	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Principal Environmental Scientist at Stantec and is a chartered member of CIWEM.	Principle Environmental Scientist

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] has worked in environmental consultancy for 8 years, using her knowledge in environmental sustainability and environmental policy to support the preparation of Environmental Statements and wider water management reports. [redacted] is also project manager at Stantec covering scope agreements, managing change and coordinating the project delivery working with a range of clients from land developement to water companies. In her role, [redacted] links with multidisciplinary teams, including GIS, adopting a systems thinking approach to deliver innovative and sustainable outcomes.	
Chapters 1-4 Chapters 24 - 27	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] brings 4 years of experience within the environmental consultancy sector, including 3 years working within environmental compliance, involved in projects surrounding; environmental permitting, remediation works, technical construction reporting, surveying and preparation of a range of environmental management plans. Within the last year [redacted]	Environmental Consultant

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			has provided a coordination and support role in the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessments for a range of projects, including DCOs. [redacted] background providing environmental support for construction and operational sites has given her hands on experience in tackling environmental issues, transitioning well into providing environmental support for Proposed Developments.	
Chapters 1-4 Chapters 24 - 27	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is an Environmental Planner with 3 years' experience coordinating and writing multi-discipline EIAs across various sectors including industrial, urban generation and energy.	Environmental Consultant
Air Quality and Odour	Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC)	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** Over 20 years' experience in air quality assessments for EIA, planning and local air	Principal Consultant / Air Quality Technical Lead

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			quality management, including assessments for airport expansion.	
Air Quality and Odour	Cass Allen	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** Circa 20 years' experience in Odour Assessment for EIA and planning, including development of new odour sources and new sensitive uses close to existing sources.	Technical Director / Odour Assessor
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Environmentalist, Chartered Scientist and Chartered Water and Environmental Manager, and for over 27 years now, he has been responsible for the management and assessment of environmental impacts on a range of major infrastructure projects throughout the UK and Ireland for clients in both the public and private sectors. [redacted] has a wide range of sector experience,	Project Director

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			including Strategic Highways, Greenways / Active Travel, Public Transport (bus and heavy rail), Energy (traditional & renewable (wind / solar)), Urban regeneration, Education, Recreation & Tourism, Oil & Gas, Potable Water, Waste Water, Flood Alleviation, Coastal, Healthcare, Remediation and Waste Management. He has also project managed a number of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) projects. He also regularly undertakes technical review and lead verification roles of environmental documentation, including environmental constraints and feasibility studies, EIA Screening Reports, EIA Scoping Reports, and outline Construction Environmental Management Plans (oCEMP). More recently, this has also included environmental due diligence peer reviews of third party EIARs on behalf of clients. Prior to joining APEM, [redacted] had been a Regional Director at AECOM and their all-Ireland Regional Lead for Impact Assessment, responsible for operational excellence, sectoral and associated team growth. He had also been their Sector Lead for Highways & Greenways in	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Scotland, Northern Ireland and Ireland, responsible for sector growth, client engagement, tender co-ordination, team identification, staff upskilling, and appraisal of current best practice. [redacted] also undertook a similar role for impact assessment services as part of their senior leadership team in the UK and Ireland. [redacted] has extensive experience in stakeholder consultation/engagement with both statutory and non-statutory bodies, including attending numerous public exhibition / consultation events. He has also produced proofs of evidence and acted as expert witness on several strategic road schemes and led the Environmental Statements through public inquiry / oral hearing. For one project, he subsequently acted as the Environmental Lead for a Judicial Review legal challenge (brought about purely on environmental grounds) through the High Court, Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court, successfully demonstrating that environmental due process had been followed at every stage in the case. [redacted] is a past Chairman [redacted] and current committee member of the Northern	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Ireland branch of the Chartered Institution of Water & Environmental Management (CIWEM).	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has twenty-five years' experience in UK ecological and environmental consultancy. His key experience is in protected species survey, assessment and mitigation, he holds NatureScot (NS), Natural England (NE) and Natural Resources Wales (NRW) licences for bats, great crested newt and barn owl. He has conducted and produced a wide variety of ecological surveys and reports ranging from Phase 1 habitat and protected species surveys to ecology chapters of EIA, HRA and statutory agency licence applications. Furthermore, he has designed, implemented and managed mitigation projects for bats, badgers, otters, water voles, reptiles and great crested newts. He has worked on includes road and rail schemes, power generation and transmission schemes, wind farms, pipelines, housing and mixed-use developments, defence projects and	Ecology & Biodiversity Lead

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			a race-course. These projects have included major transportation projects in Scotland (A96, A9, Cross Tay Link Road) and England (5 x DCO submissions), and management of delivery of major ecological frameworks such as Natural England's England Ecosystem Survey (ESS) programme, DCWW (Welsh Water) Environmental Monitoring and Assessment framework for AMP7 (now extended for 2 years into AMP8), Morgan Sindall D&B framework to support Wessex Water, and Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) asset disposal programme. [redacted] is an active member of CIEEM, he currently serves on the Audit, Risk and Investment Committee, having previously served on the Professional Standards Committee for 6 years, and the Membership Admissions Committee for 10 years, chairing for eight of those years.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:**	Aquatic Ecology Lead / Freshwater Fish SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] is an Associate Director with over 20 years' experience in both the public and private sectors delivering aquatic ecology, fisheries and water environment projects across the UK. He has extensive experience leading multidisciplinary teams and coordinating aquatic ecology inputs to complex infrastructure projects, including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessments. As Aquatic Ecology Lead for the Heathrow Expansion Project, [redacted] will provide technical leadership and strategic oversight of all aquatic ecology inputs to the DCO and EIA processes. He will lead the planning, coordination and delivery of aquatic ecology surveys and assessments, manage specialist technical teams and stakeholder engagement, and ensure the delivery of a robust evidence base to support environmental assessment and project consenting. His strong background in aquatic ecology, environmental assessment and project management enables him to effectively integrate aquatic ecology requirements within large, multidisciplinary	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			infrastructure projects and support the successful progression of major development proposals.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is experienced in the field of fisheries monitoring, conservation and river restoration, with a key focus on migratory fish species such as Atlantic salmon, shad and European eel. Highly skilled and versatile, [redacted] has a holistic view to fisheries, understanding the importance of the relationships between fish, their habitats and the hydro-geomorphological function of a river, allowing her to have a project insight from multiple viewpoints. She is well suited for both the management and technical delivery of a project with strong analytical and reporting abilities.	Freshwater Fish Assistant SME
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:**	Terrestrial Ecology SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Over eight years' relevant experience in ecological surveys, impact assessments, biodiversity net gain and technical reporting for a wide range of protected and priority species and habitats. [redacted] has worked on schemes ranging in scale, from small-scale single developments to NSIPs in a range of sectors including residential, infrastructure and wind farms. [redacted] is a full member of CIEEM (MCIEEM), holds a Natural England licence for GCN (level 1), bats (level 2) and acts as an accredited agent under Natural England barn owl and dormouse licences.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has twenty-one years' post-graduate experience in environmental consultancy and has been at APEM since 2010. She is an experienced team leader, programme manager and project director, specialising in leading water resources projects, including environmental impact assessment studies and environmental monitoring campaigns. [redacted] currently leads the Hydroecology team,	Hydroecology SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			providing freshwater ecological services to a range clients across the water and infrastructure/ construction sectors.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] brings over a decade of experience in environmental consultancy and is a Chartered Member of the Institute of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM). She has delivered projects across the transport, water, energy, residential and commercial sectors. Her expertise includes macrophyte and macroinvertebrate assessments, River Habitat Surveys, WFD assessments and WINEP delivery. [redacted] has extensive experience working within and around the Heathrow catchments, having undertaken water quality and ecological assessments for Heathrow Airport throughout the early part of her career.	Hydroecology Assistant SME
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** Qualifications:	INNS SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has over 24 years' experience working on invasive and non-native species (INNS), having worked extensively in the private and public sectors, covering research, consultancy, advisory and regulatory roles. This experience has provided [redacted] with an in-depth understanding of key issues surrounding invasion biology and INNS management. Previous experience has included providing evidence-based policy advice to UK administrations on the management of freshwater and marine INNS and on the implementation of relevant legislation. This has included involvement in various national initiatives, such as contingency planning, horizon scanning, leading national-level monitoring and management prioritisation, rapid response processes, and leading national (Marine Pathways Group) and international (OSPAR – INNS) expert groups. [redacted] has conducted and produced a wide range of INNS surveys and reports, including species distribution and impact assessments. This has included the development of industry-standard	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			risk assessment processes (e.g. SAI-RAT) and the provision of evidence-based recommendations and advice to reduce the risk of INNS spread and/or impact. [redacted] leads APEM's dedicated INNS team, which has extensive experience in all aspects of INNS assessment, monitoring and management across freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] brings 20 years of experience in environmental science, specialising in invasive non-native species (INNS), aquatic animal health, and biosecurity. He joined APEM in 2021 and is currently a Principal INNS Consultant, leading the delivery of risk assessment, biosecurity planning and invasive species management projects across the water and environmental sectors. He has developed risk-based biosecurity plans for UK water companies and clients across a range of sectors and has led the delivery of biosecurity	INNS Assistant SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			optioneering and option development projects, applying a strong understanding of invasive species management approaches. His expertise also includes undertaking INNS impact assessments for Environmental Assessment Reports and drought permit applications, developing mitigation and compensation measures, and delivering feasibility studies for invasive species control programmes.	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has over 10 years' experience in ecological consultancy and civil service roles. During his time at Natural England, [redacted] was heavily involved in the development and release of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and its associated guidance. He developed and led an organisation-wide training programme on the correct use and implementation of the metric and is a keen advocate of its use. He has carried out numerous BNG assessments across a range of schemes from individual dwellings to large scale developments and	BNG Lead / SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			NSIPs. [redacted] is a full member of CIEEM (MCIEEM) and holds Natural England licences for GCN (level 1) and bats (level 1).	
Biodiversity	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Engineer with over 26 years' experience of design and Project Management on a variety of river and environmental projects. He delivers feasibility studies, appraisals and outline and detailed designs for a wide variety of civil and environmental engineering schemes. He has appraised and produced outline and detailed designs for fish and eel passes, river restoration and weir removal schemes and flood risk management schemes. [redacted] is experienced in hydrological assessments, river modelling and construction supervision. Using his excellent interpersonal skills, [redacted] has developed a strong understanding of his client's requirements and aspirations across a range of projects. He is committed to delivering safe, sustainable and cost-effective design solutions. [redacted] leads APEM's fisheries engineering team,	Fisheries Engineering SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			where he both delivers and supervises options appraisal and design projects for fish and eel passes, river restoration and intake screening schemes. Recent clients include United Utilities, South West Water, the Environment Agency and Trent Rivers Trust.	
Ornithology	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is Ornithology Service Line Director at APEM and oversees delivery of all ornithological projects and provides technical leadership. [redacted] has over 15 years of experience within ornithological consultancy, working in both the terrestrial and offshore sectors and has a wide array of experiences involving EIA and HRA, and is an expert field ornithologist, familiar with all regularly occurring European bird species. [redacted] has supported NSIP and DCO developments through project management, technical leadership, survey design (including implementing novel methods), team leadership and reporting.	Ornithology Subject Matter Expert (SME)

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] was the lead author on the Seabird Sensitivity Evidence Review for Natural England, which covers pressures that may be exerted through decommissioning of offshore wind assets and in a previous role developed the Waterbird Mitigation Toolkit , and is an expert on disturbance of birds within intertidal habitats. [redacted] has undertaken extensive survey, project management and input into assessment of birds within estuarine and intertidal habitats including for London Gateway Port Extension, Hinkley Point C, Dogger Bank D OWF, and Clogherhead OWF. Most recently [redacted] was an expert advisor on the Robin Rigg and Scroby Sands decommissioning plans.	
Ornithology	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is the Head of Terrestrial Ornithology with over a decade of experience delivering ornithological inputs to major renewable and infrastructure projects across the UK and Ireland and will act as Technical Lead for	Ornithology SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Ornithology on the project. [redacted] specialises in the assessment and management of ornithological constraints associated with onshore wind developments. [redacted] is a member of the ReUK Onshore Planning and Environment Group. [redacted] has extensive experience in designing, managing and delivering complex survey programmes for sensitive coastal, intertidal and terrestrial environments, including wintering and passage waterbird surveys, intertidal wader counts, vantage point surveys, breeding bird surveys and raptor monitoring. He regularly provides technical leadership during post-consent phases, including discharge of consent conditions, technical report preparation, monitoring programme design, stakeholder liaison and supporting compliance with HRA and EIA requirements.	
Ornithology	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has over six years of experience in ornithological consultancy, focusing primarily on	Ornithology SME

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			renewable energy developments, including onshore wind, solar, battery energy storage systems (BESS) and grid connections across the UK and Ireland. Her experience includes management of ornithology programmes and provision of technical advice and technical reports, including EIA, for complex developments at various stages of planning.	
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has over 8 years' experience delivering climate change impact assessment work which includes greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change risk assessments. She has prepared climate change environmental statement chapters for a variety of developments, including residential, mixed-use, commercial, energy and road infrastructure schemes. [redacted] supported the development of ISEP climate change in EIA guidance for both greenhouse gas and climate resilience assessments. She is a Chartered Environmentalist and full member of ISEP.	Carbon other GHGs and Climate Change Consultant

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] leads a dedicated Sustainability team in the UK&I and has over 17 years' experience in energy, sustainability and climate change consultancy. She has extensive experience in early-stage project delivery and advisory roles in the property and construction sector. She has prepared climate change environmental statement chapters and supporting technical appendices for a variety of developments, including large scale and complex residential, mixed-use, employment and rail infrastructure schemes. [redacted] is also an alumni of the national ISEP Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Steering Committee, the current ISEP Birmingham Regional Network Chair and has been a key figure within the UK Green Building Council Advancing Net Zero and Resilience and Nature Programmes since 2019.	GHG and Climate Change Technical Reviewer
Community	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:**	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] directs socio-economic, health, and equality impact assessments for infrastructure and development projects. Her experience in aviation and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) includes directing the socio-economic analysis for the Heathrow West DCO in 2019. This work involved gravity modelling for construction workforces, planning mitigations for social infrastructure, and conducting stakeholder engagement regarding the reprovision of displaced community assets. She also provides expert evidence at major infrastructure planning inquiries. Her community and social impact experience includes establishing baseline socio-demographics for London Councils, disaggregated by protected characteristics, and overseeing the National Evaluation of Free Bikes. This evaluation required assessing health inequalities and conducting primary community engagement via surveys, focus groups, and interviews to address transport-related exclusion. Furthermore, she has delivered phased	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			population and social infrastructure modelling for large-scale regenerations, including the Joyce and Snell's Estate, assessing dynamic shifts in community needs over the development lifecycle.	
Community	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] manages socio-economic appraisals for major transport and infrastructure schemes. On the Heathrow West DCO in 2019, he led the socio-economic workstreams, assessing the impacts of temporary construction workforces, identifying social infrastructure mitigations, and engaging with stakeholders on displaced community assets. His infrastructure portfolio also includes socio-economic modelling for HS2 East and the South Yorkshire Supertram. For community and health impact assessments, [redacted] work has included the development of methodologies for monetising morbidity-related	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			health impacts and mental wellbeing, developed in collaboration with Imperial College London.	
Community	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has six years' experience building the socio-economic case for development across the UK, with extensive expertise in EIA for major development proposals. He has led the production of work that assess community impacts for large-scale developments nationwide, including the Equality Impact Assessment as part of the SDO application for Universal Studios. [redacted] work is underpinned by modelling experience, translating complex data into clear, evidence-based narratives that stand up to scrutiny in planning applications. This includes leading the socio-economic chapter for Marlow Film Studios, where he worked to develop the employment and skills plan and how the Applicant could work with nearby communities.	Reviewer
Community	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Lead Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] produces health and socio-economic topic assessments for EIAs and HIAs concerning major infrastructure and energy projects. He authored EIA topic chapters for the Immingham Green Energy Terminal, Viking CCUS Pipeline and Longfield Solar Farm (NSIP). These assessments evaluated cumulative community exposure to industrial operations, noise, air quality, dust, construction traffic, and perceived environmental risks. In urban and aviation-adjacent contexts, he delivered the health impact and social infrastructure evidence for the Silvertown Quays EIA, forecasting demand for educational and healthcare facilities in an area constrained by airport operations and major road networks. His background includes equalities assessments, notably producing socio-economic impact studies for Home Office temporary accommodation sites. This required assessing primary healthcare capacity,	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			analysing sensitive community dynamics, and considering for protected characteristics.	
Community	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] conducts socio-demographic profiling, place-based economic analysis, and spatial impact assessments. At the Independent Commission on Neighbourhoods, he managed research projects mapping typologies of local deprivation and spatial inequalities in neighbourhood social infrastructure. His community consultation experience includes undertaking field visits with communities across the UK to gather primary data, integrating these qualitative insights directly into policy and research frameworks. Technically, he executes economic and spatial modelling for large-scale infrastructure projects. He produced the economic modelling for the Euston Station Regeneration Economic Impact Assessment, quantifying the jobs, GVA and land value uplift impacts resulting from various transport infrastructure development scenarios.	Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Economics and Employment	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** 25 years experience making the socio-economic case for infrastructure across the UK. [redacted] directs socio-economic, health, and equality impact assessments for infrastructure and development projects. Her experience in aviation and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) includes directing the socio-economic analysis for the Heathrow West DCO in 2019. This work involved gravity modelling for construction workforces, planning mitigations for social infrastructure, and conducting stakeholder engagement regarding the reprovision of displaced community assets. She also provides expert evidence at major infrastructure planning inquiries. Her community and social impact experience includes establishing baseline socio-demographics for London Councils, disaggregated by protected characteristics, and overseeing the National Evaluation of Free Bikes. Furthermore, she has delivered phased population and social	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			infrastructure modelling for large-scale regenerations, including the Joyce and Snell's Estate, assessing dynamic shifts in community needs over the development lifecycle.	
Economics and Employment	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has 9 years experience making the socio-economic case for infrastructure across the UK. [redacted] manages socio-economic appraisals for major transport and infrastructure schemes. On the Heathrow West DCO in 2019, he led the socio-economic workstreams, assessing the impacts of temporary construction workforces, identifying social infrastructure mitigations, and engaging with stakeholders on displaced assets. His infrastructure portfolio also includes socio-economic modelling for HS2 East and the South Yorkshire Supertram.	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Economics and Employment	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevance Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has six years' experience building the socio-economic case for development across the UK, with extensive expertise in EIA for major development proposals. He has led the production of socio-economic chapters for large-scale developments nationwide, including the SDO application for Universal Studios. [redacted] work is underpinned by strong economic impact modelling experience, translating complex data into clear, evidence-based narratives that stand up to scrutiny in planning applications. This includes leading the socio-economic chapter for Marlow Film Studios, where he undertook detailed demand forecasting to support the wider investment case.	Lead Author
Economics and Employment	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:**	Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] has supported the Volterra team with the socio-economic analysis of a variety of schemes. She has experience conducting in depth research, baseline analysis and deriving robust estimates of economic impacts and broader contributions to industries and places.	
Recreation	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] directs socio-economic, health, and equality impact assessments for infrastructure and development projects. Her experience in aviation and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) includes directing the socio-economic analysis for the Heathrow West DCO in 2019. This work involved gravity modelling for construction workforces, planning mitigations for social infrastructure, and conducting stakeholder engagement regarding the reprovision of displaced community assets. She also provides expert evidence at major infrastructure planning inquiries. Her community and social impact experience includes establishing baseline socio-demographics for	Review

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			London Councils, disaggregated by protected characteristics, and overseeing the National Evaluation of Free Bikes. This evaluation required assessing health inequalities and conducting primary community engagement via surveys, focus groups, and interviews to address transport-related exclusion. Furthermore, she has delivered phased population and social infrastructure modelling for large-scale regenerations, including the Joyce and Snell's Estate, assessing dynamic shifts in community needs over the development lifecycle.	
Recreation	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] manages socio-economic appraisals for major transport and infrastructure schemes. On the Heathrow West DCO in 2019, he led the socio-economic workstreams, assessing the impacts of temporary construction workforces, identifying social infrastructure mitigations, and	Review

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			engaging with stakeholders on displaced community assets. His infrastructure portfolio also includes socio-economic modelling for HS2 East and the South Yorkshire Supertram. For community and health impact assessments, [redacted] work has included the development of methodologies for monetising morbidity-related health impacts and mental wellbeing, developed in collaboration with Imperial College London.	
Recreation	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has six years' experience building the socio-economic case for development across the UK, with extensive expertise in EIA for major development proposals. He has led the production of work that assess community impacts for large-scale developments nationwide, including the Equality Impact Assessment as part of the SDO application for Universal Studios. [redacted] work is underpinned by modelling experience, translating complex data into clear, evidence-based narratives that stand up to scrutiny in planning applications.	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			This includes leading the socio-economic chapter for Marlow Film Studios, where he worked to develop the employment and skills plan and how the Applicant could work with nearby communities.	
Recreation	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] produces health and socio-economic topic assessments for EIAs and HIAs concerning major infrastructure and energy projects. He authored EIA topic chapters for the Immingham Green Energy Terminal, Viking CCUS Pipeline and Longfield Solar Farm (NSIP). These assessments evaluated cumulative community exposure to industrial operations, noise, air quality, dust, construction traffic, and perceived environmental risks. In urban and aviation-adjacent contexts, he delivered the health impact and social infrastructure evidence for the	Lead Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Silvertown Quays EIA, forecasting demand for educational and healthcare facilities in an area constrained by airport operations and major road networks. His background includes equalities assessments, notably producing socio-economic impact studies for Home Office temporary accommodation sites. This required assessing primary healthcare capacity, analysing sensitive community dynamics, and considering for protected characteristics.	
Recreation	Volterra Partners LLP	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] conducts socio-demographic profiling, place-based economic analysis, and spatial impact assessments. At the Independent Commission on Neighbourhoods, he managed research projects mapping typologies of local deprivation and spatial inequalities in neighbourhood social infrastructure. His community consultation experience includes undertaking field visits with communities across the UK to gather primary data, integrating these qualitative insights directly into policy and research frameworks. Technically, he executes	Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			economic and spatial modelling for large-scale infrastructure projects. He produced the economic modelling for the Euston Station Regeneration Economic Impact Assessment, quantifying the jobs, GVA and land value uplift impacts resulting from various transport infrastructure development scenarios.	
Historic Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** 26 years of experience within the archaeology and heritage sector, including 18 years of consultancy and 8 years of commercial archaeological fieldwork. Experienced in technically assuring the full array of archaeological and heritage documents including historic environment desk-based assessments, heritage statements and EIA inputs including screening, scoping and ES chapters. Full Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologist (MCIfA).	Technical Director
Historic Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Principal Archaeology and

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Relevant Experience and Expertise: 11 years of experience within the archaeology and heritage sector, including 7 years of consultancy and 4 years of commercial archaeological fieldwork. Experienced in producing and technically reviewing a broad range of archaeological and heritage documents including historic environment desk-based assessments, heritage statements and EIA inputs including screening, scoping and ES chapters. Full Member of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologist (MCIfA).	Heritage Consultant
Historic Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** Five years' experience in the heritage industry including 2 years' in archaeological fieldwork and 3 years' in consultancy. Experienced in producing various heritage deliverables such as Historic Environment Desk-based Assessments, Setting Assessments, EIA documents, mitigation strategies and WSIs.	Assistant Archaeology and Heritage Consultant

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Health	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a public health specialist with over nine years' experience across the UK's public and private sectors and leads Stantec UK's Health and Social Impact team. [redacted] is recognised as an ISEP Competent Expert for Health Impact Assessment at Advanced Human Health Topic Lead level. Specialist expertise includes Human Health EIA, HIA, health inequalities, public health evidence, stakeholder engagement and the integration of health considerations within planning, design and environmental assessment. [redacted] has led and advised on health assessments for major infrastructure, transport, energy, water, regeneration, residential and commercial development, including Human Health work supporting DCO and nationally significant infrastructure processes.	Health Chapter Lead Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Health	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Health and Social Value Consultant with experience contributing to Human Health EIA chapters, Health Impact Assessments and Equality Impact Assessments for development and major infrastructure projects, across sectors including residential and commercial development, and transport planning. [redacted] meets the ISEP Intermediate Human Health Topic Lead competency criteria and has experience supporting Human Health assessment within multidisciplinary DCO-level EIA processes.	Human Health Author
Health	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Graduate Environmental Consultant supporting EIA projects and assessing potential health effects associated with development proposals. Experience	Human Health Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			includes contributing to health assessments and EIA health chapters for projects of varying scales across a range of sectors, including residential, commercial, and infrastructure developments.	
Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Landscape Architect and urban designer with over 20 years' experience working for a range of organisations including local authorities, large multi-disciplinary companies and smaller private practices. He has considerable experience of undertaking Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA), Townscape Assessments (TVIA) and Landscape Appraisals for a variety of development types including; linear infrastructure, renewable energy, minerals, mixed use and residential schemes. [redacted] has experience of acting as expert witness for major renewable and infrastructure projects including in relation to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects with	Associate Director

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			involvement at all project stages. He has extensive design experience which includes; devising mitigation strategies, landscape management plans and design guidance with a proven ability to design and project manage major schemes to successful completion on site. Implementation experience includes undertaking the role of Landscape Clerk of Works for nationally significant infrastructure schemes.	
Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has over 10 years' experience writing reports relating to the landscape, townscape and visual impact of development across multiple sectors including residential, commercial, industrial and renewables. This has included working on small-scale projects such as individual homes to large-scale DCO solar farms.	Principal Landscape Architect

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Landscape Architect with over 10 years of experience in landscape design and landscape planning. She specialises in infrastructure projects, delivering landscape design and planning services for rail, highway, and energy schemes across a range of scales.	Principal Landscape Architect
Ground Conditions	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted]I has worked in environmental and geotechnical consultancy for over 35 years and has provided a wide range of geoenvironmental services including contaminated land risk investigation and assessment, together with design and delivery of remediation schemes for protection of controlled waters, ecological receptors and human health. [redacted] has acted as an Expert Witness for legal disputes and under	Technical lead

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			the Town & Country planning regime, together with projects requiring DCO consent.	
Ground Conditions	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a ground conditions specialist with over 25 years' experience in geotechnical and geoenvironmental engineering across a full range of greenfield and brownfield land development schemes. [redacted] experience includes leading on topic specific chapters and working as part of teams to provide Environmental Impact Assessments for both DCO and TCPA projects and including attendance at hearings and planning inquiries. She has varied experience including design, supervision and management of ground investigations, foundation design, earthwork specification, hydrogeological and contamination risk assessments and landfill engineering and monitoring.	Chapter Reviewer
Ground Conditions	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Chapter Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Relevant Experience and Expertise: [redacted] has worked in consultancy for twelve years and has provided a range of geoenvironmental services including contaminated land risk assessment, waste characterisation, delivery of remediation schemes and their verification and the delivery of the ground conditions elements of Environmental Impact Assessments, including for NSIPs requiring DCO consent. [redacted] specialises in the risk assessment of contaminated sites. He is experienced in the writing of desk-based Phase 1 and Interpretative Phase 2 Ground Condition Assessments, as well as the delivery of Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessments for protection of controlled waters and the modelling of Site-Specific Assessment Criteria (soil and vapour) for human health risk assessment. [redacted] has been responsible for the specification, delivery and verification of multiple remediation schemes. He has experience in the direction and monitoring of both geoenvironmental and geotechnical site investigations including engagement with regulators and stakeholders.	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Agricultural Land and Soils	Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Surveyor and a Fellow of the Society of Agriculture. He has specialised in assessing the effects of development proposals on agricultural land (land quality and soils) and agricultural and rural businesses, for over 35 years. [redacted] experience includes many Environmental Assessments and NSIP applications, including road, rail, residential, industrial, infrastructure and energy proposals, mostly in England and Wales. He regularly acts as expert witness for local planning authorities, Government agencies and developers. He is currently involved in multiple NSIP renewable energy development proposals.	Agricultural Land and Soils EIA Lead
Materials and Waste	Continuplan	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Materials and Waste EIA Lead

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has managed numerous major projects involving EIA throughout his career, most notably acting for Cumbria County Council in a Development Management role in the determination of planning applications for a new coal mine near Whitehaven, and the extension of the LLWR for nuclear waste at Drigg. For some years, [redacted] was Head of Waste & Resource Management at a major environmental consultancy, leading a professional team specialising in EIA, waste management, Circular Economy, minerals and waste planning, environmental permitting, and public sector outsourced waste contracts.	
Major Accidents and Disasters	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is an Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Director with 20 years' experience leading Environmental Impact	Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Director

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Assessments (EIAs), environmental planning strategies and consenting programmes for major infrastructure, energy, regeneration and mixed-use developments across the UK. [redacted] is also the national lead for environmental planning at Stantec. In addition to EIA coordination and environmental planning, she has specialist experience in socio-economic assessment, Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and sustainability, providing a rounded understanding of how developments can affect people, communities and the environment. Her experience includes coordinating the EIA and Major Accidents and Disasters assessment for Everton Football Club's new 52,000 seat stadium at Bramley-Moore Dock, leading the EIA for a replacement waste oil sullage tank at North Mole, Gibraltar following a previous explosion and fire at the site, and leading environmental assessments for major energy infrastructure projects, including the Grain LNG Phase 3 Expansion at the Isle of Grain, comprising a second cryogenic LNG pipeline, LNG storage tanks and associated infrastructure. Her work has involved the assessment of developments with significant industrial hazards, operational safety	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			constraints and complex environmental, socio-economic and health considerations.	
Major Accidents and Disasters	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has varied experience working in Environmental Planning and Assessment alongside stakeholder engagement and consultation, including EIAs and DCOs. With more than 5 years of environmental planning industry experience, [redacted] specialises in providing successful EIA co-ordination and planning services for major complex projects. He has proved himself capable of managing workstreams and delivering excellent outcomes. He has excellent people skills and works well both independently and as part of a team.	Senior Environmental Planner
Major Accidents and Disasters	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:**	Senior Environmental Planner

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] is a Senior Environmental Planner with six years experience coordinating EIAs for renewable energy, infrastructure and residential developments. [redacted] has experience preparing and coordinating MA&D assessments, including hazard identification, environmental risk assessment and the evaluation of potential effects on environmental receptors. She has led multidisciplinary EIA teams and has extensive experience applying EIA legislation, guidance and best practice.	
Major Accidents and Disasters	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Consultant Environmental Planner with over 3 years of experience coordinating EIAs for renewable developments, large infrastructure projects and residential developments. He has developed expertise in MA&D, including leading the preparation of MA&D assessments, reviewing relevant legislation and guidance, identifying major accident scenarios, and coordinating technical	Consultant Environmental Planner

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			inputs to support robust EIARs. His experience also includes EIA coordination, environmental planning, GIS, stakeholder engagement, and the management of multidisciplinary teams throughout the planning and consenting process.	
Noise and Vibration	Bickerdike Allen Partners	[redacted]	**Qualifications.** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise.** Has been involved in acoustics for 30 years and has been a Partner at BAP since 2019 when he took over the oversight of all the aviation projects. Much of his time in acoustics has been in relation to aviation, including almost the whole of the last decade. During this time[redacted] has worked for airports and Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.	Partner
Noise and Vibration	Bickerdike Allen Partners	[redacted]	**Qualifications.** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise.** [redacted] is an experienced acoustic consultant with 26 years in environmental noise	Partner

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			assessment. He has particular experience in assessing aircraft ground noise and implementing airports sound insulation schemes for homes, educational and community buildings.	
Noise and Vibration	Bickerdike Allen Partners	[redacted]	**Qualifications.** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise.** 12 years of experience in acoustics, with an almost exclusive focus on aviation noise for the last 9 years. This has included working on multiple airport planning applications. During this time [redacted] has worked for airports and Local Authorities, and other stakeholders.	Senior Acoustic Consultant
Noise and Vibration	Bickerdike Allen Partners	[redacted]	**Qualifications.** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise.** Twenty two years of relevant experience including numerous airport EIAs, and airport	Senior Acoustic Consultant

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			noise studies. Is a corporate member(MIOA) of the Institute of Acoustics.	
Traffic and Transport	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** 30 years experience relating to transport planning. Extensive experience of EIA development proposals.	Transport Lead
Traffic and Transport	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** 2 years of experience relating to transport planning.	Transport support (Graduate Transport Planner)
Water Environment	APEM Ltd	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Environmentalist, Chartered Scientist and Chartered Water and Environmental Manager, and for over 27 years	Project Director

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			now, he has been responsible for the management and assessment of environmental impacts on a range of major infrastructure projects throughout the UK and Ireland for clients in both the public and private sectors. [redacted] has a wide range of sector experience, including Strategic Highways, Greenways / Active Travel, Public Transport (bus and heavy rail), Energy (traditional & renewable (wind / solar)), Urban regeneration, Education, Recreation & Tourism, Oil & Gas, Potable Water, Waste Water, Flood Alleviation, Coastal, Healthcare, Remediation and Waste Management. He has also project managed a number of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) projects. He also regularly undertakes technical review and lead verification roles of environmental documentation, including environmental constraints and feasibility studies, EIA Screening Reports, EIA Scoping Reports, and outline Construction Environmental Management Plans (oCEMP). More recently, this has also included environmental due diligence peer reviews of third party EIARs on behalf of clients.	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Prior to joining APEM, [redacted] had been a Regional Director at AECOM and their all-Ireland Regional Lead for Impact Assessment, responsible for operational excellence, sectoral and associated team growth. He had also been their Sector Lead for Highways & Greenways in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Ireland, responsible for sector growth, client engagement, tender co-ordination, team identification, staff upskilling, and appraisal of current best practice. [redacted] also undertook a similar role for impact assessment services as part of their senior leadership team in the UK and Ireland. [redacted] has extensive experience in stakeholder consultation/engagement with both statutory and non-statutory bodies, including attending numerous public exhibition / consultation events. He has also produced proofs of evidence and acted as expert witness on several strategic road schemes and led the Environmental Statements through public inquiry / oral hearing. For one project, he subsequently acted as the Environmental Lead for a Judicial Review legal challenge (brought about purely on environmental grounds)	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			through the High Court, Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court, successfully demonstrating that environmental due process had been followed at every stage in the case. [redacted] is a past Chairman [redacted] and current committee member of the Northern Ireland branch of the Chartered Institution of Water & Environmental Management (CIWEM).	
Water Environment	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Principal Consultant with over 12 years experience leading multi-disciplinary teams in water environment-focused EIA, Environmental Appraisal and Optioneering and technical assessment. He has expertise of both relevant national water-related policy, legislation (including those transposed from the EU Water Framework Directive) and EIA guidance, and technical input, management and review of water-related assessments. [redacted] has worked across the environmental sector in the UK & Ireland, co-ordinating and delivering technical input for the water discipline	Project Manager / WFD & Water Quality Lead

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			for a wide range of project types, including large and complex projects (including linear infrastructure) in onshore and transitional/coastal environments such as roads, railways, power generation, electricity and water transmission, flood defence schemes, waste sites and defence facilities. [redacted] experience includes the integration of the core disciplines encompassed within water EIA, including hydrology, water quality, hydromorphology/geomorphology (fluvial and estuarine/coastal), flood risk, and hydrogeology. [redacted] is also experienced with water quality and associated SuDS and drainage considerations for major infrastructure projects. Some of [redacted] major project experience with APEM Ltd and in his previous role at Jacobs UK Ltd includes the A9 Dualling Southern Section, various National Highways Motorway and Trunk Road schemes, Uisce Éireann's Water Supply Project (WSP), Lowestoft Tidal Flood Barrier, Grangemouth Flood Protection Scheme, Stallingborough CCGT, Killingholme CCGT, Ness Weir II, Tarchon Interconnector Project and Mersey Tidal Power Project. [redacted]	

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			has worked with high-profile clients including National Highways, Transport Scotland, Uisce Éireann (Irish Water), RWE, Uniper, the Canal and Rivers Trust, Transport Infrastructure Ireland, the Ministry of Defence, Internal Drainage Boards and various Local Authorities. [redacted] currently co-ordinates of water-related deliverables for a wide range of projects including onshore major infrastructure, power generation and transmission, tidal power, dredging (lotic and estuarine) and water resource projects.	
Water Environment	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Senior Consultant with over four years of experience in environmental science, with a focus on water quality, ground investigations, remediation, air quality, carbon footprinting, climate risk and ecology. He has worked across the environmental sector in the UK & Ireland delivering large scale remediation projects, surface water and groundwater monitoring campaigns, ground investigations and a range	Assistant Project Manager / WFD & Water Quality Support

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			of environmental audits for both public and private sector clients. [redacted] has experience in EIA coordination as well as authoring Water Framework Directive Assessments, Flood Risk Assessments, Preliminary Risk Assessments and Detailed Quantitative Risk Assessments, whilst contributing towards water environment and soils & geology EIA chapters. Some of [redacted] major project experience with APEM and in his previous role at AECOM include undertaking an extensive water quality monitoring campaign to detect PFAS in Ireland's major rivers, large scale remediation projects on legacy contaminated land in Maydown, Northern Ireland and preliminary Ground Investigations as part of enabling works for the construction of various data centres.	
Water Environment	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Fluvial Geomorphologist with over seven years of experience in hydrology, geomorphology, and hydraulic modelling. She	Hydromorphology support

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			has extensive experience in geomorphological process assessment and mapping, sediment transport monitoring, river restoration appraisal and design, hydrological analysis, flow gauging, flood risk assessment, and hydraulic modelling. [redacted] has delivered projects for public and private sector clients across the UK and internationally, supporting a wide range of water environment and infrastructure developments. Her expertise includes hydromorphological baseline characterisation, impact assessment, hydrological support, and the preparation of technical reporting for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). She has contributed to EIA screening and scoping reports and provided hydrological and hydromorphological support for a range of developments, including residential developments, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) projects, river restoration and realignment schemes, and wetland creation projects.	
Water Environment	APEM Ltd.	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	WFD and Water Quality Support

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Relevant Experience and Expertise: [redacted] is a Consultant within the Water Management Division of APEM Ltd. She has over 4 years of experience in water management and has worked on a range of public and private projects, undertaking Flood Risk Assessments, Flood Alleviation Schemes, Environmental Impact Assessments, and Water Framework Directive Assessments. She holds an MSc in Environmental Management with GIS and has a range of experience utilising ArcPro, QGIS, and aspects of flood modelling.	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered member of the ICE with over 25 years of experience in the flood risk and water management sector. [redacted] leads Stantec UK's national River and Coastal Management Team. He is responsible for delivering multi-disciplinary projects in the water environment for public and private clients. He has specialist skills in river restoration and engineering	Approver

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			design, flood risk management, Natural Flood Management (NFM), Water Framework Directive (WFD) assessment and permitting/consenting (Flood Risk Activity Permit, Ordinary Watercourse Consent etc.). [redacted] has a reputation for developing practical and cost-effective solutions to meet his Clients' needs and to achieve successful outcomes. He is an experienced Civil Engineer and trained in Construction, Design and Management (CDM) 2015 with skills in project management, options appraisal, design, costing and contract administration. He has developed Stantec's River Restoration & NFM technical services, including his team's capabilities in geomorphology, NFM, Nature-based Solutions (NbS), watercourse restoration, river engineering, navigation and consenting. He delivers schemes that meet the objectives of the WFD and provide environmental and sustainable solutions. [redacted] is Framework Director on the EA's Ecological Services Framework.	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:**	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			[redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is Senior Technical Director for the Water Environment at Stantec, a group that provides a service offering across the water industry, including water resources, hydrology, ground water modelling, water quality modelling and flood risk. She is an expert in water resource management, groundwater, groundwater geochemistry and contaminated land with more than 20 years of experience delivering water resources engineering solutions to the water sector, including optioneering for WINEP and PR schemes and feasibility assessments for river restoration, managed aquifer recharge and discharge to ground solutions. [redacted] has a background in sediment geochemistry, groundwater, and ecotoxicology, and also undertakes human health risk assessments for a range of pollutant sources including landfills, contaminated land, demolition wastes, and waters.	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted]	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			Relevant Experience and Expertise: [redacted] is a Member of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management and is a regional flood risk team leader within Stantec's River and Coastal Team, with over 25 years of experience in the team. [redacted] has worked on a range of public and private sector clients, providing advice, and undertaking Flood Risk Assessments and Environmental Statements, and is experienced in applying national policy and guidance with regard to flood risk.	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Member of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management and is a regional leader within Stantec's River and Coastal Team. [redacted] has also worked on a range of public and private sector clients, providing advice, and undertaking Flood Risk Assessments and Environmental Statements, and is experienced in applying national policy and guidance with regard to flood risk. She is	Reviewer

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			familiar with a range of techniques and software including the Flood Estimation Handbook (FEH) and supplementary documents, Flood Modeller, HEC-RAS and MapInfo	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is an Incorporated Civil Engineer within the Rivers and Coastal Management team, with 12 years experience in flood risk and drainage design. As a design engineer, [redacted] has been involved in a variety of schemes ranging in value for both private and public sector clients. These included standalone design and build projects, highways led schemes, and mixed-use developments. [redacted] has produced designs from concept stage through to detailed design and defects monitoring. [redacted] technical skills include; hydraulic modelling, 3D and 2D CAD design, and preparation of technical reports and calculation packs.	Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Chartered Member of CIWEM with more than 20 years' of hydrogeological experience working on a wide range of projects across the UK, Middle East and Africa. He is experienced in hydrogeological assessments, water resources, dewatering assessments for major infrastructure and large engineering projects. His expertise includes hydrogeological impact assessments undertaken as part of EIA's as well as open loop geothermal assessment for renewable energy schemes.	Author
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] has 3 years of experience in water management. [redacted] has worked on a range of public and private projects, undertaking Flood Risk Assessments, Environmental Statements, Water Framework Directive Assessments and Natural Flood Management	Author

Relevant Chapter	Company	Individual	Pen Profile	Role
			projects. She is familiar with using a range of techniques and software including ESTRY-TUFLOW, Flood Modeller and ArcGIS Pro.	
Water Environment	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** [redacted] is a Graduate River and Coastal Civil Engineer within Stantec's River and Coastal Management Team, with experience in engineering design, optioneering and project delivery across river, coastal and flood risk projects. He joined Stantec in September 2025 following the completion of an MEng in Civil Engineering at the University of Bath, where he developed a strong foundation in engineering principles	Author
Lighting	Stantec	[redacted]	**Qualifications:** [redacted] **Relevant Experience and Expertise:** 6 years' experience of lighting design and impact assessments, and an associate member of the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP).	Senior Lighting Consultant

1.2 Organisational Pen Profiles

Table 1-2: Organisational Pen Profiles

Company	Pen Profile	Role
Stantec	Stantec is a founder member of the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) (formerly the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's (IEMA)) EIA Quality Mark scheme for quality in EIA. Stantec has a dedicated EIA team that specialises in leading the EIA process for development projects, including land development, regeneration, energy and infrastructure projects. Stantec typically leads 10-20 EIA projects each year. Each of Stantec's EIA team have suitable academic and professional qualifications, with professional qualifications including Principal EIA Practitioner, Practitioner and Associate membership of ISEP, member of Royal Town Planning Institute and Chartered Environmentalist.	EIA Coordinator
CERC	Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants Ltd are experts in atmospheric dispersion and air quality. CERC are developers of the ADMS suite of models, including the ADMS-Airport model. CERC has wide ranging experience in air quality assessments including detailed modelling, in support of planning, national and local government decision making and research.	Air quality Assessment
Cass Allen	Cass Allen Associates Ltd is a specialist UK environmental consultancy, established in 2000. The company has extensive experience in undertaking air quality and odour assessments in support of major infrastructure, residential, commercial, industrial and mixed-use developments, including projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Development Consent Orders (DCOs). The company's technical specialists have considerable experience in the assessment of odour effects associated with industrial processes, wastewater infrastructure, waste management facilities, agricultural	Odour Assessment

Company	Pen Profile	Role
	developments and commercial operations, and regularly engage with planning authorities, environmental regulators and other stakeholders throughout the planning process.	
APEM	APEM Group, consisting of 13 specialist entities (including AARC Environmental Solutions, Ambiente S.r.l., APEM Group, APEM Inc, AQUAFACT, Aspect Ecology, Attexo, Biosis, CSA Ocean Services, GoBe, Macro Works, NASH Maritime and Woodrow), is a leading global environment consultancy providing independent, expert environmental and scientific advice to a wide range of sectors including transportation, water, energy, utilities, ports and harbours as well as to regulators and governments around the world. APEM provides a range of consultancy services to clients to support their project at all stages of development to comply with environmental regulations. With deep scientific and technical expertise, supplemented with a heritage of innovative solutions, our team of scientists, technical experts and consultants provide a range of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecology, landscape and other consultancy services, combined with market-leading geospatial services, across the globe. In early 2026, APEM Group officially joined Applus+, marking the launch of a new Environmental Services Division. The Environmental Services Division now incorporates the Applus+ global renewable technical advisory teams of Barlovento Applus+ and Enertis Applus+, to create a world-class environmental consulting and advisory division. Bringing together the environmental consulting capabilities of APEM Group with the technical advisory expertise of Barlovento Applus+ and Enertis Applus+, creates a team of over 1,500 technical experts, focused on delivering services across the asset lifecycle so that our clients' projects are compliant and aligned with environmental best practices.	Biodiversity Ornithology Water Environment

Company	Pen Profile	Role
Stantec	Stantec is a founder member of the ISEP EIA Quality Mark scheme for quality in EIA. Stantec's climate change team specialises in undertaking greenhouse gas (GHG) assessments and climate resilience adaptation assessments for development projects, including land development, regeneration, energy and infrastructure projects. Each of Stantec's climate change team have suitable academic and professional qualifications, including membership with ISEP.	GHGs and Climate Change
Volterra Partners LLP	Volterra is a socioeconomic consultancy specialising in the economic impact of major infrastructure and development. We work for both public and private sector clients in understanding the potential effects of proposed developments, infrastructure, specific sectors, and individual policy proposals on the local, regional and national economy. Our economic analysis for major rail infrastructure projects like HS1 and HS2 demonstrates our capability to quantify wide-ranging economic benefits across the UK.	Community, Economics and Employment, and Recreation
Stantec	Stantec's Archaeology and Heritage team has substantial expertise in assessing the archaeological potential of sites, carrying out setting assessments, and assessing geoarchaeology and palaeoenvironmental potential. The team also has extensive experience in liaising and negotiating with county archaeologists and heritage stakeholders, individually or as part of workshops, to agree robust, appropriate and pragmatic evaluation and mitigation strategies. The A&H team work across the UK on a wide range of projects including nationally important infrastructure schemes; residential, commercial and industrial developments; and energy, utilities and waste projects. Individual staff are all members of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) and work in accordance with the CIfA Code of Conduct and all historic environment standards and guidance.	Historic Environment
Stantec	Stantec has a dedicated Health and Social Impact team specialising in Human Health Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA), Equalities	Health

Company	Pen Profile	Role
	Impact Assessment and wider social impact assessment. The team includes practitioners with expertise in public health, health inequalities, epidemiology, health evidence appraisal and the assessment of health effects associated with major infrastructure, transport, energy, water, regeneration and development projects. Stantec's health specialists have experience leading Human Health assessments within Development Consent Order (DCO) and other EIA processes, working collaboratively with environmental topic specialists to assess the pathways through which environmental, social and economic changes may influence population health and wellbeing. The team includes ISEP Competent Experts in Human Health and practitioners meeting the ISEP Intermediate Human Health Topic Lead competency criteria.	
Stantec	Stantec has a dedicated landscape team that specialises in undertaking landscape, townscape and visual impact assessments and appraisals for development schemes, including land development, regeneration, energy and infrastructure projects. The landscape team includes experienced staff, who have relevant academic and professional qualifications, including those who are a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute (CMLI). In addition, Stantec UK Ltd is a Registered Practice of the Landscape Institute and a corporate member of Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP). The LTVIA has been carried out by Chartered Landscape Architects.	Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact
Stantec	Stantec has a dedicated Ground Conditions team with experience in contaminated land, geohazards, geotechnical engineering, hydrogeology and input into EIA.	Ground Conditions
Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd	Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd specialises in assessing the effects of development proposals on agricultural land, soils and rural businesses. KCC act nationwide and are involved with numerous NSIP and large developments, including multiple solar farms, road schemes and large non-agricultural developments. Experts with KCC are experienced expert witnesses and frequently provide evidence at Public Inquiry.	Soils and Agriculture

Company	Pen Profile	Role
Continuplan	Continuplan specialises in waste and resource management, minerals and renewable energy. Our Director Adrian Lynham has over 30 year's experience in these sectors and is highly specialist in the field. Continuplan supports both public and private sector clients in the regulation and delivery of major projects through the planning system.	Materials and Waste EIA Lead
Stantec	Stantec is a founder member of the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals (ISEP) EIA Quality Mark scheme and has extensive experience leading and coordinating Environmental Impact Assessments across the infrastructure, transport, energy, water, regeneration and land development sectors. Stantec's multidisciplinary EIA team routinely undertakes assessments of Major Accidents and Disasters (MA&D).	Major Accidents and Disasters
Bickerdike Allen Partners	Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP (BAP) has provided specialist acoustics consultancy services for more than 60 years and was a founding member of the Association of Noise Consultants. The practice specialises in the assessment and management of noise and vibration for development, regeneration, transport and major infrastructure projects. The team regularly undertakes and contributes to environmental impact assessments for airports, highways, railways, residential and commercial developments, industrial facilities and nationally significant infrastructure projects. Our consultants have extensive experience in baseline surveys, noise and vibration modelling, impact assessment, mitigation design, stakeholder engagement and the preparation of technical evidence for planning applications, examinations and inquiries. The team includes suitably qualified and experienced acoustic consultants, including Chartered Engineers and Corporate Members of the Institute of Acoustics (IOA), supported by specialists in environmental acoustics, building acoustics, architectural acoustics and vibration.	Noise and Vibration

Company	Pen Profile	Role
Stantec	Stantec has a dedicated transport team that specialises in undertaking transport planning, modelling and appraisal for development schemes, including land development, regeneration and infrastructure projects. Stantec's transport team includes experienced staff, who have relevant academic and professional qualifications, including those who hold Transport Planning Professional (TPP) and those who are Chartered Members of the Institute of Highways and Transportation (CMIHT). In addition, Stantec holds corporate membership of the Transport Planning Society (TPS) and the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transport (CIHT).	Traffic and Transport
Stantec	Stantec UK Limited is a multidisciplinary engineering, environmental and planning consultancy with extensive experience in the assessment, management and mitigation of water environment effects associated with a wide range of development projects. Stantec provides technical expertise across the full spectrum of water environment disciplines, including hydrology, hydrogeology, water quality, flood risk, surface water management, geomorphology, drainage design, water resources, and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Stantec's Water Environment specialists have extensive experience supporting residential, commercial, industrial, energy, transport and infrastructure developments throughout the UK. The team regularly undertakes Water Environment Chapters for Environmental Statements, Water Framework Directive assessments, Flood Risk Assessments, Drainage Strategies, water quality assessments, and water resource assessments in support of planning applications, Development Consent Orders and other consent regimes. This experience includes liaising with statutory consultees such as the Environment Agency, local authorities, internal drainage boards and water companies. The Water Environment team comprises qualified and experienced professionals, including Chartered Engineers, Chartered Environmentalists and members of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM). The team includes	Water Environment

Company	Pen Profile	Role
	specialists with significant experience in river and coastal processes, flood risk management, water resources, drainage strategy development and EIA, ensuring assessments are undertaken by competent experts in accordance with the EIA Regulations.	
Stantec	Stantec's Lighting Team specialises in Lighting Impact Assessments (LIAs) and lighting strategies for a wide range of development and infrastructure projects. The team comprises experienced lighting professionals with relevant academic and professional qualifications, including membership of the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP), and applies industry best practice to deliver operationally effective and environmentally sensitive lighting solutions.	Lighting

Appendix 4.1

Transboundary Screening

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 4 -1 Transboundary Screening

Contents

Appendix 4-1 – Transboundary Screening 1

Tables

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening 2

Appendix 4-1 – Transboundary Screening

This appendix provides information to assist the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, in undertaking transboundary screening under Regulation 32 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

It considers whether the Proposed Development may be likely to have significant effects on the environment in a European Economic Area (EEA) state and, where relevant, other states that are parties to the Espoo or Aarhus Conventions, either alone or cumulatively. The screening reflects the precautionary approach described in the Planning Inspectorate's advice and is based on the information available at the EIA scoping stage.

The conclusions will be reviewed as the design, and environmental assessments develop and if new or materially different information becomes available.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
Characteristics of the Project ○ Size ○ Use of natural resources ○ Production of waste ○ Pollution and nuisances ○ Risk of accidents ○ Use of technologies	<u>Size</u> The Proposed Development comprises the expansion of Heathrow Airport through the construction of a new 2,400m long third runway, associated apron and taxiway infrastructure and new Terminal 6 buildings to the west of the current Terminal 5. The Project includes the development of a range of associated infrastructure including airfield and airport infrastructure, airport supporting facilities, surface access and public transport improvements, utilities, river engineering works, environmental mitigation and enhancement measures, construction compounds, support areas and access infrastructure, and all other works required to facilitate the expansion and operation of the airport. The Proposed Development will provide additional passenger, airline, and operational capacity, with an airport capacity increase of up to 260,000 additional air transport movements (ATMs) per annum and will be compatible with potential future rail access improvements serving Heathrow, including the Western Rail Link and Heathrow Southern Rail. The Proposed Development allows for the potential future increase of the 2,400m long third runway up to 3,500m long, permission for which is not sought through this application. <u>Use of Natural Resources</u> Construction of the Proposed Development would require a range of natural resources associated with major infrastructure projects, including aggregates, construction materials, soils, fuels, water and manufactured products. Additional natural resources would also be indirectly consumed through the extraction, processing, manufacture and transportation of construction materials and equipment used throughout the supply chain. The sourcing of these materials may involve national and international supply chains. However, the specific origin of materials has not been determined at this stage and procurement would be undertaken through established commercial supply networks operating within relevant environmental and regulatory

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	frameworks. The extraction, manufacture and transportation of such materials would not be uniquely attributable to a particular state and are not anticipated to result in identifiable pathways through which the Proposed Development could give rise to likely significant environmental effects within another EEA state. During operation, the Proposed Development would utilise natural resources associated with the operation of an international airport, including energy, water, fuels and maintenance materials. The use of such resources would largely occur within the United Kingdom and would be subject to applicable environmental controls and resource management measures. No direct transboundary pathway has been identified through which the operational use of natural resources would be likely to result in significant effects on the environment of another European Economic Area (EEA) state. Resource consumption associated with construction and operation would contribute indirectly to greenhouse-gas emissions through supply chains and energy use. The potential effects of greenhouse-gas emissions will be assessed within the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases chapter of the Environmental Statement. No other significant transboundary effects arising from the use of natural resources have been identified at the scoping stage. <u>Production of waste</u> Construction of the Proposed Development would generate a range of waste materials typical of large-scale infrastructure projects, including excavated materials, demolition arisings, construction materials, packaging and other construction-related wastes. The design and construction approach would seek to maximise the re-use of materials, including the beneficial re-use of suitable excavated materials where practicable, thereby reducing the requirement for off-site disposal and the consumption of primary resources. Waste generated during construction and operation would be managed in accordance with the principles of the waste hierarchy, prioritising waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery before disposal. Detailed

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	measures relating to waste management would be developed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the operational waste management framework. At the scoping stage, no significant transboundary pathway has been identified in relation to the generation, storage, transport, treatment or disposal of waste arising from the Proposed Development. Waste would be managed through established and regulated waste management infrastructure and, where practicable, treated or disposed of within the United Kingdom in accordance with relevant environmental legislation and permitting requirements. While some waste streams may ultimately be processed through national or international recycling and recovery markets, the specific destination of such materials cannot be identified at this stage and no mechanism has been identified through which waste management activities associated with the Proposed Development would be likely to give rise to significant environmental effects in another EEA state. The transportation of waste associated with the Proposed Development is also not anticipated to generate effects of a scale or magnitude capable of resulting in likely significant transboundary effects. No likely significant transboundary effects arising from the generation or management of waste have therefore been identified at the EIA scoping stage. <u>Pollution and Nuisances</u> The Proposed Development is anticipated to increase passenger capacity resulting in an increase in air transport movements and associated surface access trips during operation. Potential pollution and nuisance effects associated with the Proposed Development include emissions to air, noise, vibration, artificial lighting and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions arising during both construction and operation.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	The principal air quality and noise effects associated with aviation activity are expected to occur in the vicinity of Heathrow Airport and along associated surface access corridors within the United Kingdom. Increases in aircraft movements may also result in changes to air traffic movements between Heathrow Airport and airports in other states. However, at the current stage of project development, the future distribution of flights between Heathrow Airport and individual international destinations cannot be identified with sufficient certainty to determine whether any particular airport or state could experience a change of a scale capable of giving rise to likely significant transboundary environmental effects. This potential pathway has nevertheless been considered as part of this screening and will be kept under review as aviation forecasting and operational information develops through the EIA process. Aircraft emissions released during cruise conditions would disperse over a wide geographical area and are not anticipated to result in significant project-specific air quality effects within another state. Similarly, significant project-specific noise effects are not anticipated beyond the vicinity of airports and established flight operations. On the basis of the information currently available, no likely significant transboundary effects relating to air quality or noise have been identified. Construction and operation of the Proposed Development would generate greenhouse gas emissions. These emissions would contribute to the global atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases and therefore have the potential to contribute to climate change through a global impact pathway rather than through effects on any specific state. Greenhouse gas emissions and climate change effects will be assessed within the Environmental Statement, including consideration of measures to avoid, reduce or offset emissions where appropriate and reasonably practicable. The potential for major accidents and disasters will be considered throughout the EIA process in accordance with the EIA Regulations. The assessment will identify receptors that could be affected by reasonably foreseeable major accidents and disasters associated with the Proposed Development and will consider the

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	effectiveness of embedded and additional mitigation measures in reducing potential environmental effects. At this stage, the principal source of accident risk is anticipated to relate to the operation of Heathrow Airport, including aircraft take-off and landing activities. Given the location and nature of the Proposed Development, significant transboundary effects arising from major accidents or disasters affecting other EEA States are not considered likely. The Proposed Development is expected to utilise established construction techniques, operational systems and technologies that are routinely applied within the aviation and airport sectors. No novel technologies or processes are currently anticipated that would be likely to give rise to significant environmental effects beyond those typically associated with comparable airport developments. Given the nature, scale and location of the Proposed Development, significant transboundary environmental effects arising from the technologies to be employed during construction or operation are not considered likely.
Location of development (including existing use) and geographical area. Existing use. Distance to another EEA state. Area of impact in EEA state.	Heathrow Airport is located approximately 15 miles west of Central London within the London Borough of Hillingdon. The airport currently operates four passenger terminals (Terminals 2 to 5) and two runways (the Northern and Southern Runways). Heathrow is principally accessed via the M4, which runs immediately north of the airport and connects with the M25 to the west. The airport is served by a range of rail services, including the Elizabeth Line, Piccadilly Line and Heathrow Express, providing direct connections to London, Reading and the wider rail network. Extensive bus services also connect Heathrow with surrounding communities and transport hubs. The nearest EEA State is France, located approximately 160 km to the south-east of the Proposed Development. The potential for significant transboundary effects has therefore been considered with regard to the nature of the Proposed Development, the extent of potential environmental impact pathways and the geographical separation between Heathrow Airport and other EEA States.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	The maximum Zone of Influence (ZOI) identified for topics considered likely to experience the greatest spatial extent of effect is 25 km from the Proposed Development in relation to ornithological receptors, including geese and gulls. The ZOI adopted for the assessment of internationally designated biodiversity sites is 20 km. European designated sites within the Study Area include the South West London Waterbodies Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area (SPA), Windsor Forest and Great Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Richmond Park SAC, Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC, Thames Basin Heaths SPA, Burnham Beeches SAC, Wimbledon Common SAC, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC and Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC. The potential for transboundary biodiversity effects has also been considered with regard to mobile and migratory species. Further review will be undertaken during the EIA process to establish whether qualifying species associated with designated sites within the study area form part of wider biogeographical populations or ecological networks extending into other EEA States. On the basis of the currently anticipated scale and geographic extent of effects, significant transboundary biodiversity effects are not considered likely. The ZOIs identified for the environmental topics proposed for assessment are substantially smaller than the distance between the Proposed Development and the nearest EEA State. Accordingly, no direct environmental pathway has been identified through which land take, habitat loss, construction activities or operational effects associated with the Proposed Development could give rise to likely significant environmental effects within another EEA State. Given the distance between Heathrow Airport and the nearest EEA State, together with the dispersion characteristics of pollutants emitted during aircraft operations, significant transboundary air quality effects are not considered reasonably foreseeable. Similarly, significant transboundary noise effects are considered

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	unlikely due to the substantial distance between Heathrow Airport and the nearest EEA State and the altitude at which aircraft would operate during the relevant phases of flight. Greenhouse gas emissions have the potential to contribute to global climate change irrespective of national boundaries and will be assessed within the climate chapter of the EIA. However, the contribution of the Proposed Development to global greenhouse gas emissions would not give rise to identifiable significant environmental effects affecting a particular EEA State. At the screening stage, the distribution and frequency of additional air traffic movements between Heathrow Airport and individual airports outside the UK cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular destination airport or EEA State. The potential pathway has nevertheless been considered on a precautionary basis. Further review will be undertaken as aviation forecasting and route-distribution information develops, including consideration of whether any individual state or airport could experience a concentration of additional movements capable of giving rise to a likely significant environmental effect. Based on the information currently available, no likely significant transboundary effects have been identified. Any environmental effects associated with aircraft operations at destination airports would continue to be subject to the applicable regulatory, operational and consenting regimes within the relevant jurisdictions. This position will be kept under review as the design, aviation forecasts and assessment assumptions are further developed through the EIA process.
Environmental importance.	Potential transboundary noise and air quality effects could theoretically arise through changes in aircraft movements at airports outside the UK that are connected to Heathrow Airport. However, at the screening stage, the distribution and frequency of any additional air traffic movements between Heathrow Airport and individual airports in other EEA States cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
Environmental value of areas affected. Capacity of natural environment.	project-specific change at any particular airport. Consequently, the nature, sensitivity and value of any potentially affected receptors cannot be determined, and no likely significant transboundary noise or air quality effects have been identified on the basis of the information currently available. Greenhouse gas emissions have the potential to contribute to climate change irrespective of national boundaries and their effects are inherently global in nature. The contribution of the Proposed Development to greenhouse gas emissions will therefore be assessed within the climate chapter of the EIA. Whilst greenhouse gas emissions may be significant in the context of climate assessment, they would not give rise to identifiable likely significant environmental effects affecting a particular EEA State.
Potential impacts and carrier pathways	The South West London Waterbodies SPA and Ramsar Site, together with their constituent SSSIs, support internationally and nationally important populations of wintering waterbirds, including the SPA qualifying species gadwall and shoveler. These sites are considered the designated nature conservation sites most likely to have a potential ecological pathway connecting them to the Proposed Development. The EIA will consider whether any changes in traffic flows associated with the Proposed Development could result in air quality effects affecting habitats that support qualifying species. The potential for transboundary biodiversity effects has also been considered in relation to the movement and migration of qualifying bird species. On the basis of the currently anticipated scale and geographic extent of effects, significant transboundary ecological effects are not considered likely. A theoretical transboundary pathway could arise through changes in aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and airports located within other EEA States. Such changes could, in principle, result in localised air quality and noise effects in the vicinity of destination airports. However, at the screening stage, the distribution, frequency and geographic concentration of any additional aircraft movements cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular airport,

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	EEA State or Convention State. Consequently, no likely significant transboundary air quality or noise effects have been identified on the basis of the information currently available. Greenhouse gas emissions arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would contribute to global atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases and therefore to climate change. The effects of individual greenhouse gas emissions cannot generally be attributed to a particular EEA State or Convention State. The Proposed Development's greenhouse gas emissions will therefore be quantified and assessed within the Environmental Statement using the applicable climate assessment methodology. Whilst greenhouse gas emissions have the potential to contribute to effects that are global in nature, no likely significant transboundary effect on a specific EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening. The developing EIA will be kept under review as further information becomes available. The outcomes of the assessment process will be reviewed to determine whether any new information emerges that could alter the conclusions of this transboundary screening exercise.
Extent. Geographical area/affected population.	Deposition of pollutants from traffic to habitats occur within a limited distance from any road affected by a significant increase in traffic flow. Air quality impacts will be modelled and assessed within a 14 km by 11 km grid centred around the Proposed Development, while noise from flights will also be assessed in vicinity of Heathrow Airport. Therefore, impacts may be possible at similar distances from destination airports in EEA states. GHG emissions and the impact on climate change is a global issue and therefore has the potential to affect all EEA states. Air quality effects associated with road traffic emissions are generally limited to relatively short distances from affected roads and are therefore spatially constrained. The air quality assessment for the Proposed Development will consider effects within a study area surrounding Heathrow Airport. Similarly, potential

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	noise effects associated with aircraft operations are expected to be concentrated in the vicinity of Heathrow Airport and along local flight paths where changes in aircraft activity may occur. A theoretical transboundary pathway could arise through changes in aircraft movements at destination airports located within EEA States. Any associated air quality or noise effects would, if present, be localised to the vicinity of those airports and surrounding communities. However, at the screening stage, the distribution, frequency and concentration of any additional aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and individual airports within EEA States cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular location. Consequently, the geographic extent of any such effects cannot presently be defined. Greenhouse gas emissions arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would contribute to global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations. Accordingly, any effects associated with climate change are inherently global in extent and not confined to a particular EEA State. For the purposes of transboundary screening, no identifiable likely significant effect on a specific EEA State has been identified.
Magnitude. Likely magnitude of the change.	The potential for effects on European designated sites and the species they support will be considered throughout the EIA process where a reasonably foreseeable pathway exists between the Proposed Development and the receptor. Particular consideration will be given to designated sites supporting mobile and migratory species where there is potential for ecological connectivity beyond the UK. Based on the information currently available, the potential magnitude of any effect affecting populations or designated

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	sites within another EEA State is considered to be low and no likely significant transboundary biodiversity effects have been identified. A theoretical transboundary pathway could arise through changes in aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and airports located within other EEA States. Such changes could, in principle, give rise to localised air quality and noise effects in the vicinity of destination airports and surrounding communities. However, the nature and magnitude of any such effects are dependent upon a range of factors, including future airline scheduling, route allocation, operational practices and commercial decisions that cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence at the screening stage. Consequently, it is not currently possible to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular airport, EEA State or Convention State, nor to determine a magnitude of effect for any individual receptor. On the basis of the information presently available, no likely significant transboundary air quality or noise effects have been identified. Greenhouse gas emissions arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would contribute to global atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases. The resulting climate change effects are inherently global in nature and cannot generally be attributed to a specific EEA State or Convention State. The Proposed Development's greenhouse gas emissions will therefore be quantified and assessed within the Environmental Statement using the applicable climate assessment methodology. Whilst the Proposed Development may make a measurable contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effect on a specific EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	The developing EIA will continue to be reviewed as further information becomes available, including aviation forecasting and route-distribution data, to determine whether any new information emerges that could alter the conclusions of this transboundary screening exercise.
Probability. Likelihood under normal circumstances or exceptional circumstance (accidents and disasters).	Operational aircraft movements have the potential to give rise to air quality, noise and greenhouse gas emissions. A theoretical transboundary pathway could arise through changes in aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and airports located within EEA States or Convention States. However, the occurrence, scale and location of any resulting changes at individual destination airports are dependent upon a range of factors, including airline scheduling, route allocation, passenger demand, airport operational decisions and regulatory controls that are not wholly determined by the Proposed Development. At the screening stage, the future distribution and frequency of any additional aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and individual airports outside the UK cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular airport, EEA State or Convention State. Consequently, the probability of a likely significant transboundary air quality or noise effect occurring at a specific location cannot be determined with sufficient certainty and no likely significant transboundary effects have been identified on the basis of the information currently available. Any air quality and noise effects that may arise from aircraft operations at destination airports would remain subject to the applicable regulatory, operational and consenting regimes within the relevant jurisdictions. Whilst these controls do not form the basis of the screening conclusion, they provide an additional mechanism through which environmental effects associated with airport operations are managed. Greenhouse gas emissions arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development are reasonably foreseeable and would occur under normal operating conditions. The resulting contribution to climate change would be global in nature rather than affecting a specific EEA State or Convention State.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	The Proposed Development's greenhouse gas emissions will therefore be quantified and assessed within the Environmental Statement using the applicable climate assessment methodology. Whilst the Proposed Development may contribute to global climate change, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effect on a particular EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening.
Duration. Temporary, short-term or long-term. Phase of occurrence.	Any potential transboundary air quality or noise effects associated with aircraft movements would, if they were to occur, be limited to the operational phase of the Proposed Development and would therefore have the potential to persist over the operational lifetime of the project. However, at the screening stage, the distribution, frequency and concentration of any additional aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and individual airports within EEA States or Convention States cannot be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular airport. Consequently, the duration of any project-specific transboundary air quality or noise effects cannot presently be defined, and no likely significant transboundary effects have been identified. Potential effects on biodiversity receptors, including internationally designated sites and mobile or migratory species where a reasonably foreseeable ecological pathway exists, will be considered throughout the EIA process. Any such effects could arise during either the construction or operational phases depending on the nature of the impact pathway being assessed. Based on the information currently available, no likely significant transboundary biodiversity effects have been identified. Greenhouse gas emissions arising during both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development would contribute to global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations and therefore to climate change. The consequences of climate change are inherently long term and global in nature. The Proposed Development's greenhouse gas emissions will be quantified and assessed within the

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
	Environmental Statement using the applicable climate assessment methodology. Whilst these emissions may contribute to long-term global climate change effects, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effect on a specific EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening.
Frequency. Temporal pattern.	Potential effects on European designated sites and their qualifying species would be dependent on the frequency of activities giving rise to a relevant impact pathway. Where reasonably foreseeable pathways exist, including changes in traffic flows affecting supporting habitats, these will be considered through the EIA process. Based on the information currently available, no likely significant transboundary biodiversity effects have been identified. A theoretical transboundary pathway could arise through changes in aircraft movements between Heathrow Airport and airports within EEA States or Convention States. However, the distribution and frequency of any additional aircraft movements cannot currently be predicted with sufficient confidence to identify a meaningful project-specific change at any particular airport, EEA State or Convention State. Consequently, the frequency of any potential transboundary air quality or noise effects cannot presently be determined and no likely significant transboundary effects have been identified. Greenhouse gas emissions would arise throughout both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development and would contribute to global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations. Whilst emissions would occur over the lifetime of the Proposed Development, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effect on a specific EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
Reversibility. Reversible or irreversible.	Any potential air quality or noise effects associated with aircraft movements would be reversible should the relevant activity cease or reduce. However, at the screening stage, no project-specific transboundary air quality or noise effects have been identified. Any potential effects on biodiversity receptors would depend on the nature of the impact pathway and receptor sensitivity. Based on the information currently available, no likely significant transboundary biodiversity effects have been identified. Greenhouse gas emissions arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development would contribute to global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations. Whilst the effects of individual emissions are not readily reversible in the short term, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effect on a specific EEA State or Convention State has been identified for the purposes of Regulation 32 screening.
Cumulative impacts. Other major developments.	The EIA will include an assessment of cumulative effects with other relevant plans, projects and activities in accordance with the agreed assessment methodology. For the purposes of transboundary screening, consideration has been given to whether other plans, projects or activities could act through the same transboundary pathways as the Proposed Development, including changes in aviation activity, impacts on mobile or migratory species and cumulative greenhouse gas emissions. At this stage, no likely significant cumulative transboundary effects on EEA States or Convention States have been identified.

Table 1-1: Transboundary Screening Screening Criteria	Comments
Conclusion.	On the basis of the information currently available, no likely significant effects on the environment of an EEA State or other relevant Convention State have been identified, either from the Proposed Development alone or in combination with other relevant plans and projects. The transboundary screening has considered the nature of potential impact pathways, the geographical extent of likely environmental effects, the sensitivity of potential receptors and the reasonable foreseeability of project-specific effects occurring outside the United Kingdom. For the environmental topics assessed, the identified Zones of Influence are substantially less than the distance between the Proposed Development and the nearest EEA State. No direct transboundary pathways giving rise to likely significant effects have therefore been identified. Potential pathways associated with international aviation movements, migratory species and greenhouse gas emissions have nevertheless been identified and will be kept under review as the EIA develops. However, based on the information currently available, no identifiable likely significant transboundary effects have been identified in relation to these pathways. In particular, the screening will be reviewed as further information becomes available regarding aviation demand and route distribution, ecological connectivity, cumulative effects and the Proposed Development's greenhouse gas emissions. This conclusion is provided to inform the Planning Inspectorate's screening under Regulation 32 and does not prejudge the determination to be made by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State. The position will be reviewed if new or materially different information becomes available during the EIA process.

Appendix 5.1

Air Quality and Odour: Monitoring Data and Dispersion Modelling Methodology

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 5.1 - Air Quality and Odour

Monitoring Data and Dispersion Modelling Methodology

Contents

1 Monitoring data 1
1.1 Monitoring data 1
1.2 PCM data 7
1.3 Monitoring data for other pollutants 7
2 Dispersion modelling methodology 9
2.1 Dispersion modelling 9

Tables

Table 1-1: Study area automatic monitors annual mean NO_2 concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) 1
Table 1-2: Study area automatic monitors annual mean PM_{10} concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) 3
Table 1-3: Study area automatic monitors annual mean $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) 5
Table 1-4: Range of annual mean background concentrations for the core and wider study areas 2024 (https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/pcm-data) showing minimum – maximum (median) 7
Table 1-5: Monitored annual mean concentrations of lead, arsenic, cadmium, nickel and Benzo(a)pyrene at London sites in Defra's Heavy Metal Network and PAH Network. 7

1 Monitoring data

1.1 Monitoring data

Table 1-1: Study area automatic monitors annual mean NO_2 concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$)

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
Hillingdon	LHR2: London Heathrow	Airport	32	29	29
	T55: Heathrow Green Gates	Airport	21	18	20
	HRL: London Harlington	Airport	22	19	22
	HIL: London Hillingdon	Urban background	25	23	25
	SIPS: Hillingdon Sipson	Urban background	23	22	26
	HIL1: London Harmondsworth	Roadside	18	16	17
	HIL5: Hillingdon Hayes	Roadside	34	29	32
	HI1: Hillingdon 1 - South Ruislip	Roadside	24	20	20
	HI3: Hillingdon 3 - Oxford Avenue	Urban background	28	27	24
	LHRBR: Heathrow Bath Road	Roadside	36	32	33
Hounslow	HS4: Chiswick	Roadside	29	27	24
	HS5: Brentford	Roadside	33	27	26
	HS6: Heston	Roadside	23	20	24

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
	HS7: Hatton Cross	Urban background	19	18	18
	HS8: Gunnersbury	Roadside	31	26	30
	HS9: Feltham	Roadside	23	23	23
Spelthorne	SBC01: Sunbury Cross	Urban background	20	LD	-
	T54: Heathrow Oaks Road	Urban background	20	18	20
	SCC_ECO: Haslett Road	Urban background	LD	-	-
Slough	SLH8: Lakeside 2	Industrial	17	16	17
	SLH10: Wellington Street	Roadside	25	23	23
	SLH11: Brands Hill London Road	Roadside	26	24	25
	SLH12: Slough Windmill Bath Road	Roadside	26	22	24
	SLH13: Spackmans Way	Other	22	20	21
	SLH14: Station Road Langley	Roadside	20	17	18
Ealing	EI1: Western Avenue	Roadside	30	28	28
	EI3: Acton Vale	Urban background	LD	LD	LD
	EI8: Horn Lane	Roadside	29	26	24

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
	EA6: Hanger Lane Gyratory	Roadside	**41**	36	LD
Richmond upon Thames	RI1: Castlenau Library	Roadside	16	19	18
	RI2: Wetland Centre	Urban background	LD	12	13
Windsor and Maidenhead	MW2: Clarence Road	Roadside	24	LD	-

Table 1-2: Study area automatic monitors annual mean PM_{10} concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$)

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
Hillingdon	LHR2: London Heathrow	Airport	13	11	15
	T55: Heathrow Green Gates	Airport	12	12	15
	HRL: London Harlington	Airport	12	11	14
	HIL: London Hillingdon	Urban background	14	13	17
	HIL1: London Harmondsworth	Roadside	13	13	13
	HIL4: London Harmondsworth Osiris	Urban background	12	12	12
	HIL5: Hillingdon Hayes	Roadside	27	22	27
	HI1: Hillingdon 1 - South Ruislip	Roadside	19	18	21
	HI3: Hillingdon 3 - Oxford Avenue	Urban background	26	18	21

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
	LHRBR: Heathrow Bath Road	Roadside	14	13	16
Hounslow	HS4: Chiswick	Roadside	20	19	LD
	HS5: Brentford	Roadside	25	23	18
	HS6: Heston	Roadside	20	17	LD
	HS7: Hatton Cross	Urban background	20	19	LD
	HS8: Gunnersbury	Roadside	29	20	LD
	HS9: Feltham	Roadside	18	16	LD
Spelthorne	SBC01: Sunbury Cross	Urban background	14	LD	LD
	T54: Heathrow Oaks Road	Urban background	12	12	14
	SCC_ECO: Haslett Road	Urban background	LD	-	-
Slough	SLH8: Lakeside 2	Industrial	13	12	15
	SLH9: Lakeside 2 Osiris	Industrial	14	13	16
	SLH11: Brands Hill London Road	Roadside	20	21	25
	SLH12: Slough Windmill Bath Road	Roadside	17	17	-
	SLH13: Spackmans Way	Other	12	11	14
	SLH14: Station Road Langley	Roadside	-	-	16

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
	SLOW: Slough Windmill Bath Road	Roadside	-	-	19
Ealing	EI1: Western Avenue	Roadside	21	22	25
	EI3: Acton Vale	Urban background	LD	LD	LD
	EI8: Horn Lane	Roadside	24	LD	26
	EA8: Horn Lane	Roadside	28	27	29
	EA6: Hanger Lane Gyratory	Roadside	18	20	23
Richmond upon Thames	TED2: Teddington	Suburban	14	LD	14
	RI1: Castlenau Library	Roadside	14	15	17
	RI2: Wetland Centre	Urban background	LD	14	14

Table 1-3: Study area automatic monitors annual mean $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$)

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
Hillingdon	LHR2: London Heathrow	Airport	8	7	9
	T55: Heathrow Green Gates	Airport	7	7	9
	HRL: London Harlington	Airport	7	7	9
	HIL: London Hillingdon	Urban background	8	7	9

Local authority	Site ID and Name	Site type	2023	2024	2025
	HIL4: London Harmondsworth Osiris	Urban background	6	6	6
	LHRBR: Heathrow Bath Road	Roadside	8	8	9
Hounslow	HS4: Chiswick	Roadside	9	9	10
	HS5: Brentford	Roadside	9	9	LD
	HS6: Heston	Roadside	-	LD	LD
	HS7: Hatton Cross	Urban background	-	LD	LD
	HS8: Gunnersbury	Roadside	-	LD	LD
	HS9: Feltham	Roadside	-	LD	LD
Spelthorne	SBC01: Sunbury Cross	Urban background	8	LD	LD
	T54: Heathrow Oaks Road	Urban background	7	7	8
	SCC_ECO: Haslett Road	Urban background	LD	-	-
Slough	SLH9: Lakeside 2	Industrial	6	5	7
	SLOW: Slough Windmill Bath Road	Roadside	-	-	10
Richmond upon Thames	TED2: Teddington	Suburban	8	LD	8
	RI2: Wetland Centre	Urban background	-	-	LD

1.2 PCM data

Table 1-4: Range of annual mean background concentrations for the core and wider study areas 2024 (https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/pcm-data) showing minimum – maximum (median)

Pollutant	Metric (units)	Core study area	Wider study area (excluding core area)
PM_{10}	Annual mean (µg/m³)	11.5 – 15.0 (13.4)	10.3 – 16.5 (12.3)
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual mean (µg/m³)	7.4 – 8.9 (8.3)	6.9 – 9.6 (7.8)
NO_2	Annual mean (µg/m³)	11.9 – 35.5 (16.9)	8.7 – 23.1 (13.7)
NO_x	Annual mean (µg/m³)	15.8 – 61.1 (23.4)	11.2 – 33.7 (18.4)
CO (2010)	Maximum 8-hour running mean (mg/m^3)	1.5 – 2.1 (1.6)	1.5 – 1.9 (1.6)
SO_2	Annual mean (µg/m³)	1.4 – 5.6 (2.4)	1.0 – 4.0 (1.8)
Benzene	Annual mean (µg/m³)	0.4 – 0.7 (0.6)	0.4 – 0.8 (0.5)
O_3	Exceeding 120 µg/m³ (days)	0 – 2.8 (2.2)	1.4 – 3.2 (2.6)

1.3 Monitoring data for other pollutants

Table 1-5: Monitored annual mean concentrations of lead, arsenic, cadmium, nickel and Benzo(a)pyrene at London sites in Defra's Heavy Metal Network and PAH Network.

Pollutant	Limit / Target Value (ng/m^3)	Site	2023	2024	2025
Lead	500	London Marylebone Road	5.1	5.5	6.6
		London Westminster	5.3	5.4	6.0
Arsenic	6	London Marylebone Road	0.74	0.73	0.87
		London Westminster	0.77	0.72	0.73
Cadmium	5	London Marylebone Road	0.10	0.10	0.12
		London Westminster	0.08	0.10	0.10
Nickel	20	London Marylebone Road	1.4	1.4	1.7

Pollutant	Limit / Target Value (ng/m^3)	Site	2023	2024	2025
		London Westminster	1.0	1.8	1.1
Benzo(a)pyrene	1	London Marylebone Road	0.11	0.06	0.08
		London Brent	0.15	0.07	0.07

2 Dispersion modelling methodology

2.1 Dispersion modelling

2.1.1 The air quality impacts of the Proposed Development will principally be assessed by means of dispersion modelling. The modelling will be carried out in line with recommendations from PSDH for airport emissions compilation and dispersion modelling methodology, for construction and operational phase scenarios.

2.1.2 Annual inventories of Heathrow Airport airside emissions are produced on behalf of HAL, calculated in line with PSDH recommendations; the latest publicly available inventory is the year 2024[1]. Where available, the assessment for the Proposed Development will use the same datasets for calculating airside emissions, as used for the Heathrow Airport annual inventories, leading to a consistent approach with other and previous assessments of the airport.

2.1.3 The calculation of airport airside emissions will include aircraft main engine emissions up to a height of 3,000 feet, Auxiliary Power Unit (APU) and ground support equipment (GSE) emissions. The calculation assumptions will take account of current and potential future operational efficiencies such as reduced thrust take-off, single engine taxiing, electrical ground power and electrification of GSE.

2.1.4 For the calculation of airside emissions, data from datasets held by HAL will be requested, including: their Power BI/HDS information database for aircraft movement data; All Up Weight Return (AUWR) database; noise and track keeping (NTK) system; APU running time surveys; and datasets of GSE fuel use and activity data. These data will be supplemented by data from NATS's electronic flight processing strips (EFPS) dataset and where available, from airlines and Heathrow Airport service providers.

2.1.5 Aircraft emissions are calculated from:

- Aircraft movement data from HAL's Power BI/HDS information database include ATMs and non-ATMs (for example, position movements and private flights), both will be included in the emission calculations. From this dataset, the required movement data are by flight date and time, aircraft registration number, runway and type of movement (arrival or departure) identifiers and stand number.
- Using AUWR, aircraft registration numbers will be matched with aircraft engine assignments for the emission calculations. The AUWR database also provides maximum take-off weights (MTOW), which are used for the calculation of aircraft brake and tyre wear.

[1] Ricardo 2025. Heathrow Airport Airfield Emission Inventory 2024; Report for: Heathrow Airport Limited. Ricardo ref: ED21806, Issue 1. August 2025

- Aircraft main engine emissions will be calculated for each mode of operation, based on the time-in-mode (TIM) and the engine thrust settings for each operation. The emission calculations will use emission factors and indices from the most current version of ICAO emissions databank.[2]
- Data from NTK will be used to derive TIMs for airborne modes of operation (approach, initial climb and climb-out) and EFPS data will be used to derive TIMs for ground modes of operation (taxi, hold, line-up, take-off roll and landing roll).
- Thrust settings will be derived from available airline survey data and / or historic data from previous surveys. Thrust assumptions will account for operational efficiencies such as reduced thrust take-off and single engine taxiing.
- Using APU running times for arrivals and departures by aircraft type, derived from survey data, APU emissions will be calculated using emission factors from ICAO Doc 9889 Air Quality Manual.

2.1.6 The modelling will include landside airport emissions, including vehicle movements (for staff and public car parks, taxi feeder park, terminal forecourt drop-off), energy centre emissions and building emissions. In addition, emissions will be included for road traffic on public roads and other non-airport emissions within the modelling domain.

2.1.7 On and off airport road transport emissions will be calculated from the activity datasets and models described in **Chapter 21 Traffic and Transport**. The calculation of road transport emissions of NO_x, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ will be based on the latest version of Defra's emission factor toolkit (EFT)[3], with consideration of projected road traffic fleet changes in future years and due to proposed mitigations. Emissions of NH_3 and SO_2 will be calculated using established national or international datasets, such as the CREAM model[4] and the EMEP/EEA Emissions Inventory Guidebook[5].

2.1.8 Emissions for other non-airport sources will be taken from the LAEI and NAEI. Where necessary, these emissions will be projected for future year scenarios in line with Defra datasets.

2.1.9 Emissions for construction phase scenarios will include emissions from construction sites and the impact of construction and construction traffic on public highways. This will include emissions from delays and diversions due to construction works, based on activity data from traffic model outputs.

[2] ICAO 2026. ICAO Aircraft Engine Emissions Databank. Current Issue 32, March 2026. Available at: https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/domains/environment/icao-aircraft-engine-emissions-databank [Last accessed 18/08/2026]

[3] Defra 2026. Emission Factor Toolkit. Current version 14.1, May 2026. Available at: https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/air-quality/air-quality-assessment/emissions-factors-toolkit/ [Last accessed 19/08/2026]

[4] Air Quality Consultants 2025. Calculator for Road Emissions of Ammonia CREAM V2A. February 2025. Available at: https://www.aqconsultants.co.uk/resources [Last accessed 19/08/2026]

[5] European Environment Agency 2023. EMEP/EEA air pollutant emission inventory guidebook 2023. October 2023. Available at: https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/publications/emep-eea-guidebook-2023 [Accessed 19/08/2026]

2.1.10 In line with PSDH recommendations, the ADMS-Airport software will be used for dispersion modelling. The emissions described above will be used as input to the model, with contributions from sources outside of the modelling domain included in the background inputs to model, derived from rural and urban background air quality monitoring sites.

2.1.11 Within the core study area, aircraft main engine emissions will be modelled as a moving jet sources, to account for the change in plume rise characteristics of the source, due to the changes in the aircraft speed. For output at more distant receptors from aircraft sources i.e. beyond core study area, aircraft emissions modelling can be simplified to volume sources without compromising the accuracy of the model outputs. This approach will be taken for outputs for the wider study area.

2.1.12 Other airport emissions will be represented as appropriate source types, including point, road and volume sources.

2.1.13 The model will also include detailed representation of major emissions sources beyond the airport boundary, including industrial sources as point sources and major road emissions as road sources. Emissions from other sources, such as commercial and domestic emissions, will be included as aggregated emission sources with a resolution of 1 km x 1 km.

2.1.14 Meteorological data will be taken from the Heathrow station, for the current baseline year used for the assessment. The baseline meteorological data will also be used for the modelling of future scenarios.

2.1.15 The ADMS-Airport model includes a Chemical Reaction Scheme module for the calculation of NO_2 concentrations from NO_x emissions and background concentrations of NO_x, NO_2 and O_3. This is PSDH recommended method for calculating NO_2 concentrations and therefore the preferred method for NO_x chemistry for the modelling. Alternative post-processing schemes will be considered if there is a requirement for the assessment.

2.1.16 Modelling for the baseline year will include model verification through a comparison of model outputs against automatic air quality monitoring across the study area. Model verification will be carried out in line with Defra LAQM TG(22) guidance, including evaluation against relevant performance statistics.

2.1.17 In line with the guidance, the model verification process will be used to refine the model set-up and inputs, to improve agreement with monitoring data. Post-modelling adjustment of model concentrations will be avoided, where possible, as this process introduces additional uncertainty with regard to future year modelling. If post-modelling adjustment is required, adjustment on a source-group basis will be considered in order to minimise the additional uncertainties introduced for future year scenarios.

Appendix 6.1

Biodiversity: Baseline Condition

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 6.1 – Biodiversity Baseline

Contents

1 Introduction 3
1.1 Background 3
2 Baseline conditions 4
2.1 Baseline Description 4
3 Proposed approach to the assessment 33
3.1 Additional Baseline Information Required 33

Figures

Figure 6-1: Biodiversity Study Area

Figure 6-2: Biodiversity Survey Areas

Figure 6-3: Statutory and Non-statutory Sites Designated for Ecological Features

Tables

Table 1-1: European designated sites within 20 km of site, and national designated sites within 2 km of site 4
Table 2-2: INNS included on the WFD UKTAG, Schedule 9 of the WCA and Species of Special Concern recorded in the Desk Study Area and their associated designations 27
Table 2-2: Non-native species not specified on WFD UKTAG, Schedule 9 WCA or Species of Special concern recorded within the Desk Study Area 30

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1.1 This Appendix of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report Biodiversity Chapter has been prepared by APEM Limited (APEM) and describes the baseline conditions including initial desk study data and surveys relevant to the Proposed Development.

2 Baseline conditions

2.1 Baseline Description

2.1.1.1 A plan denoting the Biodiversity Study Area is shown in **Figure 6-1**.

2.1.1.2 A plan denoting the various Biodiversity Survey Area is shown in **Figure 6-2**.

Designated Sites

2.1.1.3 There are ten European designated sites located within 20 km of the site. There are ten SSSIs located within 2 km of the site. Additional sites at a greater distance may be added if connectivity is established during the assessment process, these would also be assessed as part of the HRA process.

2.1.1.4 A plan denoting statutory and non-statutory designated sites is shown on **Figure 6-3**.

Table **Error! No text of specified style in document.**-1: European designated sites within 20 km of site, and national designated sites within 2 km of site

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
International (within 20 km)		
South West London Waterbodies	Ramsar Site Designated for a number of reservoirs, and former gravel pits which support internationally important numbers of gadwall (*Anas strepera*) and shoveler (*Anas clypeata*)[1].	Directly adjacent
South West London Waterbodies	SPA Designated for a number of reservoirs, and former gravel pits which support internationally important	Directly adjacent

[1] Ramsar Sites Information Service (2026). South West London Waterbodies. Available from: https://rsis.ramsar.org/ris/1038 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
	numbers of gadwall and shoveler[2].	
Windsor Forest and Great Park	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitats including 9190 Old acidophilous oak woods with *Quercus robur* on sandy plains and 9120 Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with *Ilex* and sometimes also *Taxus* in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion*). Also designated for its Annex II species 1079 violet click beetle (*Limoniscus violaceus*)[3].	1.78 km west
Richmond Park	SAC Designated for its Annex II species 1083 stag beetle (*Lucanus cervus*)[4].	4.55 km east
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitats including 4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix,* 4030 European dry heaths and 7150 Depressions on peat substrates of the *Rhynchosporion*[5].	5.77 km south

[2] Natural England (2014). European Site Conservation Objectives for South West London Waterbodies SPA (UK9012171). Available from: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4901473695563776 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[3] JNCC (2026). Windsor Forest and Great Park. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012586 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[4] JNCC (2026). Richmond Park. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0030246 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[5] JNCC (2026). Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012793 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
Thames Basin Heaths	SPA Designated for its complex heathlands that support important breeding bird populations of nightjar (*Caprimulgus europaeus*), woodlark (*Lullula arborea*) and Dartford warbler (*Sylvia undata*)[6].	5.77 km south
Burnham Beeches	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitat 9120 Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with *Ilex* and sometimes also *Taxus* in the shrublayer (*Quercion robori-petraeae or Ilici-Fagenion*)[7].	8.19 km north west
Wimbledon Common	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitats including 4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* and 4030 European dry heaths. Also designated for its Annex II species 1083 stag beetle[8].	8.17 km east
Chilterns Beechwoods	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitats including 9130 *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests and 6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous	14.99 km north west

[6] Natural England (2014). European Site Conservation Objectives for Thames Basin Heaths SPA (UK9012141). Available from: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4952859267301376 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[7] JNCC (2026). Burnham Beeches. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0030034 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[8] JNCC (2026). Wimbledon Common. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0030301 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
	substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites). Also designated for its Annex II species 1083 stag beetle[9].	
Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment	SAC Designated for its Annex I habitats including 5110 Stable xerothermophilous formations with Buxus sempervirens on rock slopes (Berberidion p.p.), 6210 Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (*Festuco-Brometalia*) (* important orchid sites), 91J0 *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles * Priority feature, 4030 European dry heaths and 9130 *Asperulo-Fagetum* beech forests. Also designated for its Annex II species 1166 great crested newt and 1323 Bechstein's bat (*Myotis bechsteinii*)[10].	17.15 km south
National (within 2 km)		
Staines Moor	SSSI Designated for its alluvial meadows and rich flora, whilst the reservoirs hold nationally important populations of wintering wildfowl. One pond within the SSSI carries an aquatic flora which is of national importance, which	On Site

[9] JNCC (2026). Chilterns Beechwoods. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012724 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[10] JNCC (2026). Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment. Available from: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0012804 (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
	includes one plant which is extremely rare in Britain[11].	
Wraysbury and Hythe End Gravel Pits	SSSI Designated for its mosaic of habitats (open water, islands, grassland, scrub, woodland) within area of previous gravel extraction. The site supports nationally important numbers of three species of wintering wildfowl together with an important assemblage of breeding birds associated with open waters and wetland habitats. In addition the site supports two nationally scarce invertebrates and a number of locally uncommon plants[12].	On Site
Wraysbury No. 1 Gravel Pit	SSSI Designated for its populations of shoveler, goldeneye (*Bucephala clangula*) and smew (*Mergus albellus*). The site is also locally important for other wintering bird species including great crested grebe (*Podiceps cristatus*), cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo*), pochard (*Ahthya farina*), tufted duck (*Aythya fuligula*) and coot (*Fulica atra*)[13].	On Site

[11] Natural England (1975). Staines Moor Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1001792.pdf (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[12] Natural England (1992). Wraysbury and Hythe End Gravel Pits Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1004168.pdf (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[13] Natural England (1999). Wraysbury No. 1 Gravel Pit Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/2000381.pdf (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
Wraysbury Reservoir	SSSI Designated for its nationally important numbers of wintering cormorant, great crested grebe and shoveler[14].	Directly adjacent
Langham Pond	SSSI Designated for its alluvial meadows and its pond supports several nationally scarce invertebrates. The woodland adjacent on higher ground supports a rich community of breeding birds[15].	0.64 m south
Thorpe Hay Meadow	SSSI Designated for its meadow, ditches and hedges[16].	1.04 km south
Bushy Park and Home Park	SSSI Designated for its nationally important saproxylic invertebrate assemblage, population of veteran trees and acid grassland communities[17].	1.26 km east
Kempton Park Reservoirs	SSSI	1.30 km south

[14] Natural England (1999). Wraysbury Reservoir Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/2000374.pdf (accessed on: 12/08/2026).

[15] Natural England (1986). Langham Pond Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1000918.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

[16] Natural England (1985). Thorpe Hay Meadow Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1000859.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

[17] Natural England (2014). Bushy Park and Home Park Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1000859.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
	Designated for its national importance for wintering gadwall and shoveler[18].	
Kingcup Meadows and Oldhouse Wood	SSSI Designated for its mosaic of habitats, including woodland, unimproved pastures and semi/unimproved meadowland[19].	1.52 km southwest
Windsor Forest and Great Park	SSSI Designated for its woodland and parkland, and rare species of invertebrate which include the internationally important violet click beetle and stag beetle and a rich assemblage of other Red Data book beetles and flies. The range of provisional Red Data List fungi present includes *Buglossoporus pulvinus, Phelinus robustus, Boletus regius* and *Hericium coralloides*. In addition, there are areas of unimproved acid grassland[20].	1.76 km southwest
Arthur Jacob Nature Reserve	LNR Designated for its reedbeds, planted woodland and wet woodland.	On Site

[18] Natural England (1999). Kempton Park Reservoirs Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/2000385.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

[19] Natural England (1992). Kingcup Meadows & Oldhouse Wood Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1006013.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

[20] Natural England (2001). Windsor Forest and Great Park Citation. Available from: https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/PDFsForWeb/Citation/1004110.pdf (accessed on: 13/08/2026).

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
Bedfont Lakes	LNR Designated for its lakes, wetlands, meadow and woodland. The site supports a large population of breeding reed warblers (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*), as well as common tern (*Sterna hirundo*) and pochard (*Aythya ferina*). Both lakes are important for migrating and over-wintering wildfowl and wading birds.	On Site
Cranebank	LNR Designated for its wet meadows, lakes, reedbeds, woodland, scrub, ditches and ponds.	On Site
Hounslow Heath	LNR Designated for its moorland, heathland, acid grassland, scrub, woodland and ponds.	On Site
Thorney Park	Country Park Designated for its woodland, grassland and lake habitats.	On Site
Bedfont Lakes	Country Park Designated for its lakes, wetlands, meadow and woodland. The site supports a large population of breeding reed warblers, as well as common tern and pochard. Both lakes are important for migrating and over-wintering wildfowl and wading birds.	On Site
Cranford Countryside Park	Country Park	On Site

Site name	Designation type and reason for designation	Distance and direction from the Scoping Boundary (km)
	Designated for its wildflower meadows, wetlands and ancient woodland.	
Minet	Country Park Designated for its wet meadows, ponds, grassland and hedgerows.	On Site
Lake Farm	Country Park Designated for its meadow, ditches, hedgerow and ruderals.	Directly adjacent
Stockley	Country Park Designated for its wildflower meadows, woodlands, wetland communities, reedbeds and lakes.	0.89 km north
Ancient Woodland (51 parcels)	Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW) Designated for its ancient woodlands.	On Site (closest parcel)

6.2.1.1 A desk study was undertaken in 2017 to inform the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report and undertaken in 2020 to inform the 2020 HWL PEIR. It is noted that the HAL DCO Project is different and unaffiliated with the Proposed Development. The HAL 2018 and 2025 EIA Scoping Chapters have solely been used in this baseline data collection to provide supplementary contextual baseline data on species and habitats that may be present within the HWL Study Area. APEM has commenced field surveys in 2026 within the HWL Study Area, to confirm our baseline data.

2.1.1.5 The previous desk study data has been reviewed in relation to the Desk Study Area. The records have returned a total of 41 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) from Greater Greenspace for London CIC (GiGL), 16 Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) from Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) and 16 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) from TVERC, within the Desk Study Area.

2.1.1.6 An independent Statement to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment in support of the draft HENPS identified eight designated sites (across six

geographical areas) for which Likely Significant Effects for air quality could not be ruled out. These designated sites are up to 10 km from the airport. In the interim, the wider study extent is determined by the locations of: Burnham Beeches SAC (northern extent), Wimbledon Common SAC (eastern extent); Thames Basin Heaths SPA (southern extent); and Windsor Forest Great Park SAC (western extent).

2.1.1.7 For the HAL DCO Project, PINS identified that the ES will need to consider SSSIs beyond 2 km, where air quality could result in an impact upon sensitive features from the Proposed Development. Site-specific, vegetation and ecosystem critical loads will be determined at later stages of the EIA and scoped in the assessment as appropriate, in conjunction with **Chapter 5: Air Quality and Odour.**

Habitats

2.1.1.8 The habitats baseline has been established using a combination of desk-based sources and previous field survey data presented in the 2018 HAL Scoping Report, 2025 HAL Scoping Addendum and 2020 HWL PEIR. Existing information includes previous ecological surveys commissioned in support of the Proposed Development, OS basemaps, aerial imagery and MAGIC Maps. Collectively, these sources provide an understanding of the distribution, composition and conservation importance of habitats within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area. The habitat surveys were undertaken within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area were undertaken using JNCC Phase 1 'extended' methodology, alongside National Vegetation Classification (NVC) methodology.

Grassland

2.1.1.9 Surveys of grassland within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area identified semi-improved neutral grassland, improved grassland, marshy grassland, poor semi-improved grassland and amenity grassland present. Unmanaged semi-improved neutral grassland dominated the site, whilst marshy grassland was present within Staines Moor SSSI, and poor semi-improved grassland was noted as heavily grazed. Grassland within Staines Moor SSSI, Harmondsworth Moor and Bedfont Court West were subject to further NVC surveys. Within Staines Moor, six NVC communities or sub-community types were recorded including MG6 *Lolium perenne – Cynosurus cristatus* grassland, MG7 *Lolium perenne* ley and related grasslands, MG9 *Holcus lanatus – Deschampsia cespitosa* grassland, MG10b *Holcus lanatus – Juncus effusus* rush-pasture *Juncus inflexus* sub, MG10c *Holcus lanatus – Juncus effusus* rush-pasture *Iris pseudacorus* sub community and U1 *Festuca ovina – Agrostis capillaris – Rumex acetosella* grassland. Within Harmondsworth Moor, four NVC communities or sub-community types or mosaic types, MG1 *Arrhenatherum elatius* grasslands, MG1u *Arrhenatherum elatius – Helminthotheca echiodies – Daucus carota* grassland un-named sub-community and mosaic, MG1/7 *Arrhenatherum*

elatius / Lolium perenne grassland and MG7 *Lolium perenne* ley and related grasslands. Finally, within Bedfont Court West, two NVC communities or sub-community types were recorded including MG1 *Arrhenatherum elatius* grasslands and MG1u *Arrhenatherum elatius – Helminthotheca echiodies – Daucus carota* grassland un-named sub-community and mosaic.

Woodland, Parkland and Trees

2.1.1.10 Surveys of woodland within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area identified broadleaved semi-natural woodland and plantation woodland. Areas of broadleaved woodland were classified as Habitats of Principle Importance, and subject to an NVC survey which identified W6 *Alnus glutinosa - Urtica dioica* (Lowland mixed deciduous woodland) and W8 *Fraxinus excelsior - Acer campestre - Mercurialis perennis* (Wet woodland). An area of ancient woodland is present within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, southeast of Richings Park Golf and Country Club.

2.1.1.11 Surveys of parkland within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area identified both broadleaved and mixed parkland habitats. Two areas of broadleaved parkland were identified, whilst only a single area of mixed parkland was present situated adjacent to King George IV reservoir, to the south of Stanwell Moor.

2.1.1.12 Following a review of the Ancient Tree Inventory, the following has been identified:

- No ancient trees are located within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area;
- 20 veteran trees are located within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area;
    - One ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) (NGR: TQ 0643 7782);
    - One common lime (*Tilia x europaea*) (NGR: TQ 1013 7808);
    - One sweet chestnut (*Castanea sativa*) (NGR: TQ 1012 7804);
    - Two horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) (NGRs: TQ 08427 73522, TQ 08437 73510);
    - Two cedars of Lebanon (*Cedrus libani*) (NGRs: TQ 08469 73764, TQ 1001 7812);
    - Two oaks (*Quercus* spp.) (NGRs: TQ 03846 77963, TQ 09763 77329)
    - Two walnuts (*Juglans regia*) (NGRs: TQ 0560 7784, TQ 0560 7784)
    - Three willow species (*Salix* spp.) (NGRs: TQ 03654 72991, TQ 03370 77437, TQ 03691 77497); and,
    - Six pedunculate oaks (*Quercus robur*) (NGRs: TQ 0726 7782, TQ 0956 7828, TQ 1007 7815, TQ 1013 7811, TQ 09793 77324, TQ 10021 77177).
- Three notable trees are located within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area;

- One Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) (NGR: TQ 0549 7778);
- One walnut (NGR: TQ 0558 7782); and,
- One common yew (*Taxus baccata*) (NGR: TQ 08481 73666).

Scrub

2.1.1.13 Surveys of scrub within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area identified both scattered and dense / continuous scrub. Scattered scrub was recorded throughout Harmondsworth Moor and within Arthur Jacobs LNR. Much of the dense scrub identified was considered inaccessible.

Waterbodies, Rivers and Streams

2.1.1.14 A review of OS data, MAGIC Maps and aerial imagery, approximately 108 waterbodies have been identified within the GCN Study Area, a mixture of lakes, ponds and ditches (excluding rivers, considered below).

2.1.1.15 A review of OS data, MAGIC Maps, aerial imagery and surveys of rivers and streams within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area identified numerous watercourses including, but not limited to, River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland River, River Thames, Longford River, Frays River, River Ash, Staines Reservoir Aqueduct, Grand Union Canal, Yeading Brook, Horton Brook, Colne Brook, Datchet Common Brook and Mill Stream. The chalk geology should be noted; chalk rivers are globally rare ecosystems and therefore are a priority habitat.

Swamp, Marginal and Inundation Vegetation

2.1.1.16 Surveys of swamp, marginal and inundation habitats identified swamp habitats comprising reedbeds around lake perimeters and isolated wetland areas. The largest of swamp habitat was present within Mayfield Farm and Water Treatment Works SINC. Meanwhile, marginal and inundation habitats were identified in association with open and running water habitats, and a small area of wet woodland.

Other Habitats

2.1.1.17 The remainder of habitats within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area are scattered trees, arable land, tall ruderal vegetation and urban habitats (such as the airport, buildings, bare ground, gardens, tracks and roads).

Species

2.1.1.18 The species baseline has been established using a combination of desk-based sources and previous field survey data presented in the 2018 HAL Scoping Report, 2025 HAL Scoping Addendum and 2020 HWL PEIR. Existing information includes previous ecological surveys commissioned in support of the Proposed Development, and current species datasets

available through NBN Atlas and granted European Protected Species Licences (EPSLs) on MAGIC Maps. Collectively, these sources provide an understanding of the distribution, composition and conservation importance of species within the Desk Study Area.

Bats

2.1.1.19 An initial 2 km desk study for bats identified 15 species, including barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*), brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), common pipistrelle, Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*), serotine (*Cnephaeus serotinus*), Leisler's bat (*Nyctalus leisleri*), lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*), Nathusius' pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus nathusii*), noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*), soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) and whiskered bat (*Myotis mystacinus*). Three EPSLs were returned as granted within the Desk Study Area, including 2014-5172-EPS-MIT for brown long-eared and soprano pipistrelle; 2019-39760-EPS-MIT for common pipistrelle; 2018-33297-EPS-NSIP1-1 for common and soprano pipistrelle; and, EPSM2013-5923 for common pipistrelle. In addition, the Little Britain SINC has three bat species listed on its citation, comprising noctule, Daubenton's bat and soprano pipistrelle.

2.1.1.20 A suite of bat activity surveys in 2017 by HAL identified at least nine bat species as confirmed within the HAL Study Area, including common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, brown long-eared bat, noctule, Daubenton's bat, serotine, Leisler's and Natterer's (*Myotis nattereri*). A limitation of the field survey data analysis by HAL cited that the known variability of calls of *Myotis* species and difficulty to accurately identify down to species level solely based on echolocation calls, meant that species were not identified further than genus level. Advanced licence bat survey techniques (ALBST) were also used in 2017 by HAL, including bat trapping, which identified Daubenton's. High numbers of common and soprano pipistrelles were recorded, followed by moderate numbers of *Myotis* and low numbers of noctule, serotine, Leisler's, Nathusius', brown long-eared and Natterer's bat. Activity levels were highest in proximity to standing water, in particular Old Slade Lake, Swan Lake, River Colne and Colne Brook.

2.1.1.21 Further to the above, a suite of field surveys was undertaken in 2017 by HAL which confirmed several bat roosts within the HAL Study Area. Roosts were confirmed within four buildings with species recorded comprising brown long-eared, soprano pipistrelle, common pipistrelle and an unconfirmed bat species. In addition, two underpasses were confirmed bat roosts, a Daubentons' maternity roost, soprano pipistrelle roosts, respectively. A single tree within the Desk Study Area is also noted as a previously confirmed bat roost, the species not specified.

2.1.1.22 A suite of Ground Level Tree Assessments (GLTAs) and Preliminary Roost Assessments (PRAs) were undertaken by HWL in 2019, during the Phase 1 habitat survey. Subsequently, a suite of field surveys comprising bat

emergence / re-entry surveys and bat activity surveys were undertaken on site (between July – September 2019). No confirmed bat roosts were recorded during the field surveys undertaken in 2019 by HWL.

2.1.1.23 The unmanaged grassland, woodland, hedgerows, lines of trees, scrub, watercourses and waterbodies within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area are optimal habitats for supporting foraging and commuting bats. These habitats provide continuous linear features which are connected to further suitable habitats to support bats in the wider landscape including further up and downstream of the watercourses, grassland, scrub, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodlands. The watercourses and adjacent woodlands are likely considered important foraging resources for bats in the wider area. In addition, the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area includes a large number of trees and buildings / structures which may provide suitable roosting and hibernating habitat for bats.

Water Vole

2.1.1.24 A 2 km desk study for water vole returned ten records. However, four SINCs have water vole listed under the citation (Little Britain SINC, Lower Colne SINC, Crane Corridor SINC and the Bedfont SINC.

2.1.1.25 A suite of field surveys in 2017 by HAL and 2019 by HWL identified no evidence of water vole. However, it is noted that American mink (*Neogale vison*), which predates water vole, has been noted as present within the Otter and Water Vole Study Area through desk study records and previous field surveys.

2.1.1.26 A suite of updated field surveys commenced in August 2026, whereby a portion of the River Colne and Wraysbury River were surveyed along public rights of way. No evidence of water vole was observed.

2.1.1.27 The site includes watercourses and large waterbodies provide suitable foraging and commuting habitat for water vole.

Otter

2.1.1.28 A 2 km desk study for otters returned 16 records. It is also understood that Little Britain SINC has otter listed under the citation and is located with Colne Valley.

2.1.1.29 A suite of field surveys in 2017 by HAL identified evidence of otters, mainly spraints with occasional slides and feeding signs, along six watercourses, and three waterbodies (Colne Brook, Poyle Channel, Wraysbury River, River Colne, River Longford / Duke of Northumberland's River, River Crane, Colnebrook West Lake, Orlitts Lake and Old Slade Lake). Resting sites were identified as present along the Colne Brook, Wraysbury River, River Colen and Orlitts Lake. A suite of field surveys in 2019 by HWL was undertaken, whereby no evidence of otter was observed.

2.1.1.30 A suite of updated field surveys commenced in August 2026, whereby a portion of the River Colne and Wraysbury River were surveyed along public rights of way. No evidence of otter was observed.

2.1.1.31 The site includes woodland associated with watercourses and large waterbodies, which provide suitable habitat for otter holt building. The watercourses and large waterbodies on site provide suitable foraging and commuting habitat for otters.

Great Crested Newt and Common Amphibians

2.1.1.32 A 2 km desk study for amphibians identified five species, including GCN and common amphibians comprising smooth newt (*Lissotriton vulgaris*), palmate newt (*Lissotriton helveticus*), common frog (*Rana temporaria*) and common toad (*Bufo bufo*). One EPSL were returned as granted for GCN within the GCN Study Area, 2016-25615-EPS-MIT.

2.1.1.33 A suite of field surveys in 2017 by HAL was undertaken, comprising HSI assessments on 226 waterbodies, with eDNA surveys undertaken on ten waterbodies. All ten waterbodies returned negative results, indicating the likely absence of GCN, but did not exclude that GCN were present below the threshold of DNA detection. However, the 2020 HWL PEIR states "*two positive eDNA results… from a pond west of Harmondsworth*" were returned by HAL, its exact location is unknown at the time of writing this Chapter.

2.1.1.34 A suite of updated field surveys commenced in June 2026, whereby only one ditch (NGR: TQ 02465 77427) was subject to an HSI assessment and eDNA survey due to access constraints. The HSI score returned 'Excellent', whilst the eDNA survey returned a negative result, indicating the likely absence of GCN, but did not exclude that GCN were present below the threshold of DNA detection.

2.1.1.35 Suitable GCN habitat is located on site, whilst several other suitable ponds, drains and ditches are located within the wider area. This is further supported by suitable terrestrial GCN and other amphibian habitats, including woodland, unmanaged grassland, scrub and hedgerows. It is anticipated that the site will support brash and log piles which offer potential sheltering opportunities and cover for GCN and common amphibians.

Reptiles

2.1.1.36 A 2 km desk study for reptiles identified four species, including slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*), grass snake (*Natrix helvetica*), adder (*Vipera berus*) and common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*).

2.1.1.37 A suite of field surveys in 2017 by HAL identified evidence of reptiles, comprising a 'Low' population of grass snake and 'Good' population of slow worm. Records of slow worm were localised to north of Old Slade Lake (NGR: TQ 03874 78265), meanwhile records of grass snake were across the

site including Old Slade Lake, Saxon Lake (NGR: TQ 05480 78116), Harmondsworth Moor (NGR: TQ 04936 77564), along the River Colne (NGR: TQ 04207 75912), and south of Spout Lane North (NGR: TQ 04807 75300).

2.1.1.38 The grassland, fringes of the woodlands, hedgerows and scrub provide suitable habitat for both active and hibernating reptiles. Other suitable reptile habitat located in the wider landscape includes the aquatic habitat suitable for grass snake comprising the watercourses and associated ditch network. It is anticipated that the site will support brash and log piles which offer potential sheltering opportunities and cover for reptiles.

Badgers

2.1.1.39 A 2 km desk study for badgers returned 106 records.

2.1.1.40 A suite of field surveys in 2017 by HAL identified a “low density” of badger activity, with no main setts or associated setts (e.g. well used annex or subsidiary setts), observed. A suite of field surveys in 2019 by HWL was undertaken, whereby no evidence of badger was observed.

2.1.1.41 The woodland habitat located on site, and within 30 m of site, provides suitable sett building habitat for badgers, as well as the woodland, scrub and grassland providing optimal foraging and commuting habitat. The site is connected to habitats within the wider landscape (e.g. underpasses, hedgerows, lines of trees, watercourses) which offer further sett building with connectivity to woodlands and foraging and commuting habitat for badgers comprising agricultural fields and hedgerows.

Hazel Dormouse

2.1.1.42 A 2 km desk study for hazel dormouse returned no records. No EPSLs were returned as granted for hazel dormouse within the Desk Study Area.

2.1.1.43 A suite of field surveys in 2018 by HAL identified no evidence of dormice. A suite of field surveys in 2020 by HWL were also undertaken within Harmondsworth Moor, the results of this survey effort are currently unknown.

2.1.1.44 The woodland, hedgerow and scrub habitat within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area provides suitable terrestrial habitat to support breeding and hibernating dormice. The suitable habitat on site is connected to suitable hazel dormouse habitat within the wider landscape, comprising scrub, woodland and hedgerow networks.

Terrestrial Invertebrates

2.1.1.45 A 2 km desk study for terrestrial invertebrates returned two species of invertebrate species with protection against killing and injuring under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), with two records of marsh fritillary (*Euphydryas aurinia*) and one record of swallowtail butterfly (*Papilio*

machaon). No records of European protected invertebrate species with full protection were returned during the desk study. It is key to note that 3,241 records were returned for stag beetle, which is listed under citations for Richmond Park SAC, Wimbledon Common SAC, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC and Windsor Forest & Great Park SSSI.

2.1.1.46 A suite of field surveys in late August and early September 2017 by HAL identified 15 notable species within the HAL Study Area. Surveys recorded six 'nationally rare' red data book species comprising a fruitfly (*Acinia corniculata*), a parasitic fly (*Cistogaster globosa*), a snail-killing fly (*Dichetophora finlandica*), a yellow-faced bee (*Hylaeus (Lamdopsis) dilatatus*), a beetle (*Olibrus flavicornis*) and the Bee Wolf (a solitary wasp) (*Philanthus triangulum*).Surveys recorded seven 'nationally scarce' species comprising a solitary wasp (*Crossocerus (Crossocerus) distinguendus*), a cranefly (*Dicranomyia ventralis*), a ground bug (*Drymus (Drymus) latus*), Adonis' ladybird (*Hippodamia (Adonia) variegata*), a weevil (*Larinus planus*), a pollen beetle (*Meligethes fulvipes*) and a lauxaniid fly (*Sapromyza quadricincta*). Surveys also recorded two species of principle importance, brown-banded carder bee (*Bombus humilis*) and small heath butterfly (*Coenonympha pamphilus).*

2.1.1.47 The woodland, hedgerows, lines of trees, scrub, neutral grassland, and associated waterbodies / watercourses within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area are likely to support wide assemblages of terrestrial invertebrates. The areas of exposed bare ground and open soil also offer suitability. Standing deadwood would offer suitability, in particular for stag beetle. Habitats such as managed modified grassland, arable land and urban habitats are unlikely to support a diverse assemblage of terrestrial invertebrates due to their low botanical diversity.

2.1.1.48 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) species swallowtail butterfly, returned in the desk study, relies on principal plant species milk-parsley (*Peucedanum palustre*). Swallowtail butterflies require wet fens, marshes and reedbeds. Marshy grassland and reedbeds were noted as present within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area. Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) species marsh fritillary, returned in the desk study, relies on principal plant species devil's-bit scabious (*Succisa pratensis*). Marsh fritillary caterpillar also requires tussocky swards of marshy grassland for shelter and warmth. Marshy grassland was noted as present within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area.

Freshwater Fish

2.1.1.49 The freshwater fish baseline has been established using a combination of desk-based sources and previous field survey data presented in the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report. Existing information includes historical fish population surveys undertaken by the Environment Agency, previous ecological surveys commissioned in support of the Proposed Development,

and current fisheries datasets available through the Environment Agency Ecology and Fish Data Explorer (Environment Agency, 2026). Collectively, these sources provide an understanding of the distribution, composition and conservation importance of fish communities within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area.

2.1.1.50 Previous surveys used to inform the 2018 HAL scoping report identified a diverse freshwater fish assemblage typical of lowland rivers within the Thames catchment. Fish communities within the River Colne, Colne Brook, River Wraysbury, Longford River, Duke of Northumberland's River and associated connected watercourses are dominated by cyprinid species and include chub (*Squalius cephalus*), dace (*Leuciscus leuciscus*), roach (*Rutilus rutilus*), gudgeon (*Gobio gobio*), minnow (*Phoxinus phoxinus*), perch (*Perca fluviatilis*), pike (*Esox lucius*), stone loach (*Barbatula barbatula*), barbel (*Barbus barbus*), common bream (*Abramis brama*), tench (*Tinca tinca*) and three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*).

2.1.1.51 Previous baseline surveys also identified the presence of two species of elevated conservation importance: European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) and European bullhead (*Cottus gobio*). Historical Environment Agency monitoring has additionally recorded brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) within reaches of the River Wraysbury, indicating locally suitable habitat conditions and good ecological function within sections of the watercourse.

2.1.1.52 Recent Environment Agency freshwater fish surveys undertaken between 2020 and 2026 confirm that the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area continues to support a diverse and well-established fish community characteristic of the Lower Colne catchment (Environment Agency, 2026). A total of 24 fish taxa have been recorded, with chub and roach being the most frequently encountered species, followed by perch, bleak (*Alburnus alburnus*), dace, gudgeon, and pike. Other commonly recorded species include minnow, barbel, common bream, and tench, reflecting the diversity of habitats and flow conditions present throughout the river network. The assemblage remains strongly dominated by cyprinid species, with salmonids represented only occasionally.

2.1.1.53 The recent Environment Agency dataset also confirms the continued presence of species of conservation importance within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area. European eel, including juvenile life stages (elvers), were recorded on 34 occasions between 2022 and 2026, demonstrating the continued use of the catchment by this Critically Endangered migratory species. European eel is considered the principal fish species of conservation concern within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area owing to its Critically Endangered status and reliance on connectivity between freshwater and marine environments to complete its life cycle. European bullhead were also recorded and are considered to be of elevated conservation importance owing to their inclusion on Annex II of the Habitats Directive and their association with clean, well-oxygenated watercourses.

Less frequently recorded species include brown trout, ruffe (*Gymnocephalus cernua*), rudd (*Scardinius erythrophthalmus*), silver bream, stone loach, ten-spined stickleback and common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), reflecting localised variation in habitat conditions across the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area.

2.1.1.54 In addition to the connected river network, the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area and its immediate surroundings support a range of stillwater habitats, including reservoirs, former gravel extraction lakes, ponds and drainage ditches. The most notable of these comprise the large reservoir and gravel pit complexes associated with the Lower Colne catchment, including Wraysbury Reservoir, King George VI Reservoir and the extensive Wraysbury and Horton lake complexes. These waterbodies support diverse coarse fish assemblages and provide substantial areas of aquatic habitat within the wider landscape.

2.1.1.55 Many of these stillwater waterbodies are known to support established populations of coarse fish characteristic of the Lower Thames and Colne catchments, including cyprinid species such as roach, bream, tench and carp, together with predatory species including pike and perch. The large gravel pit fisheries within the Wraysbury and Horton complexes are recognised fisheries of regional and national angling importance, supporting established coarse fish populations and forming an important component of the wider aquatic environment surrounding the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area.

2.1.1.56 These stillwater habitats also contribute to ecological connectivity within the catchment. Although many waterbodies are partially isolated or managed for water supply or fisheries purposes, hydraulic connections with the River Thames and Lower Colne river network provide opportunities for the movement of fish between habitats. Such connectivity is particularly relevant for migratory species, including European eel, which may utilise a range of habitats throughout different stages of their life cycle, including rivers, channels, reservoirs, lakes and associated wetland habitats.

2.1.1.57 The watercourses and connected stillwater habitats within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area form part of the wider Lower Colne catchment and ultimately maintain hydrological connectivity with the River Thames, providing a potential migration corridor for diadromous fish species that move between freshwater and marine environments. In particular, European eel is known to utilise these connected habitats during upstream migration of juvenile life stages (elvers) and downstream migration of adults returning to the sea to spawn.

2.1.1.58 The Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area is located approximately 29 km upstream of the Normal Tidal Limit (NTL) of the River Thames at Teddington Lock and Weir (TQ 17017 71393), measured from the southern extent of the Site at Staines-upon-Thames (TQ 03367 71621). As such,

migratory fish species utilising the study area would be required to migrate upstream through the freshwater River Thames before entering one or more of the connected Lower Colne catchment watercourses, including the River Colne, Colne Brook, Wraysbury River and associated channels.

2.1.1.59 Of the fish species known or expected to occur within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area, European eel is the principal migratory species of conservation interest. Upstream migration into the catchment is expected to occur from the River Thames via hydrologically connected channels and watercourses, allowing access to a range of habitats including rivers, side channels, reservoirs, gravel pit lakes and drainage features.

2.1.1.60 In accordance with Environment Agency guidance (Environment Agency, 2025), eel life stages potentially present within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area, given the distance of the Proposed Development to the NTL is less than 30km may, are expected to comprise glass eels and elvers, together with larger yellow eel and silver eel life stages moving through, or residing within, connected freshwater habitats. The continued occurrence of European eel records within the catchment indicates that these habitats remain accessible despite the presence of existing water management structures and barriers to fish passage.

2.1.1.61 The Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area contains multiple barriers to fish passage, comprising weirs, sluices, culverts and other water management structures, which may influence the movement of both resident freshwater species and diadromous species migrating between freshwater and marine environments. Searches on the AMBER database (Environment Agency, 2026) database and River Obstacle database (Environment Agency, 2021) database have shown 78 barriers directly within The Site. The passability of these barriers is not specified in these datasets.

2.1.1.62 While many freshwater fish species recorded within the catchment can complete their life cycles within connected freshwater habitats, the passage of migratory species may be more sensitive to the cumulative effects of such barriers. The degree to which individual structures restrict fish movement varies according to their design, operation and prevailing flow conditions.

2.1.1.63 Notwithstanding the presence of these structures, recent records of European eel within the catchment confirm that a functional level of connectivity with the wider Thames system remains. The continued occurrence of this migratory species indicates that aquatic habitats within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area retain relevance for fish movements between freshwater and marine environments, although the distribution and abundance of migratory fish may be influenced by the extent and condition of existing fish passage opportunities.

2.1.1.64 Overall, the available evidence indicates that the watercourses within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area support a species-rich,

predominantly cyprinid-dominated fish assemblage comprising rheophilic species associated with faster-flowing habitats (e.g. barbel, dace and chub), limnophilic species associated with slower-flowing or impounded reaches (e.g. common bream, tench and carp), predatory species (e.g. pike and perch), benthic species (e.g. European bullhead and stone loach) and migratory species (European eel), with European eel and European bullhead representing the principal species of conservation interest recorded within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area. Salmonids occur only occasionally within the catchment, reflecting the predominantly lowland character of these watercourses. This assemblage is supported by a diverse network of connected aquatic habitats, including rivers, channels, reservoirs, gravel pit lakes, ponds and drainage features, which collectively contribute to habitat availability and ecological connectivity across the Lower Colne catchment. Although fish movement is influenced by the presence of multiple in-channel barriers and water management structures within the catchment, recent records of European eel demonstrate that functional connectivity with the wider River Thames system remains. The diversity and distribution of fish communities within the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area reflect the varied hydromorphological characteristics of the Lower Colne catchment and indicates a freshwater environment of high ecological value.

Freshwater Macrophytes

2.1.1.65 The freshwater macrophyte baseline has been established using field survey data presented in the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report and the 2020 PEIR, as well as novel data collected in summer 2026. These sources provide an understanding of the distribution, composition and conservation importance of macrophyte communities within the Macroinvertebrate and Macrophyte Field Survey Study Area.

2.1.1.66 Using Environment Agency data the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report generalised across all the water courses of the HAL Study Area that macrophyte assemblages were typical of slow flowing/ standing water (e.g. club rush (*Schoenoplectus lacustris*), yellow water-lily (*Nuphar lutea*), arrowhead (*Sagittaria sagittifolia*), least bur-reed (*Sparganium natans*) and common duckweed (*Lemna minor*)), and indicative of eutrophic (i.e. nutrient rich) conditions (e.g. fennel pondweed (*Stuckenia pectinata*) and fool's watercress (*Apium nodiflorum*)). The heavily modified nature of water courses in the HAL Study Area were found to constrain macrophyte populations, in particular in the Longford River and Duke of Northumberland's River, which are severely modified with reinforced concrete banks. In some reaches macrophyte communities were dominated by those planted within gabion baskets; for example, along the western boundary of the airport where common reed was recorded at over 70% coverage of the river. No protected aquatic vascular plant species were recorded in surveys carried out in the preceding ten years.

2.1.1.67 The 2020 HWL PEIR presented macrophyte data for 16 locations surveyed in September 2019, encompassing the Colne Brook, River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland's River, Stanwell Moor Ditch, Bonehead Ditch, River Ash, Bigley Ditch, and Poyle Channel. The 2019 data supported the 2018 EIA conclusions that macrophyte assemblages of the water courses surveyed were in general typical of elevated nutrient conditions and slow-flowing or standing water. However, a more meso-trophic and calcareous environment was represented by macrophytes in the Wraysbury River, with records of stream water-crowfoot (*Ranunculus penicillatus ssp. Pseudofluitans*), river water-dropwort (*Oenanthe fluviatilis*) and water-starwort (*Callitriche sp.*). As reported in the 2018 EIA, severe modification of the Longford River and Duke of Northumberland's River, and associated effects on macrophyte communities, were highlighted. The invasive species Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) was recorded throughout the Macroinvertebrate and Macrophyte Field Survey Study Area and floating pennywort (*Hydrocotyle ranunculoides*) was recorded in the River Colne and Wraysbury River (invasive species are considered further in Section 0).

2.1.1.68 Macrophyte surveys were carried out in summer 2026 on the Colne Brook, River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland's River, Stanwell Moor Ditch, Bonehead Ditch, River Ash and Longford River. Overall, the species recorded confirmed the findings of previous work, with dominant taxa those associated with slow flowing water and high levels of nutrients, for example reed sweet grass (*Glyceria maxima*), arrowhead (*Sagittaria sagittifolia*), branched bur reed (*Sparganium erectum*), and fool's watercress. As documented in the 2020 Preliminary Environmental Information Report, species associated with moderate levels of nutrients and calcareous water were also recorded, although these species were not limited to the Wraysbury River but were also recorded in the River Colne and Colne Brook. This included river water dropwort (*Oenanthe fluviatilis*), a nationally scarce plant, recorded in both the Wraysbury River, at an upstream control location, and in the Colne Brook towards the western extent of the Site (location CB-02b). Water crowfoot (Ranunculus (sect Batrachian)), the iconic plant species of chalk streams, was recorded in the River Colne at Staines Moor and in the Colne Brook at CB-02b. No protected species were recorded in any of the surveys.

Freshwater Macroinvertebrates

2.1.1.69 Aquatic macroinvertebrates were not characterised in detail in the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report. However, Environment Agency data were reviewed for species of conservation interest, with seven species of nationally notable status or greater recorded. Most notable was historical records of white clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*). This protected species is considered further in Section 2.1.1.78.

2.1.1.70 Macroinvertebrate surveys were carried out by APEM in spring and summer 2026 (and will be repeated in autumn); however, these samples have not yet been processed and therefore data are currently unavailable. Because of this, the freshwater macroinvertebrate baseline has primarily been established using the 2020 Preliminary Environmental Information Report. This source provides an understanding of the distribution, composition and conservation importance of macroinvertebrate communities within the Macroinvertebrate and Macrophyte Field Survey Study Area.

2.1.1.71 The 2020 PEIR reviewed historical Environment Agency data in conjunction with data for surveys carried out in summer 2019. In total, 16 locations were surveyed, encompassing the Colne Brook, River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland's River, Stanwell Moor Ditch, Bonehead Ditch, River Ash, Longford River, Bigley Ditch, and Poyle Channel.

2.1.1.72 Overall, macroinvertebrate communities were characterised as pollution tolerant, frequently including tolerance to excess deposition of fine sediment, and comprised mainly of common taxa. Less impacted communities, with moderate conservation value, were reported for the River Colne, the Wraysbury River and Bigley Ditch. A single notable species was recorded in the 2019 surveys in the Wraysbury River, on the western extent of Staines Moor. *Anacaena bipustulata* is a scavenger beetle associated with shallow wetland environments and slow flowing or stagnant water. It is not a protected species.

2.1.1.73 Invasive non-native macroinvertebrates were identified throughout the Macroinvertebrate and Macrophyte Field Survey Study Area; the demon shrimp (*Dikerogammarus haemobaphes*) was identified in the River Colne and Poyle Chanel; the freshwater shrimp *Crangonyx pseudogracilis* was identified in the River Colne, Duke of Northumberland's River, Colne Brook, Bigley Ditch and Poyle Channel; and American signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*) was recorded during walkover surveys of the River Colne. Invasive non-native macroinvertebrates are considered further in the following section..

2.1.1.74 The 2020 Preliminary Environmental Information Report acknowledged the limitation of using macroinvertebrate data from a single summer sampling window. Summer is not the optimal time to survey macroinvertebrates as life-stages can be too small for detection by the methods routinely used.

Invasive Non-Native Species

2.1.1.75 The INNS baseline has been compiled through open access INNS records accessed through the NBN Atlas (CC-BY-NC records removed), previous field survey data presented in the 2018 HAL EIA Scoping Report, and surveys carried out by APEM in spring and summer 2026 (see sections above).

2.1.1.76 Record sources include the Biological Records Centre, Botanical Society of Britain & Ireland, Freshwater Fish Recording Scheme, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Natural England, Birda, Mammal Society, Greenspace Information for Greater London CIC, British Trust for Ornithology, Environment Agency, Conchological Society of Great Britain & Ireland, and the Bat Conservation Trust (accessed August 2026). Collectively, these data provide an initial baseline understanding of the occurrence and distribution of INNS and NNS present within the Desk Study Area.

2.1.1.77 Eighty-five non-native species, including 52 INNS included on either the WFD UKTAG INNS list, Schedule 9 of the WCA, and Species of Union Concern (now known as Species of Special Concern) lists have been identified from the sources above within the Desk Study Area. Only records noted to species level were included in this baseline:

Table 2-2: INNS included on the WFD UKTAG, Schedule 9 of the WCA and Species of Special Concern recorded in the Desk Study Area and their associated designations

Scientific Name	Common Name	Designation(s)
Acorus calamus	Sweet-flag	WFD UKTAG Low Impact
Ailanthus altissima	Tree-of-heaven	Species of Special Concern
Aix galericulata	Mandarin duck	WCA Sch.9
Allium triquetrum	Three-cornered garlic	WCA Sch.9
Alopochen aegyptiaca	Egyptian goose	Species of Special Concern
Astacus leptodactylus	Turkish crayfish	WFD UKTAG Low Impact; WCA Sch.9
Azolla filiculoides	Water fern	WFD UKTAG High Impact; WCA Sch.9
Branta canadensis	Canada goose	Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Claytonia sibirica	Pink purslane	WFD UKTAG Low Impact

Scientific Name	Common Name	Designation(s)
Cotoneaster horizontalis	Wall cotoneaster	WCA Sch.9
Cotoneaster simonsii	Himalayan cotoneaster	WCA Sch.9
Crangonyx pseudogracilis	Northern river amphipod	WFD UKTAG Low Impact
Crassula helmsii	New Zealand Pigmyweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Crocosmia aurea x pottsii = C. x crocosmiiflora	Montbretia	WFD UKTAG Low Impact; WCA Sch.9
Ctenopharyngodon idella	Grass carp	WFD UKTAG Low Impact
Cyprinus carpio	Common carp	WFD UKTAG High Impact
Dikerogammarus haemobaphes	Demon shrimp	WFD UKTAG High Impact
Dreissena polymorpha	Zebra mussel	WFD UKTAG High Impact
Dreissena rostriformis bugensis	Quagga mussel	WFD UKTAG High Impact
Eichhornia crassipes	Water-hyacinth	WFD UKTAG Low Impact; Species of Special Concern
Elodea callitrichoides	South American waterweed	WFD UKTAG Low Impact; WCA Sch.9
Elodea canadensis	Canadian waterweed	WFD UKTAG Moderate Impact; WCA Sch.9
Elodea nuttallii	Nuttall's waterweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern
Gunnera manicata	Brazilian giant-rhubarb	WFD UKTAG High Impact
Gunnera tinctoria	Giant-rhubarb	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9

Scientific Name	Common Name	Designation(s)
Heracleum mantegazzianum	Giant hogweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Hydrocotyle ranunculoides	Floating pennywort	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern
Impatiens capensis	Orange balsam	WFD UKTAG Low Impact
Impatiens glandulifera	Himalayan Balsam	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Lagarosiphon major	Curly waterweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern;
Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. argentatum	Yellow archangel	WCA Sch.9
Lemna minuta	Least duckweed	WFD UKTAG Moderate Impact;
Muntiacus reevesi	Reeve's muntjac	Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Myriophyllum aquaticum	Parrot's-feather	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern
Neovison vison	American mink	Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Oncorhynchus mykiss	Rainbow trout	WFD UKTAG Low Impact
Pacifastacus leniusculus	Signal crayfish	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Parthenocissus inserta	False Virginia-creeper	WCA Sch.9
Parthenocissus quinquefolia	Virginia-creeper	WCA Sch.9
Pelophylax ridibundus	Marsh frog	WCA Sch.9
Phasianus colchicus	Pheasant	WCA Sch.9

Scientific Name	Common Name	Designation(s)
Pistia stratiotes	Water-lettuce	Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Potamopyrgus antipodarum	Jenkins' spire snail	WFD UKTAG Moderate Impact
Psittacula krameri	Ring-necked parakeet	WCA Sch.9
Reynoutria japonica	Japanese knotweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Reynoutria sachalinensis	Giant knotweed	WFD UKTAG High Impact; Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Rhododendron ponticum	Rhododendron	WFD UKTAG High Impact; WCA Sch.9
Robinia pseudoacacia	False-acacia	WCA Sch.9
Sagittaria latifolia	Duck-potato	WCA Sch.9
Sciurus carolinensis	Grey squirrel	Species of Special Concern; WCA Sch.9
Silurus glanis	Wels catfish	WFD UKTAG Low Impact; WCA Sch.9
Smyrnium perfoliatum	Perfoliate alexanders	WCA Sch.9

2.1.1.78 Thirty-five non-native species not listed on WFD UKTAG, Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act or Species of Special Concern were also recorded in the Desk Study Area:

Table 2-3: Non-native species not specified on WFD UKTAG, Schedule 9 WCA or Species of Special concern recorded within the Desk Study Area

Scientific Name	Common Name
Aponogeton distachyos	Cape-pondweed
Arbutus unedo	Strawberry-tree
Avena fatua	Wild-oat

Scientific Name	Common Name
Bistorta amplexicaulis	Red bistort
Buddleja davidii	Butterfly-bush
Carassius auratus	Goldfish
Chelicorophium curvispinum	Caspian mud shrimp
Cortaderia selloana	Pampas-grass
Eucalyptus gunnii	Cider Gum
Fagopyrum esculentum	Buckwheat
Fallopia baldschuanica	Russian-vine
Fallopia convolvulus	Black-bindweed
Harmonia axyridis	Harlequin ladybird
Iris filifolia x tingitana = I. x hollandica	Dutch iris
Iris germanica	Bearded iris
Lonicera japonica	Japanese honeysuckle
Nymphoides peltata	Fringed water-lily
Persicaria capitata	Pink-headed persicaria
Persicaria pensylvanica	Pinkweed
Petasites pyrenaicus	Winter heliotrope
Physella acuta	Physella
Polygonum arenarium	Lesser red-knotgrass
Polygonum arenarium subsp. pulchellum	Knotgrass species
Polygonum arenastrum	Equal-leaved knotgrass
Prunus laurocerasus	Cherry laurel
Rattus norvegicus	Brown rat
Rheum x rhabarbarum	Rhubarb

Scientific Name	Common Name
Rosa rugosa	Japanese rose
Rumex cristatus	Greek dock
Rutilus rutilus	Roach
Sisyrinchium bermudiana	Blue-eyed-grass
Sisyrinchium striatum	Pale yellow-eyed-grass
Stratiotes aloides	Water-soldier

White-Clawed Crayfish

2.1.1.79 Two records of white clawed crayfish are recorded within the Desk Study Area, while one record is historic (1900) the other, at the east of the site, is from 2010. There is also a single record of signal crayfish at this same location also from 2010, as well as signal crayfish within connected waterbodies also from 2010.

2.1.1.80 The presence of signal crayfish in the same waterbody as white-clawed crayfish poses a significant threat to the native species due to signal crayfish carrying crayfish plague (*Aphanomyces astaci*), which impacts white-clawed crayfish, but does not impact signal crayfish; and due to competition and aggression, in favour of signal crayfish, between the species.

3 Proposed approach to the assessment

3.1 Additional Baseline Information Required

2.1.1.81 The baseline environment is not static and is expected to change over time, irrespective of the Proposed Development. When undertaking impact assessments, it is therefore necessary to consider potential effects in the context of the range of environmental changes that may occur in the absence of the Proposed Development over its operational lifetime. This future baseline will be defined for the purpose of the EIA.

2.1.1.82 In relation to the current baseline, the future baseline will take into account anticipated future pressures, including those arising from ongoing anthropogenic activities and broader changes associated with climate change, such as global warming. Where relevant and where data are available, these considerations will be reflected in the assessment to ensure that potential effects are appropriately contextualised.

Additional UKHab Surveys

2.1.1.83 Additional UKHab surveys will be undertaken within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, in line with The UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 manual[21]. It is noted that as of May 2026, Version 2.1 of the manual is currently under consultation which may supersede existing guidance if implemented. Should this be the case prior to submission of the DCO Application, the habitat data will be updated accordingly.

Additional Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessments

2.1.1.84 Additional BNG baseline condition assessments will be undertaken within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area to inform the BNG Assessment / Outline Biodiversity Gain Plan, using The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology[22], unless superseded by a later version. The latest BNG policy for NSIPs, referred to in Table 1-3, outlines that habitats within the order limits that are considered ‘unimpacted by the development’ will not need to be included at the baseline, or BNG boundary, although applicants may choose to voluntarily include them. BNG condition assessments will be undertaken for all habitats at this stage, until it is understood the extent of habitats considered ‘unimpacted’.

[21] UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at https://www.ukhab.org)

[22] DEFRA (2026). Statutory biodiversity metric tools and guides. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides (accessed on: 22/07/2026).

Modular River Physical (MoRPh) Surveys

2.1.1.85 A Modular River Physical (MoRPh) survey will be undertaken on all applicable watercourses up to 50 m from the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, in line with The MoRPh Survey Technical Reference Manual 2019 Version[23]. Applicable watercourses will be identified following a review of UKHab survey results, OS Maps, MAGIC Maps and aerial imagery. The survey will be undertaken by a River Condition Assessment accredited agent who has undertaken the relevant accredited training course. The survey will be carried out using the River MoRPh methodology. The MoRPh survey is used in the river condition assessment to collect field information for subreach(es) of a watercourse with the aim of surveying at least 20% of the total watercourse length within the area of a proposed development. For assessing river condition, a MoRPh5 subreach survey is required which comprises of 5 contiguous MoRPh module surveys to capture information for subreaches. These 5 modules are placed at fixed points on the watercourse depending on the watercourse width. Although MoRPh surveys can be undertaken at any time of year, the surveys must be undertaken in low flow conditions and ideally during the optimal survey period is considered May to September, when aquatic vegetation is clearly visible. Ideal months for survey are considered May, June and September, when all vegetation is visible but not dense thus unlikely to result in access or observation constraints.

Additional Otter Surveys

2.1.1.86 Additional otter surveys will be undertaken on all applicable waterbodies within the Otter and Water Vole Study Area comprising both upstream and downstream, with a survey corridor of at least 50 m on each side of the waterbodies in line with Scottish Border Council Technical Advice Note 2, Otter Surveys[24]. During the survey, the suitability of the waterbodies and surrounding area to support otters will be assessed and surveyors will record any evidence of holts, feeding remains, slides, latrines, spraints and footprints. Particular attention will be paid to features such as reed beds, stream islands, tree roots and rabbit holes. All field signs will be noted during surveys, logging type, location, condition and age for later interpretation to distinguish any differences in habitat use and activity. Binoculars may be used to assist in the clear identification of field signs if necessary. The otter surveys can be undertaken at any time of year but ideally between April to September, avoiding periods of heavy rainfall and/or high water when evidence of otter may be washed away. In addition, heavy frost or snow can obscure evidence.

[23] Gurnell, A., England, J., Shuker, L., and Wharton, G. (2019). The MoRPh Survey Technical Reference Manual 2019 Version. Available from: https://modularriversurvey.org/wp-content/uploads/MoRPh-Manual-ver-11.pdf (accessed on: 22/07/2026).

[24] Scottish Borders Council (2017) Technical Advice Note 2, Otter Surveys. Available from: https://www.scotborders.gov.uk/downloads/file/2961/otters_technical_advice_note (accessed: 22/07/2026).

Additional Water Vole Surveys

2.1.1.87 Additional water vole surveys will be undertaken on all suitable waterbodies within the Otter and Water Vole Study Area comprising both upstream and downstream, with a survey corridor of at least 50 m on each side, a methodology derived from the Water Vole Mitigation Handbook[25]. The survey area will be assessed for its suitability to support water vole, considering habitat characteristics, bordering land use, vegetation type, bank profiles, stream depth, width and flow. Surveyors will also record potential pathways between suitable habitats and proposed construction activities. All accessible areas will be inspected for signs of water vole activity, including latrines, runs, footprints, burrows and feeding stations. Field signs will be recorded by type, location, condition and age to support interpretation of habitat use and activity. Binoculars may be used where necessary to confirm field signs. Two surveys are required for each waterbody: one between April and June and one between June and September. Surveys should avoid periods of heavy rainfall, high water, heavy frost or snow, as these conditions may obscure or remove evidence.

Additional GCN HSI Assessments and GCN eDNA Surveys

2.1.1.88 Additional HSI Assessments will be undertaken to assess the suitability of all waterbodies within the GCN Study Area in line with ARG UK Advice Note 5[26], as breeding and terrestrial habitat may be impacted through the proposed works. A HSI score is derived by allocating values to 10 different factors associated with the pond which are known to affect GCN. Some of the factors include the size of the water body, the water quality and macrophyte cover. These scores are used to calculate the overall HSI number between 0 and 1, with 0 being the least suitable to support GCN and 1 being the most suitable. Please note that a new methodology is currently under development[27], which may supersede existing guidance. Should this be the case prior to completing the HSI assessment, we will adopt the new methodology.

2.1.1.89 Additional eDNA surveys will be undertaken to determine presence or likely absence of all waterbodies within the GCN Study Area . The survey would be undertaken in line with SureScreen Scientifics Sample Collection Methodology[28]. An eDNA survey is a technique which can be used to detect GCN DNA in a waterbody and can be used to confirm presence or likely

[25] Dean, M., Strachan, R., Gow, D. and Andrews, R. M (2016). Water Vole Mitigation Handbook.

[26] ARG UK (2010). Great Crested Newt Habitat Suitability Index ARG UK Advice Note 5. Published May 2010. Available from: https://www.arguk.org/info-advice/advice-notes/9-great-crested-newt-habitat-suitability-index-arg-advice-note-5/file (accessed 22/07/2026).

[27] Seccombe, E. & Salguero-Gomez, R. (2024). An improved habitat suitability index for the great crested newt Triturus cristatus. Herpetological Journal 34(2) p55-67.

[28] SureScreen Scientifics (2026). Great crested newt eDNA sample collection guide. Available from: https://www.surescreenscientifics.com/blog/great-crested-newt-edna-sample-collection-guide/ (accessed 22/07/2026).

absence of GCN. It requires one daytime visit per waterbody (between 15th April and 30th June) to collect water samples, which are then tested in a laboratory for the presence of GCN DNA. The results are then returned with details of a positive or negative detection. If the waterbodies return a positive result, traditional GCN presence / absence and population surveys may be required between March - June. The eDNA surveys will be undertaken by a licenced (or accredited) GCN ecologist.

NVC Surveys

2.1.1.90 NVC are typically required for projects of this complex and large-scale, in addition to projects which may affect an SSSI and/or other designated sites. NVC surveys may also be triggered as required following the results of the UKHab survey, if rare plant communities or individual plants are identified. Discrete stands of vegetation will be identified on-site and mapped separately. Surveyors will use quadrats within each stand of vegetation (as appropriate)[29]. At this stage, it is anticipated NVC surveys will be undertaken in line with previous NVC surveys within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, inclusive of Staines Moor SSSI, Harmondsworth Moor and Bedfont Court West. The visits should be undertaken during the optimal botanical period relevant to the habitat type targeted for survey, generally between May and August (inclusive). If a stand of vegetation does not correlate strongly to a recognised NVC community (or comprises a complex mosaic of vegetation) the closest match will be assigned with an explanation as to why this community was mapped as such or, in the case of mosaics, the vegetation communities present within the stand will all be listed. The recognised NVC communities are not entirely comprehensive and occasionally vegetation occurs with little correlation to published communities. In this case, APEM will use a 'common-sense' approach to mapping the vegetation.

Hedgerow Regulations Surveys

2.1.1.91 It is anticipated that hedgerows will be proposed for either full, or partial removal to facilitate the development. Some hedgerows are afforded legal protection if they meet specific criteria set out in the Hedgerow Regulations Act 1997. A hedgerow survey should be undertaken on all hedgerows proposed for removal (full or partial), to determine if the hedgerow meets the criteria set out in the Regulations and if it is deemed to be an 'Important' hedgerow. The hedgerow survey will comprise completing an assessment of the hedgerow in accordance with the Hedgerow Survey Handbook 2nd Edition[30]. Notes will be made on the type, shape, length of the hedgerow as well as the number of woody species. The visits should be undertaken during the optimal botanical period, considered April to October (inclusive).

[29] Rodwell, J.S. (2006) NVC Users' Handbook, JNCC, Peterborough, ISBN 978 1 86107 574 1.

[30] DEFRA (2007). Hedgerow Survey Handbook A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6863a03d08bf2f5376121a64/hedgerow-survey-handbook__corrected_01.07.25_.pdf (accessed on 22/07/2026).

Hedgerow regulations surveys are ideally undertaken in the peak months of June to July.

Bat Surveys

2.1.1.92 A suite of bat activity surveys comprising Night-Time Bat Walkovers (NBW) and static monitoring, is recommended to be undertaken across targeted areas within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, in line with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist: Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition[31]. A targeted approach will be undertaken for the bat activity surveys within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area and will be informed by results from the UKHab which will collect information equivalent to that of a Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW). It is currently assumed that the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area is considered to be at least moderate suitability habitat for bats, requiring one NBW per season (spring – April/May, summer – June/July/August, autumn – September/October). The surveyors will walk a pre-determined route in each targeted survey area taking acoustic recordings and notes on bat activity and behaviour. The approach will be responsive and dynamic, stopping or making a detour where appropriate to observe bat activity. Night Vision Aids (NVAs) will be utilised (if deemed appropriate) to overcome the constraint of low light levels and cluttered environments. In addition, automated/static bat detectors will be deployed for a minimum of five consecutive nights per month (April to October). All surveys will be undertaken in appropriate weather conditions for bats.

2.1.1.93 A Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) survey will be undertaken of all trees to be impacted by the proposed development within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area, in line with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist: Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition. It may not be possible to assess all trees, particularly those in residential properties and as such, consultation is being sought with Natural England through the Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) to discuss how these limitations can be overcome. Trees will be assessed from the ground using binoculars and high-power torches for the presence of Potential Roost Features (PRFs), such as knot holes, hazard beams, or flaking bark. The aim of the survey is to determine the actual or potential presence of bats, and the need for further survey and / or mitigation. The GLTA survey can be undertaken at any time of year, but the optimal survey period is between November to March when trees are not in leaf as this may obscure PRFs. Each tree will be classified as either “None” (no PRFs present), “PRF” (PRFs present) or “FAR” (Further Assessment Required - where the presence of PRFs cannot be ruled out). Where trees are classified as “PRF” or “FAR” further surveys such as aerial inspection or presence / absence surveys may be required. Where possible, each PRFs will be further categorised (where practicable) as either PRF-I (only suitable for small numbers of bats) or PRF-M (suitable for multiple bats or maternity colony) from ground level. It is anticipated that the GLTA will be undertaken once the Order Limits is revised, to target areas being impacted under the development proposals.

[31] Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust: London. ISBN-978-1-7395126-0-6.

2.1.1.94 Following the GLTA, described above, trees classified as “PRF-M” will require three surveys undertaken a minimum of three weeks apart between May to September, with at least two within May to August, in line with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist: Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition. Bats are highly mobile animals, and can switch roosts every two to three days, utilising a large number of trees within their home range. Further survey effort may be undertaken through aerial inspection or presence / absence surveys. A suite of presence / absence surveys would utilise full spectrum acoustic bat recorders. The number of NVAs required would be determined during the GTLA. The tree will be illuminated by sufficient infra-red lights to ensure adequate coverage and illumination. All acoustic data will be analysed using Wildlife Acoustics Kaleidoscope Pro software using auto ID with all positive recordings assessed by bat ecologist for accuracy of identification. Infra-red video footage will be analysed using motion detection software such as Motion Meerkat to isolate emergence events in a consistent manner and precisely identify the location of bat emergence. A suite of aerial inspection surveys would involve a suitably qualified ecologist to inspect the PRF-M using an endoscope for presence or evidence of bats. The same methodology can be applied to trees classified as “FAR”, to determine whether PRFs are present and whether PRFs are “PRF-I” or “PRF-M”. An aerial inspection survey can either be undertaken by an ecologist with specific training in Tree Climbing and Aerial Rescue, on a ladder, scaffold tower or a Mobile Elevated Working Platform (MEWP).

2.1.1.95 It is anticipated there is a high likelihood of inaccessibility to the vast majority of buildings and structures within the Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area, to be able to undertake Preliminary Roost Assessments (PRA) or Hibernation Surveys. Based on the current Proposed Development, it is anticipated that a large number of structures and buildings will be demolished to facilitate the works. Consultation with Natural England will be undertaken to review the proposed survey approach and agree appropriate mitigation and compensation to overcome any significant limitations posed by access constraints, with particular regard to roosting and hibernating bats.

Reptile Surveys

2.1.1.96 Reptile surveys will be undertaken the presence / likely absence of reptiles across targeted suitable habitat within the Terrestrial Ecological Field Survey Study Area. Reptile surveys require a total of eight visits. The first visit involves the deployment of artificial refuges (1 m x 0.5 m approximate rectangles of black roofing felt and / or corrugated metal), which are then left in situ for one week, to allow ‘bedding in’. The refugia is then checked for reptiles seven times by a suitably qualified ecologist, with the refugia collected following the final survey visit. Reptiles are active between March and October and surveys are best carried out during April, May and September, in periods when reptiles are most visible. Survey effectiveness is influenced by weather conditions. During the summer months (June to

August) reptiles are more challenging to detect as they bask less and make less use of refugia.

Hazel Dormouse Surveys

2.1.1.97 Hazel dormouse are known to be present within Greater London[32], and the works will involve the removal of suitable dormouse habitat e.g. woodland, hedgerows, scrub. A suite of hazel dormouse surveys will be undertaken following best practice guidance set out for surveying dormice using nest tubes (and footprint tunnels if deemed appropriate) per the latest Dormouse Mitigation Handbook[33]. The guidance suggests that where a site consists mainly of hedgerows, it may be more practical to cover the site by putting out several clusters of tubes with a minimum of 50 tubes or footprint tunnels should be used in each section of the Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area. The Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area also includes some areas of woodland, which will be subject to the same survey effort. It is proposed that 50 nest tubes are deployed at 15 – 20 m intervals (where feasible) across targeted survey areas within the Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area. The survey areas will include varying habitat quality for dormice (woodland, scrub, hedgerows) to ensure a representative survey sample is undertaken on Site. The surveys should be undertaken between May to October. The deployment and checking of dormouse tubes will be undertaken by a licenced (or accredited) dormouse ecologist who will place the tubes within optimal dormouse habitat. Dormouse tubes will be collected in during the final check.

Terrestrial Invertebrate Surveys

2.1.1.98 Terrestrial invertebrate surveys are recommended within the Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area, through the design of a standardised survey methodology, based on Common Standards Monitoring (CSM) guidelines prepared by Natural England[34], to ensure that the surveys provide a fairly broad taxonomic coverage. The surveys will cover the different habitats within targeted locations within the Terrestrial Ecology Field Survey Study Area (informed by the UKHab data). The surveys will incorporate surveying several transects/quadrats/plots utilising an array of different invertebrate sampling techniques, based on which is most appropriate.

Freshwater Fish Surveys

2.1.1.99 To update the baseline for the Environmental Statement, contemporary Environment Agency fisheries collected data since 2021 should be reviewed

[32] PTES (2016). Current dormouse distribution. Available from: https://ptes.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Current-Dormouse-Distribution-Map.png (accessed on 22/07/2026).

[33] Wells, D., Chanin, P. and Gubert, L. (2025). *Dormouse Mitigation Handbook*. The Mammal Society.

[34] Drake, C. M., Lott, D. A., Alexander, K. N. A., and Webb, J. (2007). Surveying terrestrial and freshwater invertebrates for conservation evaluation. Published 11th December 2007. Available from: https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/36002 (accessed on 22/07/2026).

alongside any additional ecological information available for the Freshwater Fish Field Survey Study Area. This will be supplemented by targeted field surveys undertaken by APEM in September 2026 and 2027. Combined fisheries population assessments and fisheries habitat walkovers will be undertaken at 28 survey locations within the Site and on hydrologically connected watercourses extending up to 2 km beyond the Site where appropriate. The surveys will verify the continued presence of previously recorded species, identify any changes in fish community composition and provide an up-to-date characterisation of fisheries' habitats. Fisheries habitat walkovers will extend 500 m upstream and 500 m downstream of each survey location and will record habitat characteristics, geomorphological features, flow types and potential barriers to fish migration in accordance with the methodology of Hendry and Cragg-Hine (1997). The future baseline will take account of reasonably foreseeable changes to the freshwater environment prior to implementation of the Proposed Development. This will include consideration of trends in fish community composition, Water Framework Directive waterbody status, known river restoration and flood risk management schemes, and other committed developments that have the potential to influence baseline conditions.

Additional Freshwater Aquatic Macroinvertebrate and Macrophyte Surveys

2.1.1.100 Additional aquatic macroinvertebrate surveys are recommended to ensure that sufficient up to date baseline data are available for assessment. Following discussions with the EA (26/09/2019) during the initial scoping phase, spring (March to May inclusive), summer (June to August inclusive) and autumn (September to November inclusive) samples were recommended in order to capture seasonal variation in species assemblage. Samples will be collected in autumn 2026 (spring and summer 2026 samples have already been collected) and 2027 (autumn 2027 sampling will not be possible as all data are to be collected by August 2027). Standard three-minute pond-net samples will be collected following the EA Operational Instruction 018_08 Issued 01/03/2017 which is compliant with WFD-UKTAG guidance[35]. Water bodies included within scope are the River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland's River, Longford River, Colne Brook, Horton Brook, Poyle Channel, Bigley Ditch, Stanwell Moor Ditch, Bonehead Ditch, River Ash and Staines Reservoir Aqueduct. Assessment of potential impacts on the macroinvertebrate community will be made in the context of the baseline condition, using a suite of diagnostic biotic indices designed to detect the biological effects of water and habitat quality. Any protected or notable species will be identified, and their relative conservation status will be reported.

[35] WFD-UKTAG (2023). UKTAG River Assessment Method Benthic Invertebrate Fauna. Available from: https://www.wfduk.org/sites/default/files/River%20Invertebrates%20WHPT%20UKTAG%20Method%20Statement%20-%20updated%20July%202023.pdf (accessed on: 21/09/2026).

2.1.1.101 Additional aquatic macrophyte surveys are recommended to ensure that sufficient up to date baseline data are available for assessment. A macrophyte survey programme was developed for 2026 and 2027, enabling a two year baseline. Summer (June – September) surveys will follow LEAFPACS survey methodology which is compliant with WFD-UKTAG guidance. 16 repeat surveys will be undertaken in 2027 at the same locations as the 2019 surveys. In addition, 9 further sites have been identified for survey. There will be a total of 25 sites covering River Colne, Wraysbury River, Duke of Northumberland's River, Longford River, Colne Brook, Horton Brook, Poyle Channel, Bigley Ditch, Stanwell Moor Ditch, Bonehead Ditch and River Ash. Macrophyte data will be processed using LEAFPACS2 to produce standard metrics and obtain indicative WFD classifications for individual surveys. Any protected or notable species will be identified, and their relative conservation status will be reported. These data will be used to understand the current baseline condition of the water bodies.

2.1.1.102 The survey programme in 2019 did not encompass lentic (still) water bodies. Pond and lake surveys will be carried out in summer 2027 in order to ensure baseline representation of pond/ lake habitats. Predictive SYstem for Multimetrics (PSYM) surveys, developed by the Freshwater Habitats Trust and the Environment Agency, are recommended for ponds. The method is for use in the summer season (June to August) and based on two biological receptors (aquatic macroinvertebrates and plants). Environmental data will be used to predict which plants and animals would be expected to be present if the pond/ lake were in a natural condition (reference state). Survey data (plant and macroinvertebrate species observed) will then be compared with the reference state (plant and macroinvertebrate species expected). A metric score will provide a single value which summarises the overall ecological quality of the water body (ranging between poor and pristine state). Any protected or notable species will be identified, and their relative conservation status will be reported.

2.1.1.103 Phytoplankton sampling of four reservoirs within the Study Area is recommended if not otherwise being collected by the Environment Agency as part of their routine environmental monitoring programme. The reservoirs identified within a 50 m buffer of the Scoping Boundary are King George VI Reservoir, Staines Reservoir North, Staines Reservoir South and Wraysbury Reservoir. The number of reservoirs and/ or samples required may change following consultation with the Environment Agency. Phytoplankton sampling and analysis will follow WFD-UKTAG guidance which is compliant with the WFD. The methodology requires collecting 12 months of Chlorophyll-a data over a 12 month period to capture the full extent of algal growing season in the UK. Phytoplankton species composition samples will be collected monthly between July and August 2027 (September ideally would also be included; however, data collection must be completed in August 2027). Phytoplankton assessment comprises three metrics, which are combined and used to calculate and Ecological Quality Ratio (EQR) for the water body and indicative WFD status. The metrics are phytoplankton abundance

(measured using chlorophyll-*a*), phytoplankton species composition (a plankton trophic index is calculated using the biovolume of taxa present in the late summer), and bloom intensity (biovolume of cyanobacteria).

Invasive Non-Native Species Surveys

2.1.1.104 To update the baseline for the ES, up to date INNS records will be requested from Local Environmental Record Centre and/ or gathered National Biodiversity Network Atlas will be reviewed alongside any additional ecological information available for the Study Area. Environmental DNA (eDNA) surveys are also proposed to establish the presence of targeted high-priority INNS (American signal crayfish *(Pacifastacus leniusculus*) and mussels, including zebra and quagga mussels and Asian pea clam (Family: Dreissenidae and Veneridae)) across selected still waters within the Study Area. Walkover surveys for INNS will also be conducted to provide more robust information on the current distribution of INNS within the Study Area using a rapid assessment approach. This survey will provide point data on location of key high priority INNS.

2.1.1.105 The survey programme will prioritise eight water bodies from within the Study Area. The final locations will be selected to provide representative spatial coverage across the Study Area, taking account of the size of the Study Area and the hydrological connectivity between waterbodies. A maximum of 10 eDNA samples will be collected from each waterbody in accordance with the latest WFD UKTAG and best practice guidance. It is assumed that all sampling will be undertaken on foot from the littoral margins of each waterbody, with no requirement for boat access. Sample locations will be distributed as evenly as practicable around the perimeter of each waterbody, with preference given to areas supporting suitable habitat for the target species where present. eDNA assays will also be included for the detection of Native European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) all eight water bodies sampled. Whilst undertaking the eDNA sampling, the surveyors will also complete targeted walkover surveys of the surrounding aquatic and riparian habitats to record the presence of INNS. Particular attention will be given to riparian margins, accessible shallow water habitats, macrophyte stands and other habitats considered suitable for priority INNS. All INNS observations will be georeferenced, with estimates of abundance or density recorded where appropriate. Representative photographs of INNS records will be obtained where practicable and incorporated into the wider biodiversity baseline for the Environmental Statement.

White-Clawed Crayfish Surveys

2.1.1.106 White-clawed crayfish surveys are proposed to determine the presence or likely absence of the species within suitable aquatic habitats in the overall Study Area. The survey methodology is subject to consultation with, and agreement from, the client and relevant regulator. Given that white-clawed crayfish, if present, are anticipated to occur at low densities, a multi-method survey approach is proposed comprising both eDNA sampling and refuge

trapping surveys. The combined methodology is intended to maximise survey confidence and increase the likelihood of detecting the species across a range of habitat conditions. The eDNA survey will comprise a maximum of 160 water samples collected by two suitably experienced surveyors across eight waterbodies identified as having suitable habitat for white-clawed crayfish following the desk study. Sample collection will be undertaken in accordance with current best practice guidance, including appropriate biosecurity measures to minimise the risk of contamination and disease transfer. Water samples will be analysed using a species-specific quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) assay to determine the presence of white-clawed crayfish DNA. To supplement the eDNA surveys, traditional refuge trapping surveys will be undertaken to provide additional confidence in determining the presence or likely absence of the species. It is assumed that up to 400 refuge traps will be deployed by two suitably qualified surveyors across the eight survey locations. Trap locations will be informed by the findings of the desk-based assessment and the eDNA survey results and will be distributed to provide representative spatial coverage of suitable habitat. Refuges will remain in situ for three days and will be checked on two consecutive nights before being removed following completion of the survey. All survey activities will be undertaken in accordance with recognised biosecurity guidance and the relevant licence conditions. All surveys will be undertaken in accordance with the conditions of the appropriate statutory survey licence (CL11) and will be carried out during the optimal survey period between July and September.

Appendix 10.1

Community Baseline

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 10.1 – Community Baseline

Contents

1 Community Baseline 1

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Community Area Definition 3

1.3 Sources of data used in the baseline preparation 7

1.4 Approach to refining the baseline 7

1.5 Baseline conditions 8

1.6 West Drayton Community Area Baseline 8

1.7 Hayes Community Area Baseline 10

1.8 Longford Community Area Baseline 11

1.9 Harmondsworth Community Area Baseline 11

1.10 Sipson Community Area Baseline 12

1.11 Cranford Cross Community Area Baseline 13

1.12 Cranford Community Area Baseline 13

1.13 Heston Community Area Baseline 14

1.14 Feltham North Community Area Baseline 16

1.15 Bedfont Community Area Baseline 17

1.16 Stanwell Community Area Baseline 18

1.17 Stanwell Moor Community Area Baseline 19

1.18 Poyle Community Area Baseline 20

1.19 Colnbrook Community Area Baseline 20

1.20 Brands Hill Community Area Baseline 20

1.21 Hounslow (West and Heath) Community Area Baseline 21

1.22 Iver and Richings Park Community Area Baseline 23

1.23 Harlington Community Area Baseline 24

1.24 North Staines Community Area Baseline 25

1.25 Horton and Wraysbury Community Area Baseline 25

1.26 Langley Community Area Baseline 26

Tables

Table 1-1: Baseline information location 1

Table 1-2: Community Area definition 3

Table 1-3: Sources of baseline data 7

Table 1-4: West Drayton community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 8

Table 1-5: Hayes community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 10

Table 1-6: Hayes: public services initial baseline 10

Table 1-7: Longford community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 11

Table 1-8: Harmondsworth community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 11

Table 1-9: Harmondsworth: public services initial baseline 12

Table 1-10: Sipson community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 12

Table 1-11: Cranford Cross community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 13

Table 1-12: Cranford community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 13

Table 1-13: Heston community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 14

Table 1-14: Feltham North community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 16

Table 1-15: Feltham North: public services initial baseline 17

Table 1-16: Bedfont community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 17

Table 1-17: Stanwell community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 18

Table 1-18: Stanwell: public services initial baseline 19

Table 1-19: Stanwell Moor community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 19

Table 1-20: Poyle community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 20

Table 1-21: Colnbrook community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 20

Table 1-22: Brands Hill community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 20

Table 1-23: Hounslow (West and Heath) community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 21

Table 1-24: Iver and Richings Park community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 23

Table 1-25: Harlington community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 24

Table 1-26: North Staines community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 25

Table 1-27: Horton and Wraysbury community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 25

Table 1-28: Langley community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline 26

1 Community Baseline

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1.1 This appendix should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 10: Community** of the Scoping Report. This appendix sets out:

- An initial review of the baseline characteristics of the study areas considered in the community assessment for the purposes of establishing sensitivity of receptors, pertaining to communities.
- Provisional of receptors to be used for the purposes of the assessment, including community facilities and community-facing businesses and the public services[1]potentially affected by the Proposed Development. This will be subject to refinement according to the rationale set out in **Chapter 10: Community** and described below.

1.1.1.2 The remainder of this appendix covers these baseline characteristics and receptors where relevant to the community assessment areas proposed to be used for the respective scoped-in effects (refer to **Section 10.4 of the Scoping Report**).

1.1.1.3 Baseline information is presented for each of the Community Areas that together comprise the Inner Study Area ('ISA').

1.1.1.4 Baseline information is presented insofar as it represents a receptor for the community assessment (residents, homes and the housing market, communities, community facilities and community-facing businesses, and public services and users/beneficiaries of those services). Relevant baseline data that describes these receptors in relation to demography and housing is also presented in **Appendix 14.1** rather than being duplicated here but nonetheless being relevant, as shown in **Table 1-1** below.

1.1.1.5 For each Community Area, where there are no identified community facilities and community-facing businesses or public services of any given type, these rows are omitted.

Table 1-1: Baseline information location

Receptor	Appendix 10.1	Appendix 14.1
Residents		• Population

[1] Public services relate specifically to the physical assets that support emergency services, and are hence made up of the following list: Police service facilities and operations, fire service facilities and operations, ambulance service facilities and operations, and emergency healthcare facilities including hospitals.

Receptor	Appendix 10.1	Appendix 14.1
		• Population demographic profile • Population density • Population growth • Population projections
Homes and the housing market		• Number of households • Household size • Accommodation type • Accommodation tenure • Occupancy rating for bedrooms • Household composition
Communities	• Community Needs Index	• Indices of deprivation • Age profile • Ethnicity • Gender • Religion • General health • Disability • Working age residents • Economic activity • Qualifications • Occupation • Car or van availability • Industry
Community facilities and community-facing businesses and users of those facilities	• GPs • Pharmacies • Dentists • Early year facilities • Primary schools • Secondary schools • Post-16 schools • All-through schools • Independent schools • Places of worship • Community centres • Public houses • Post offices • Libraries • Children's centres • Youth centres • Sport facilities	Not applicable
Public services and	• Police service facilities and operations	Not applicable

Receptor	Appendix 10.1	Appendix 14.1
users/beneficiaries of those services	• Fire service facilities and operations • Emergency healthcare facilities including hospitals • Ambulance service facilities and operations	

1.2 Community Area Definition

1.2.1.1 The approach to defining the Community Areas is set out in detail in **Chapter 10: Community** of the Scoping Report. The rationale for including Community Areas, and the proposed approach for identifying additional areas and/or refining the current list is also presented.

1.2.1.2 Community Areas are defined using output areas[2]. The output areas and relevant local authorities in which the Community Areas are located are shown in the table below.

Table 1-2: Community Area definition

Community Area	Output Area Definition
West Drayton	E00012174, E00012203, E00012204, E00012205, E00012206, E00012207, E00012208, E00012566, E00012567, E00012568, E00012569, E00012570, E00012571, E00012572, E00012573, E00012574, E00012575, E00012576, E00012577, E00012578, E00012579, E00012580, E00012581, E00012582, E00012583, E00012584, E00012585, E00012587, E00012590, E00012591, E00012592, E00012593, E00012594, E00012595, E00012596, E00012597, E00012599, E00012600, E00012601, E00012602, E00012603, E00176471, E00176472, E00176473, E00184388, E00184396, E00184405, E00184412, E00184419, E00184423, E00184425, E00184444, E00184458, E00184463, E00184465, E00184479, E00184507, E00184524
Hayes	E00012384, E00012385, E00012386, E00012387, E00012388, E00012389, E00012390, E00012391, E00012392, E00012393, E00012394, E00012395, E00012396, E00012397, E00012398, E00012399, E00012400, E00012401, E00012402, E00012403, E00012404, E00012405, E00012406, E00012407, E00012408,

[2] Output areas are small geographical units with broadly consistent population sizes used in the reporting of national statistics.

Community Area	Output Area Definition
	E00012409, E00012410, E00012411, E00012412, E00012413, E00012414, E00012415, E00012416, E00012417, E00012418, E00012419
Longford	E00012179, E00012202
Harmondsworth	E00012181, E00012184, E00012185, E00012188, E00012198
Sipson	E00012175, E00012183, E00012191
Cranford Cross	E00012196, E00012200, E00012201, E00184410, E00184476
Cranford	E00012858, E00012860, E00012862, E00012864, E00012879, E00012880, E00012881, E00012882, E00012883, E00012884, E00012885, E00012886, E00012887, E00012888, E00013089, E00013091, E00013112
Heston	E00013024, E00013025, E00013026, E00013027, E00013028, E00013029, E00013030, E00013031, E00013032, E00013035, E00013036, E00013037, E00013038, E00013039, E00013040, E00013041, E00013043, E00013044, E00013045, E00013046, E00013047, E00013048, E00013049, E00013050, E00013051, E00013052, E00013053, E00013054, E00013055, E00013056, E00013057, E00013058, E00013059, E00013060, E00013061, E00013062, E00013063, E00013064, E00013065, E00013066, E00013067, E00013068, E00013070, E00013071, E00013072, E00013074, E00013075, E00013076, E00013078, E00013079, E00013080, E00013081, E00013082, E00013083, E00013084, E00013085, E00013086, E00013087, E00013088, E00013090, E00013092, E00013093, E00013094, E00013095, E00013096, E00013097, E00013098, E00013099, E00013100, E00013101, E00013102, E00013103, E00013104, E00013105, E00013106, E00013107, E00013108, E00013109, E00013110, E00013111, E00013113, E00013114, E00013115, E00179103, E00179111, E00179130, E00179158, E00179159, E00179183, E00179200, E00179202, E00179209, E00179245, E00179256, E00179269, E00179273
Feltham North	E00012889, E00012890, E00012891, E00012892, E00012893, E00012894, E00012895, E00012896, E00012897, E00012898, E00012899, E00012900, E00012902, E00012903, E00012904, E00012905, E00012906, E00012907, E00012908, E00012909, E00012910, E00012911, E00012912, E00012913, E00012914,

Community Area	Output Area Definition
	E00012915, E00012916, E00012917, E00012918, E00012919, E00179142, E00179240, E00179270
Bedfont	E00012713, E00012714, E00012715, E00012716, E00012717, E00012719, E00012720, E00012721, E00012722, E00012723, E00012724, E00012725, E00012726, E00012727, E00012728, E00012729, E00012730, E00012731, E00012732, E00012733, E00012734, E00012735, E00012736, E00012738, E00012739, E00012740, E00012742, E00012744, E00012745, E00166034, E00168182, E00168863, E00168873, E00168894, E00012741, E00012743
Stanwell	E00156590, E00156591, E00156592, E00156594, E00156595, E00156596, E00156597, E00156598, E00156599, E00156600, E00156601, E00156602, E00156603, E00156604, E00156605, E00156606, E00156607, E00156608, E00156609, E00156610, E00156611, E00156612, E00156776, E00156777, E00156778, E00156779, E00156780, E00156781, E00156782, E00156783, E00156784, E00156785, E00156786, E00156787, E00156788, E00156789, E00156790, E00156791, E00156792, E00156794, E00156798, E00156799, E00156800, E00156801, E00167804, E00167805, E00167806, E00180580, E00180622, E00180646
Stanwell Moor	E00156793, E00156795, E00156796, E00156797
Poyle	E00083225, E00083227, E00083228, E00083229, E00083230
Colnbrook	E00083215, E00083216, E00083221, E00083223, E00083224, E00083226
Brands Hill	E00083214, E00083217, E00083218, E00083219, E00083220, E00083231, E00083222
Hounslow (West and Heath)	E00013150, E00013152, E00013153, E00013154, E00013155, E00013156, E00013157, E00013158, E00013159, E00013160, E00013161, E00013162, E00013163, E00013164, E00013166, E00013167, E00013168, E00013169, E00013170, E00013171, E00013172, E00013174, E00013175, E00013177, E00013178, E00013179, E00013180, E00013181, E00013182, E00013214, E00013215, E00013217, E00013221, E00013222, E00013223, E00013224, E00013225, E00013226, E00013227, E00013228, E00013232, E00013233, E00013234, E00013235, E00013236, E00013237, E00013238, E00013239, E00013241, E00166036, E00166037, E00168199, E00168850, E00168852, E00168853, E00168855, E00179088, E00179090, E00179094, E00179095,

Community Area	Output Area Definition
	E00179098, E00179101, E00179104, E00179122, E00179132, E00179137, E00179143, E00179165, E00179168, E00179171, E00179179, E00179190, E00179217, E00179228, E00179231, E00179242, E00179244, E00179272, E00012859, E00012861, E00012863, E00012865, E00012866, E00012867, E00012868, E00012869, E00012870, E00012871, E00012872, E00012873, E00012875, E00012876, E00012877, E00012878, E00179121, E00179155
Iver and Richings Park	E00089950, E00089956, E00089958, E00089959, E00089960, E00089961, E00089949, E00089951, E00089952, E00089953, E00089954, E00089955, E00089957, E00089962, E00089963
Harlington	E00012176, E00012177, E00012178, E00012180, E00012182, E00012186, E00012187, E00012189, E00012190, E00012192, E00012194, E00012195, E00012197, E00012199
North Staines	E00156737, E00156740, E00156741, E00156742, E00156743, E00156744, E00156745, E00156747, E00156748, E00180601, E00180610, E00180627, E00156727, E00180612, E00180618
Horton and Wraysbury	E00083680, E00083681, E00083682, E00083683, E00083684, E00083685, E00083686, E00083687, E00083688, E00083689, E00083690, E00083691, E00083692, E00083693, E00083694
Langley	E00083258, E00083259, E00083260, E00083261, E00083262, E00083263, E00083264, E00083265, E00083266, E00083267, E00083268, E00083269, E00083270, E00083271, E00083272, E00083273, E00083274, E00083275, E00083276, E00083278, E00083279, E00083312, E00083313, E00083314, E00083315, E00083316, E00083317, E00083318, E00083319, E00083320, E00083321, E00083322, E00083323, E00083324, E00083325, E00083326, E00083327, E00083328, E00083329, E00083330, E00083331, E00083332, E00083333, E00083334, E00083335, E00083337, E00083338, E00083339, E00083340, E00083342, E00083343, E00083344, E00083345, E00083347, E00083348, E00083349, E00083350, E00083351, E00083352, E00083353, E00083354, E00083356, E00083357, E00083358, E00083359, E00083360, E00083373, E00083379, E00083381, E00083382, E00083383, E00083384, E00083386, E00166701, E00166702, E00166703, E00166704, E00166705, E00166706, E00166708, E00166719, E00166720, E00188348, E00188356, E00188359, E00188380, E00188409, E00188454, E00188456, E00188460, E00188510, E00188514, E00188522, E00188528

1.3 Sources of data used in the baseline preparation

The sources used in the baseline preparation and a description of the indicators shown is presented in **Table 1-3**.

Table 1-3: Sources of baseline data

Indicator	Description	Source
Community needs index score	A statistical index that takes into account different indicators to show neighbourhoods that are lacking in social infrastructure and community capacity. The maps shown in this appendix show where community needs are high (high score) meaning the community lakes social infrastructure, or low where the community is well-resourced and has an active engaged population.	OCSI/Local Trust (2023) Community Needs Index[3]

1.4 Approach to refining the baseline

1.4.1.1 A provisional list of receptors comprising community facilities and community-facing businesses, and public services has been developed and presented in this appendix. The list provided is intended to be indicative of the receptors to be included in the assessment, in order to enable meaningful engagement. It is recognised that the list of receptors may not yet be comprehensive. The baseline is subject to refinement as ongoing assessment work progresses. This will include engagement with stakeholders, desk-based and in-person verification of the status of the receptors. The list will be confirmed and presented in full for the purposes of the preliminary environmental information report. This process will interact with the sifting exercise being undertaken as part of the health assessment and its identification of relevant receptors as described in **Chapter 14: Health** of the scoping report.

1.4.1.2 This provisional list of receptors may in future be filtered according to the likelihood they are subject to significant effects. This will be based on the proximity of receptors to the Scoping Boundary and any related land take.

1.4.1.3 A three-tier system is proposed at this stage to assess the likelihood that receptors will experience significant effects. Receptors that are within or are closer to the

[3] OCSI/Local Trust 2023. Community Needs Index. Published 2023. Available at: http://doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-9573-1 (accessed 15/08/26).

Scoping Boundary are considered more likely to experience potentially significant effects.

- Receptors that are within the Scoping Boundary
- Receptors within 500 metres of the Scoping Boundary
- Receptors that are further than 500 metres of the Scoping Boundary

1.5 Baseline conditions

1.5.1.1 **Figure 10.5** shows the Community Needs Index (CNI) score across all Community Areas. The CNI combined three domains: Civic Assets (the presence of key community, civic, educational and cultural asses in the area), Connectedness (connectivity to key services, digital infrastructure, isolation and the strength of the local jobs market), and Active and Engaged Community (levels of third sector activity and volunteering and civic participation, social fabric and barriers to participation and engagement. Larger scores mean stronger outcomes. **Figure 10.5** shows significant variation in the CNI scores across Community Areas. The CNI is broadly correlated with overall levels of income prosperity. Where areas have low scores on the CNI and have high material deprivation, they are considered to be 'doubly disadvantaged'.[4]

1.5.1.2 A low CNI score shows relatively lower needs (i.e. higher performance in the respective domains). Correspondingly, a higher needs score indicates lower performance against the domains. In this instance, Iver and Richings Park and Horton and Wraysbury show stronger CNI scores (lower need), whilst Langley, Brands Hill, and Poyle show the weakest CNI scores (greater need) across the Inner Study Area.

1.6 West Drayton Community Area Baseline

Table 1-4: West Drayton community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• The Medical Centre • Find and Treat Primary Care
Pharmacies	• Boots (West Drayton) • Carewell Chemists • Orchard Pharmacy • Winchester Pharmacy
Dentists	• Mydentist
Early year facilities	• West Drayton Day Nursery and Preschool

[4] Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/ (accessed on: 15/09/2026).

Receptor type	Receptor
Primary schools	• Cherry Lane Primary School • Laurel Lane Primary School • St Catherine Catholic Primary School • St Martin's Church of England Primary School • West Drayton Academy
Places of worship	• Bell Farm Church • St Catherine RC Church • St Martin's • West Drayton Baptist Church • Jamia Masjid West Drayton
Community centres	• Drayton Garden Village Hall • Southlands Arts Centre • The Meadows Community Centre • Yiewsley & West Drayton Community Centre
Public houses	• Anglers Retreat • Cat & Fiddle • Six Bells • Railway Arms • Sipson Public House • Six Bells
Post offices	• Laurel Lane Post Office
Libraries	• West Drayton Library
Children's centres	• Cherry Lane Infant School
Youth centres	• West Drayton Scout Hall • Platinum Jubilee Leisure Centre
Sport facilities	• Spirit Health Club (Heathrow) • Cherry Lane Primary School Playing Fields • Longmead/St. Martin's Primary School playing fields • West Drayton Primary School Playing Fields
Allotments	• West Drayton Cemetery Allotments • West Drayton Depot Allotments
Gypsy and traveller sites	• Colne Park Caravan Site

1.7 Hayes Community Area Baseline

Table 1-5: Hayes community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Hayes Medical Centre • North Hyde Road Surgery • Shakespeare Health Centre
Early year facilities	• Sunflower House Nursery Hayes • Peadpods Early Learning Centre Hayes • Pinkwell Infant School
Primary schools	• Cranford Park Academy • Pinkwell Primary School
Secondary schools	• Harlington School
Post-16 schools	• Harlington Adult Learning Centre
Places of worship	• Life Oasis Centre
Community centres	• Crane Community Centre • Harlington and Hayes Community Centre • Hounslow Music Service
Public houses	• The Great Western • Music Box
Libraries	• Harlington Library
Children's centres	• Pinkwell Children's Centre
Youth centres	• Wentworth Crescent Scout's Hall
Sport facilities	• Harlington Sports Centre • Cranford Park Primary School Playing Field • Playing Fields W Pinkwell Primary, E Harlington Community School
Allotments	• Station Road Allotments

Table 1-6: Hayes: public services initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Fire service facilities and operations	• Hayes Fire Station

1.8 Longford Community Area Baseline

Table 1-7: Longford community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Heathrow IRC*
Dentists	• Time for Teeth Ltd
Early year facilities	• Longford Littlebrook Nursery
Places of worship	• Heathrow Airport Mosque
Community centres	• Colnbrook Special Needs Farm • Sachkhand Nanak Dham
Public houses	• The Kings Arms • The White Horse • The Tin Goose - Geronimo Inns • Big Smoke Tap House & Kitchen • The Queen's Arms • The London's Pride • The Crown Rivers - Jd Wetherspoon • The Globe • The Commission
Children's centres	• Heathrow Special Needs Centre

1.9 Harmondsworth Community Area Baseline

Table 1-8: Harmondsworth community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Early year facilities	• Wonderland Nursery Ltd • Bright Horizons Hounslow Day Nursery and Preschool
Primary schools	• Harmondsworth Primary School
Independent schools	• Landon School Harmondsworth • The Eden School
Places of worship	• St Mary Harmondsworth • New Life Destiny Baptist Church

Receptor type	Receptor
Community centres	• Ansell Garden Centre • Harmondsworth and Longford Community Centre • Harmondsworth Village Stores • St Mary's Church Hall
Public houses	• The Crown • Five Bells
Post offices	• Gable Stores/Post Office
Youth centres	• Harmondsworth Scout Hut
Sport facilities	• Sipson Recreation Ground
Allotments	• Moor Lane Allotments • Pinglestone Close Allotments

Table 1-9: Harmondsworth: public services initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Fire service facilities and operations	• Heathrow Fire Station
Ambulance service facilities and operations	• Heathrow Ambulance Station
Police service facilities and operations	• Heathrow Polar Park Police Station

1.10 Sipson Community Area Baseline

Table 1-10: Sipson community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Primary schools	• Heathrow Primary School
Independent schools	• Lady Nafisa School
Places of worship	• Sipson Christian Fellowship
Community centres	• Sipson Community Centre
Public houses	• The King William IV • The Plough

Receptor type	Receptor
Post offices	• Sipson Post Office

1.11 Cranford Cross Community Area Baseline

Table 1-11: Cranford Cross community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Places of worship	• St Dunstan's Cranford

1.12 Cranford Community Area Baseline

Table 1-12: Cranford community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Cranford Medical Centre • Dr Sandhu, PS & Partner
Pharmacies	• Dunn Chemist
Dentists	• Berkeley Dental Practice • Claradent Dental Care
Early year facilities	• Lullabies Day Nursery • Cranford Infant and Nursery School
Primary schools	• Cranford Primary School • The Cedars Primary School
Secondary schools	• Cranford Community College
Independent schools	• Unique Academy
Places of worship	• Church of Our Lady and St. Christopher • Cranford Baptist Church • Heathrow Jamia Masjid Mosque • Holy Angels Church • Masjid us Sunnah
Community centres	• Cranford Memorial Hall • Meadowbank Community Hub and Library
Public houses	• The Queen's Head

Receptor type	Receptor
Libraries	• Cranford Library
Children's centres	• Cranford Children's Centre
Sport facilities	• Cranford Community College Sports Centre • David Lloyd (Heston) • Cranford Community College Grounds • Cranford School Grounds • Heston Sports Ground
Gyspy and traveller sites	• Hartlands Caravan Site

1.13 Heston Community Area Baseline

Table 1-13: Heston community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Heston Health Centre • Skyways Medical Centre • The Crosslands Surgery • Jersey Practice • HMC Health Heston Great West
Pharmacies	• Jade Pharmacy • Medico Pharmacy
Dentists	• Badenhorst & Associates Dental Surgery • CareDental Smile Studios • Ghauris Dental Practice • Heston Health Clinic • Smile 32 Dentist • Toothsome Dentists
Early year facilities	• Kinderoos • Nursery On The Green • St Mary and Little Angels Nursery • Alexandra Montessori Heston • Coat of Many Colours Nursery Hounslow • The De Lacey Day Nursery School • Lampton Park Preschool • Heston Infant and Nursery School • The Rosary Infant and Nursery School
Primary schools	• Berkeley Academy • Edison Primary School

Receptor type	Receptor
	• Heston Primary School • Norwood Green Infant and Nursery School • Norwood Green Junior School • Springwell Infant and Nursery School • Springwell School • The Rosary Catholic Primary School • Wellington Primary School • Westbrook Primary School
Secondary schools	• Heston Community School • Lampton Academy
All-through schools	• Oaklands School
Independent schools	• Tarbiyyah Primary School • Tarbiyyah Secondary School for Boys
Places of worship	• Darussalam Masjid • Heston Methodist Church • Heston United Reformed Church • Lakshmi Narayan Temple • Parish Church of St Leonard • St Paul's Church • Our Lady Queen of Apostles • St Mary & Pope Kyrillos VI Coptic Orthodox Church • Hounslow West Evangelical Church • New Hindu Temple • Masjid Al Iman - Birwa Kurdish Community
Community centres	• Heston & District Community Association • Heston Royal British Legion Hall • Heston Village Hall • Sutton Family Centre • Lampton Best Start Family Hub • Heston Farm Estate Community Hall
Post offices	• Brabazon Road Post Office
Libraries	• Heston Public Library • Hounslow Library
Sport facilities	• Airlinks Golf Club • David Lloyd Sports Centre • Heston Community School Sports Hall • Heston Pools and Fitness • Heston Indoor Bowls Club • Hounslow Sports and Social Club

Receptor type	Receptor
	• The Hounslow Dome • Airlinks Golf Course • Berkeley School Grounds • Heston Primary School / Community Sports Hall Grounds • Lampton School Grounds • Norwood Green School Grounds • Springwell School Grounds • Wellington Primary School Grounds
Allotments	• Barnes Farm Allotments • Sutton Lane Allotments • Westbrook Road Allotments

1.14 Feltham North Community Area Baseline

Table 1-14: Feltham North community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Carlton Surgery • Gill Medical Practice • Pentelow Practice • FAB PCN Hub
Dentists	• Dental Beaty Feltham
Early year facilities	• Sparrow Farm Infant and Nursery School
Primary schools	• Sparrow Farm Primary School
Secondary schools	• Rivers Academy West London • Space Studio West London
Places of worship	• Calvary Free Grace Baptist Church • Salvation Army Church • Southville Methodist Church • Feltham Hira Centre • Jumuah Salaah
Community centres	• Feltham Assembly Hall • Passer Court Community Centre • Hounslow Register Office • Feltham Assembly Hall

Receptor type	Receptor
Public houses	• The Beehive • Green Man
Post offices	• Harlington Road West Post Office
Sport facilities	• River Academy Playing Fields • Sparrow Farm School Grounds • Feltham Arenas • Glebelands Playing Fields and Running Track

Table 1-15: Feltham North: public services initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Fire service facilities and operations	• Feltham Fire Station

1.15 Bedfont Community Area Baseline

Table 1-16: Bedfont community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Bedfont Clinic • Grove Village Medical Centre • Hatton Medical Practice • Greenbrook Bedfont
Pharmacies	• Boots Bedfont • Edwards and Taylor
Dentists	• Dental Beauty Bedfont
Early year facilities	• Little Dreams Day Nursery Feltham • The Alphabet Pre-School • Bedfont Infant and Nursery School • Fairholme Infant and Nursery School
Primary schools	• Bedfont Primary School • Fairholme Primary School
All-through schools	• Marjory Kinnon School
Places of worship	• Airport Church Revival Centre • Bethany Church • St Mary's Church Bedfont • Jubilee Priesthood Centre

Receptor type	Receptor
Community centres	• Southville Community Centre • St Mary's Church Hall, Bedfont • Stoney Wall Community Centre • Fairholme Community Centre
Public houses	• The Bell on the Green • Duke Of Wellington • The Load of Hay
Post offices	• Bedfont Post Office
Libraries	• Bedfont Library
Sport facilities	• Bedfont Football and Social Club • Bloom Heathrow • Bedfont Sports Club

1.16 Stanwell Community Area Baseline

Table 1-17: Stanwell community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Ashford Health Centre • Ashford Walk In Centre • St David's Family Practice
Pharmacies	• Herman Pharmacy • Tesco Pharmacy
Dentists	• Stanwell Dental Practice
Early year facilities	• First Steps Day Nursery • Whizz Kids Pre-School
Primary schools	• Stanwell Fields C of E Primary School • Town Farm Primary School & Nursery
Secondary schools	• Fordway Centre • Thomas Knyvett College
Independent schools	• St James Senior Boys' School
Places of worship	• Ashford Burial Ground • Ashford Mosque • St David's Catholic Church • Saint Mary The Virgin • Stanwell Cemetery Chapel • Stanwell Congregational Church • Ashford and Staines Community Centre

Receptor type	Receptor
Community centres	• Stanwell Family Centre • Stanwell Rose Community Centre • Stanwell Village Hall
Public houses	• The Five Bells • Rising Sun • Sir John Gibson • The Swan
Post offices	• Clare Road Post Office • Stanwell Post Office
Libraries	• Stanwell Library
Sport facilities	• Ashford Sports Club • Ashford Town (Middlesex) Football Club • Stanwell Fields Primary School Grounds • Stanwell Recreation Ground Facilities • Town Farm Primary School Grounds
Allotments	• Stanwell Cemetery Allotments

Table 1-18: Stanwell: public services initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Emergency healthcare facilities including hospitals	• Ashford Hospital
Ambulance service facilities and operations	• Staines Ambulance Station

1.17 Stanwell Moor Community Area Baseline

Table 1-19: Stanwell Moor community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Places of worship	• Faith in God Ministries
Community centres	• Stanwell Moor Village Hall
Public houses	• The Anchor

1.18 Poyle Community Area Baseline

Table 1-20: Poyle community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Primary schools	• Pippins School
Public houses	• Punch Bowl & Bong Thai • The Golden Cross
Gypsy and traveller sites	• Poyle Traveller Site

1.19 Colnbrook Community Area Baseline

Table 1-21: Colnbrook community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Pharmacies	• Colnbrook Pharmacy
Primary schools	• Colnbrook Church of England Primary School
Places of worship	• Colnbrook and Poyle United Reform Church • Colnbrook Strict Baptist Chapel • St Thomas' Church Colnbrook
Community centres	• Colnbrook Village Hall
Public houses	• The Ostrich Colnbrook • Ye Olde George Colnbrook
Libraries	• Vicarage Way Children's Centre and Library

1.20 Brands Hill Community Area Baseline

Table 1-22: Brands Hill community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Early year facilities	• Bright World Nurseries
Community centres	• Westfield Estate Community Centre
Post offices	• Brands Hill Post Office

1.21 Hounslow (West and Heath) Community Area Baseline

Table 1-23: Hounslow (West and Heath) community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Dr. K M Singh • Clifford Road Surgery • Heart of Hounslow Health Centre • Hounslow Medical Centre • The Great West Surgery • The MWH Practice • Diabetes Intermediary Care Clinic • Community Dermatology Service • Bath Road Surgery • Blue Wing Family Doctor Unit • Chestnut Practice • Green Practice • Cavalry Medical Centre • Great West Road PCN Hub
Pharmacies	• Boots Hounslow West • Hobb's Pharmacy
Dentists	• Hounslow West Dental Practice • Mydentist Staines Road • Orthosmile • Wellington Road South Dental Surgery
Early year facilities	• Bambinos Montessori Nursery • Midsummer Park Pre-School • Parkside Playgroup • The Co-Operative Childcare Hounslow • Giggles Day Nursery • The Orchard Infant and Nursery School
Primary schools	• Beavers Community Primary School • Grove Road Primary School • Hounslow Heath Infant and Nursery School • Hounslow Heath School • Orchard Primary School • St Michael and St Martin Catholic Primary School • Orchard Primary School
Secondary schools	• St Mark's Catholic School • The Heathland School
Independent schools	• Suffah Primary School

Receptor type	Receptor
Places of worship	• Church of the Good Shepherd • Emmanuel Baptist Church • Gurdwara Sikh Temple • Gurdwara Sri Guru Singh Sabha • Hounslow Central Mosque • Hounslow Gospel Hall • Jalaram Jupadi Virpur Dham Hounslow • Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses • Ss Michael and Martin Catholic Church • St John's Mar Thoma Church • St Stephen's Parish Church • Unified Body of Christ Church International • Madina Islamic Mission • Faizan E-Jumu'ah Masjid • Al Furqan Education Trust • Build on Belief Hounslow
Community centres	• Islamic Integration Community Centre • The Hub Community Centre • West London School of Islamic Studies • Royal British Legion Hounslow
Public houses	• The Windmill • Royal Albion • Tommy Flynn's • The Lord Palmerston • The Bell • Shree Sorathia Prajapati Community Centre • Duke of York • Royal British Legion Hounslow • Heritage Kitchen & Bar • Keg & Cask • The Moon under Water - JD Wetherspoon • Lamplighter Hounslow • Yates's • The Cross Lances • The Honeycombe
Post offices	• Hounslow Heath Post Office
Libraries	• The Hub Library and Children's Centre • Beavers Library
Children's centres	• Midsummer Park Children's Centre

Receptor type	Receptor
Sport facilities	• Heathrow Gymnastics Club • Beavers School Grounds • Grove Road Primary School Ground • Heathland School Grounds • Good Time Golfin • Hounslow Heath School Grounds • St Mark's Catholic School Grounds • SS Michael and Martin • The Orchard Primary School Grounds • Gym4Less

1.22 Iver and Richings Park Community Area Baseline

Table 1-24: Iver and Richings Park community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• The Ivers Practice
Dentists	• Dental Wellbeing Limited
Early year facilities	• Lilliput Pre School • Iver Village Acorn Nursery • Iver Village Preschool • The Old Station Nursery Iver
Primary schools	• Iver Village Junior School
Places of worship	• St Leonard's Church • New Gurdwara • Kings Church • St Peter's Church • St Andrew's URC Church • Sachkhan Nanak Dham Spritiual Hub
Community centres	• Iver Village Hall
Public houses	• North Star Pub • The Tower Arms Hotel • The Swan at Iver
Post offices	• Iver Post Office • Iver Village Post Office

Receptor type	Receptor
Sport facilities	• Richings Park Sports Club • Richings Sports Park • Richings Park Golf Club • Thorney Park Golf Course • Slate Studio Pilates

1.23 Harlington Community Area Baseline

Table 1-25: Harlington community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Glendale Medical Centre • Heathrow Medical Centre
Pharmacies	• The Village Pharmacy
Dentists	• The Village Dental Care
Early year facilities	• Littlebrook Nursery Sipson
Primary schools	• William Byrd Primary Academy
Places of worship	• Harlington Baptist Church • Sant Nirankari Mandal - International Nirankari Bhaven • St Peter and St Paul Church
Community centres	• Harlington Locomotive Society Miniature Railway • St Peter & St Paul Harlington
Public houses	• The Pheasant Restaurant & Inn • The Three Magpies Heathrow • The Wheatsheaf • The White Hart
Post offices	• Harlington Post Office
Youth centres	• 1st Harlington Scouts Group
Sport facilities	• Imperial College Sports Grounds Heston • Harlington Sports Ground • Imperial College Sports Ground • Little Harlington Playing Fields

1.24 North Staines Community Area Baseline

Table 1-26: North Staines community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Pharmacies	• Boots Pharmacy
Dentists	• Kingston Road (Dental Surgery) • The Staines Centre of Dental Excellence
Early year facilities	• Station House Nursery & Preschool
Places of worship	• St Mary's Church
Community centres	• Staines Community centre
Public houses	• Thames Side Brewery • The Three Tuns • London Stone • The George
Post offices	• Staines Post Office

1.25 Horton and Wraysbury Community Area Baseline

Table 1-27: Horton and Wraysbury community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
Dentists	• Welley Road (Dental Surgery)
Primary schools	• Wraysbury Primary School
Places of worship	• St Michael's Church Horton
Public houses	• The Perseverance • The George Co Ltd • Crown Public House
Sport facilities	• Wraysbury Football Club • Wraysbury Lawn Tennis Club

1.26 Langley Community Area Baseline

Table 1-28: Langley community facilities and community-facing businesses initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor
GPs	• Langley Health Centre • The Orchard Surgery
Pharmacies	• Canons Pharmacy
Dentists	• Community Dental Clinic • Dentalcare Langley • Langley Dental and Orthodontics • Langley Road Dental Practice • Sophia Malik Dentistry
Early year facilities	• Lascelles Park Nursery
Primary schools	• Ryvers School • Castleview School • The Langley Heritage Primary • Holy Family Catholic School • Marish Primary School
Secondary schools	• St Barnard's Catholic Grammar School • Ditton Park Academy • Langley Grammar School
Post-16 schools	• Langley Academy • Slough and Langley College Windsor
Places of worship	• St Mary the Virgin Church • Holy Family Catholic Church • Faizan e Madina Langley • Langley Free Church
Community centres	• 2nd Langley Scouts • Langley Community Centre
Public houses	• The Chestnut Public House • Red Lion
Post offices	• Langley Post Office
Libraries	• Langley Library
Sports facilties	• South Bucks Archers • Slough Cricket Club • Slough Hockey Club • Langley Leisure Centre • Langley Grammar Sports Centre
Gypsy and traveller sites	• Fox Road Traveller Site • Mobile Foxborough Homes Site

Appendix 12.1

Recreation Baseline

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 12.1 - Recreation Baseline

Contents

1	Recreation Baseline		1
	1.1	Introduction	1
	1.2	Recreational Study Area Definition	1
	1.3	Approach to refining the baseline	2
	1.4	Bedfont Community Area Baseline	2
	1.5	Brands Hill Community Area Baseline	3
	1.6	Colnbrook Community Area Baseline	4
	1.7	Cranford Community Area Baseline	5
	1.8	Cranford Cross Community Area Baseline	6
	1.9	Feltham North Community Area Baseline	6
	1.10	Harlington Community Area Baseline	7
	1.11	Harmondsworth Community Area Baseline	8
	1.12	Hayes Community Area Baseline	9
	1.13	Heston Community Area Baseline	11
	1.14	Horton and Wraysbury Community Area Baseline	13
	1.15	Hounslow (West and Heath) Community Area Baseline	15
	1.16	Iver and Richings Park Community Area Baseline	16
	1.17	Langley Community Area Baseline	20
	1.18	Longford Community Area Baseline	22
	1.19	North Staines Community Area Baseline	22
	1.20	Poyle Community Area Baseline	24
	1.21	Sipson Community Area Baseline	25
	1.22	Stanwell Community Area Baseline	25
	1.23	Stanwell Moor Community Area Baseline	27

1.24 West Drayton Community Area Baseline 28

1.25 Wider Recreational Study Area Baseline 30

Tables

Table 1-1: Bedfont recreational spaces initial baseline 2

Table 1-2: Bedfont recreational routes initial baseline 3

Table 1-3: Brands Hill recreational spaces initial baseline 3

Table 1-4: Brands Hill recreational routes initial baseline 3

Table 1-5: Colnbrook recreational spaces initial baseline 4

Table 1-6: Colnbrook recreational routes initial baseline 4

Table 1-7: Cranford recreational spaces initial baseline 5

Table 1-8: Cranford recreational routes initial baseline 5

Table 1-9: Cranford Cross recreational spaces initial baseline 6

Table 1-10: Cranford Cross recreational routes initial baseline 6

Table 1-13: Feltham North recreational spaces initial baseline 6

Table 1-14: Feltham North recreational routes initial baseline 7

Table 1-15: Harlington recreational spaces initial baseline 7

Table 1-16: Harlington recreational routes initial baseline 8

Table 1-17: Harmondsworth recreational spaces initial baseline 8

Table 1-18: Harmondsworth recreational routes initial baseline 9

Table 1-19: Hayes recreational spaces initial baseline 9

Table 1-20: Hayes recreational routes initial baseline 10

Table 1-21: Heston recreational spaces initial baseline 11

Table 1-22: Heston recreational routes initial baseline 11

Table 1-23: Horton and Wraysbury recreational spaces initial baseline 13

Table 1-24: Horton and Wraysbury recreational routes initial baseline 14

Table 1-26: Hounslow (West and Heath) recreational spaces initial baseline 15

Table 1-27: Hounslow (West and Heath) recreational routes initial baseline 16

Table 1-28: Iver and Richings Park recreational spaces initial baseline 16

Table 1-29: Iver and Richings Park recreational routes initial baseline 17

Table 1-30: Langley recreational spaces initial baseline 20

Table 1-31: Langley recreational routes initial baseline 20

Table 1-32: Longford recreational spaces initial baseline 22

Table 1-33: Longford recreational routes initial baseline 22

Table 1-34: North Staines recreational spaces initial baseline 22

Table 1-35: North Staines recreational routes initial baseline 23

Table 1-36: Poyle recreational spaces initial baseline 24

Table 1-37: Poyle recreational routes initial baseline 25

Table 1-38: Sipson recreational spaces initial baseline 25

Table 1-39: Stanwell recreational spaces initial baseline 25

Table 1-40: Stanwell recreational routes initial baseline 27

Table 1-41: Stanwell Moor recreational spaces initial baseline 27

Table 1-42: Stanwell Moor recreational routes initial baseline 28

Table 1-43: West Drayton recreational spaces initial baseline 28

Table 1-44: West Drayton recreational routes initial baseline 29

Table 1-45: Wider Recreational Study Area recreational spaces initial baseline 30

Table 1-46: Wider Recreational Study Area recreational routes initial baseline 32

1 Recreation Baseline

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1.1 This appendix should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 12: Recreation** of the Scoping Report. This appendix sets out:

- An initial review of the baseline characteristics of the study areas considered in the recreation assessment for the purposes of establishing sensitivity of receptors, pertaining to: access to natural greenspace and levels of provision.
- Provisional identification of receptors to be used for the purposes of the assessment, including recreational routes and spaces, and their users, potentially affected by the Proposed Development. This will be subject to refinement according to the rationale set out in **Chapter 12: Recreation** and described below.

1.1.1.2 The remainder of this appendix covers these baseline characteristics and receptors where relevant to the recreation assessment areas proposed to be used for the respective scoped-in effects (refer to **Section 12.4 of the Scoping Report**).

1.1.1.3 Baseline information is presented for each of the Community Areas that together comprise the Inner Study Area ('ISA'). Baseline information is presented insofar as it represents a receptor for the recreation assessment (recreational routes and spaces, and their users).

1.1.1.4 Additional baseline data will presented in the preliminary environmental assessment in order to characterise the sensitivity of the receptors.

1.2 Recreational Study Area Definition

1.2.1.1 The approach to defining the Recreational Study Area is set out in detail in **Chapter 12: Recreation**. The proposed approach for identifying additional areas and/or refining the current list is also presented. Baseline data is presented by the Community Areas that are constituent parts of the Recreational Study Area (RecSA), although receptors that are located in the area of the RecSA which is not within a Community Area are also shown.

1.2.1.2 Recreational routes and spaces by their nature extend over wider areas than the study areas used for the purposes of this assessment, and may be named differently by respective local authorities despite forming a single route.

1.3 Approach to refining the baseline

1.3.1.1 A provisional list of receptors comprising recreational routes and spaces has been developed and presented in this appendix. The list provided is intended to be indicative of the receptors to be included in the assessment, in order to enable meaningful engagement. It is recognised that the list of receptors may not yet be comprehensive. The baseline is subject to refinement as ongoing assessment work progresses. This will include engagement with stakeholders, desk-based and in-person verification of the status of receptors. The list will be confirmed and presented in full for the purposes of the preliminary environmental information report. This process will interact with the assessment being undertaken as part of **Chapter 21: Traffic and Transport**.

1.4 Bedfont Community Area Baseline

Table 1-1: Bedfont recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Bedfont Close Green Space	GR106
	Bedfont Green	GR040
	Fairholme Green	GR004
	Green Space along A315, across from Bedfont Green	GR110
	Green Space along A315, East Bedfont West	GR109
	Myrtle Avenue Green Space	GR041
	Southville Green	GR074
Cemeteries and churchyards	Bedfont Cemetery	CE006
	N churchyard of St. Mary the Virgin, Bedfont	CE004
Natural and semi-natural green space	Cain's Lane Biodiversity Site	GR085
	Green Space along Longford River	GR097
	Bedfont Lake and The Pitts	GR073

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Parks and gardens	Bedfont Lakes Country Park	GR072
	Bedfont Recreation Grounds	GR163
	Cage Park	GR059
	Hatton Meadow	GR176

Table 1-2: Bedfont recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	Footpath between Hatton Road and Richmond Avenue	FO203
	Footpath between Watermead Way and Guildford Avenue	FO217

1.5 Brands Hill Community Area Baseline

Table 1-3: Brands Hill recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Severn Crescent Green	GR005
	Trent Road Green	GR006
	Crown Meadow	GR051
Children's play areas	Severn Crescent MUGA	CH002

Table 1-4: Brands Hill recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	Receptor ID
Footpath	WC|HORT|1/1	FO230
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|1	FO130
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|8	FO114

Type	Name	Receptor ID
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|9	FO113
	YT|Slough|43	FO038

1.6 Colnbrook Community Area Baseline

Table 1-5: Colnbrook recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Crown Meadow	GR051
Parks and gardens	Colnbrook Recreation Ground	GR052
	St Thomas's Quiet Garden	GR152
	Albany Park	GR067

Table 1-6: Colnbrook recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	WC|HORT|4/1	BR027
	WC|HORT|5/1	BR025
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|2a	BR002
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|5	BR011
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|6	BR009
Footpath	BM|IVE|18/1	FO219
	BM|IVE|20/2	FO052
	BM|IVE|20/3	FO036
	BM|IVE|24/1	FO120
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|1	FO130
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|2	FO138

Type	Name	ID
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|2b	FO090
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|3	FO136
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|5A	FO116
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	North-to-South Surrey Walk	TR004

1.7 Cranford Community Area Baseline

Table 1-7: Cranford recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Avenue Gardens	GR007
	Firs Drive Open Space	GR069
	Waye Avenue Green Space	GR057
Natural and semi-natural green space	Crane Meadows/Crane Bank	GR084
Parks and gardens	Avenue Park	GR068
	Cranford Park	GR070

Table 1-8: Cranford recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Byway	Byway from Old Rectory Nursery School through the Parkway and to River Crane	BY004
Trail	Hillingdon Trail	TR003
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.8 Cranford Cross Community Area Baseline

Table 1-9: Cranford Cross recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Berkeley Meadows	GR071
Parks and gardens	Cranford Park	GR070
Natural and semi-natural green space	Crane Meadows/Crane Bank	GR084

Table 1-10: Cranford Cross recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Byway	Hillingdon H70	BY002
Footpath	Hillingdon H67	FO019
	Hillingdon H80	FO250
Trail	Hillingdon Trail	TR003
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.9 Feltham North Community Area Baseline

Table 1-11: Feltham North recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Green Space between the Drive and Brayton Avenue	GR117
	POS at Hatton Green	GR105
	POS within Sparrow Farm	GR111
	Sparrow Farm Open Space	GR009
	Viola Avenue	GR010

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Cemeteries and churchyards	NE Hatton Cemetery	CE007
Natural and semi-natural green space	Crane Corridor / River Crane Park	GR104
Parks and gardens	Blenheim Park	GR120
	Feltham Park	GR107
	Hounslow Urban Farm	GR008
	Hatton Meadow	GR176

Table 1-12: Feltham North recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	Footpath between Green Man Lane and Faggs Road	FO006
Trail	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.10 Harlington Community Area Baseline

Table 1-13: Harlington recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Boltons Lane Open Space	GR065
	Browngraves Green	GR064
	Harlington Open Space	GR011
	Harlington Pond Community Garden	GR037
	Sipson Meadow	GR035
Cemeteries and churchyards	St Peter and St Paul's Churchyard	CE005

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Victoria Lane Burial Ground	CE016
Children's play areas	Brickfield Lane	CH006
Parks and gardens	William Byrd Park	GR153

Table 1-14: Harlington recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	Hillingdon H81	FO249
	Hillingdon H68	FO018

1.11 Harmondsworth Community Area Baseline

Table 1-15: Harmondsworth recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	East of Five Bells PH Harmondsworth	GR058
Cemeteries and churchyards	St. Mary's Churchyard (Harmondsworth Cemetery)	CE003
Natural and semi-natural green space	Longford Moor	GR087
	Dawley Rd/A437 Green Space	GR103
	Harmondsworth Moor	GR079
	North (and West) of The Great Barn at Harmondsworth	GR088
	Public Open Space southeast of Harmondsworth Moor	GR098
Parks and gardens	Harmondsworth Recreation Ground	GR062
	Sipson Recreation Ground	GR089

Table 1-16: Harmondsworth recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	Hillingdon Y13	BR001
Byway	Hillingdon Y23	BY003
	Hillingdon Y12	BY001
Footpath	Hillingdon Y11	FO007
	Hillingdon Y8	FO181
	Hillingdon Y19	FO012
	Hillingdon Y15	FO011
	Hillingdon Y16	FO010
	Hillingdon Y17	FO015
	Hillingdon Y18	FO013
	Hillingdon Y20	FO058
	Hillingdon Y22	FO056
Trail	Harmondsworth Moor Circular Walk	TR002
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.12 Hayes Community Area Baseline

Table 1-17: Hayes recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Snowdon Crescent Green	GR012
Cemeteries and churchyards	Cherry Lane Cemetery	CE008
Children's play areas	Croyde Avenue Playground	CH018

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Hoskins Close Playground	CH019
	Lundy Drive MUGA	CH021
	Lundy Drive Playground	CH020
Parks and gardens	Bourne Farm Recreation Ground / Sandgate FC Club	GR112
	Carfax Road Recreation Ground	GR090
	Pinkwell Park	GR060
	Sam Philp Recreation Ground - The Moats	GR113

Table 1-18: Hayes recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Byway	Hillingdon H62	BY007
Footpath	Boswell Path	FO098
	Hillingdon H67	FO019
	Hillingdon H80	FO250
	Hillingdon H62	BY007
	Hillingdon H58	FO229
	Hillingdon H59	FO227
	Hillingdon H57	FO225
	Hillingdon H79	FO005
	Hillingdon H60	FO220
	Hillingdon H63	FO223
	Hillingdon H64	FO222

Type	Name	ID
	Hillingdon H66	FO020
Trail	Hillingdon Trail	TR003
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.13 Heston Community Area Baseline

Table 1-19: Heston recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Brabazon Road Green	GR151
	Clunberry Avenue Green	GR013
	Convent Way Green	GR154
Cemeteries and churchyards	New Brentford Cemetery	CE020
	St Leonard's Churchyard, Heston	CE019
Children's play areas	Claypole Drive MUGA	CH017
	Sutton Lane Community Centre MUGA	CH023
Parks and gardens	King's Arbour Park	GR014
	Lampton Park	GR161
	Sutton Playing Field	GR162

Table 1-20: Heston recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	Footpath adjacent 35 Sutton Road to adjacent 44 Heston Road	FO140

Type	Name	ID
	Footpath at St Leonards Church	FO238
	Footpath between 27 and 29 Kingsbridge Road	FO204
	Footpath from adjacent 436 Great West Road to adjacent 32 Sutton Road	FO083
	Footpath from Civic Centre and along front of Lampton School to Great West Road	FO244
	Footpath from Henleys Garage Burns Way to Brabazon Road	FO218
	Footpath from Lampton Road to Boundary of Lampton School	FO089
	Footpath from rear of 176A Jersey Road across Osterley Park and across M4 to Osterley Lane	FO077
	Footpath from Willow Gardens to Lampton School	FO209
	Footpath known as Watersplash Lane in Cranford Park	FO199
	Footpath north of Heston School	FO226
	Footpath rear of St Leonards Church through Heston School to Heston Road	FO215
	Footpath from Cambourne Way to Great West Road	FO031
Trail	Hillingdon Trail	TR003

Type	Name	ID
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.14 Horton and Wraysbury Community Area Baseline

Table 1-21: Horton and Wraysbury recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Arthur Jacob Nature Reserve	GR082
	Green Space behind Wraysbury Village hall	GR174
	Horton Village Green	GR118
	Open Access Land at Ankerwycke Farm	GR125
	Poyle Poplars	GR018
Cemeteries and churchyards	St. Michael's Churchyard, Horton	CE012
Parks and gardens	Horton Recreation Ground	GR119
	Remenham Park	GR016
	Wraysbury Play Park	GR015
Waterbodies	Heron Lake	WA017
	Horton Fishing Lake	WA014
	Wraysbury & Hythe End Gravel Pits	WA015
	Wraysbury II Gravel Pit/ Wellapool Lake	WA013
	Wraysbury No1 Gravel Pit	WA011
	The Queen Mother Reservoir	WA009

Table 1-22: Horton and Wraysbury recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	WC|HORT|4/1	BR027
	WC|HORT|5/1	BR025
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|5	BR011
Footpath	SU|Staines|20#1	FO240
	SU|Staines|20#2	FO239
	SU|Staines|49	FO151
	WC|DATC|6/1	FO228
	WC|DATC|7/2	FO206
	WC|HORT|1/1	FO230
	WC|HORT|3/1	FO149
	WC|WRAY|1/1	FO001
	WC|WRAY|10/1	FO042
	WC|WRAY|11/1	FO243
	WC|WRAY|11/2	FO242
	WC|WRAY|11/3	FO241
	WC|WRAY|12/1	FO221
	WC|WRAY|13/1	FO050
	WC|WRAY|2/1	FO234
	WC|WRAY|3/1	FO067
	WC|WRAY|4/1	FO035
	WC|WRAY|6/1	FO213
	WC|WRAY|7/1	FO155
	WC|WRAY|8A/1	FO235

Type	Name	ID
	WC|WRAY|8B/1	FO169
	WC|WRAY|8C/1	FO152
	WC|WRAY|8C/2	FO205
	WC|WRAY|9/1	FO074
	WC|WRAY|9/2	FO075
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	North-to-South Surrey Walk	TR004
	Freedom Trail	TR001
	Buckinghamshire Way	TR008

1.15 Hounslow (West and Heath) Community Area Baseline

Table 1-23: Hounslow (West and Heath) recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Amenity Space Cobbs Rd	GR077
	Aston Green Rectory Estate	GR054
	Cavalry Close	GR078
	Chester Road Open Space	GR055
	Grantley Road Park	GR053
	Maitland Close Open Space	GR020
	Open Space East of Clements Court	GR021
Cemeteries and churchyards	Hounslow Cemetery	CE014
Children's play areas	Blackburn Way Playspace	CH014

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Clements Court Playground	CH025
	Frampton Road Playspace	CH016
	Logans Close Playground	CH003
	Maitland Close Playground	CH004
	Vimy Close Playspace	CH015
Natural and semi-natural green space	Hounslow Heath	GR075
	Crane Corridor / River Crane Park	GR104
Parks and gardens	Beaversfield Park	GR039
	Green Lane Recreation Ground	GR019
	Midsummer Avenue Park	GR076

Table 1-24: Hounslow (West and Heath) recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Trail	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

1.16 Iver and Richings Park Community Area Baseline

Table 1-25: Iver and Richings Park recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Colne Orchards	GR140
	Huntsmoor Park	GR022
	Iver Green	GR129
	Swan Meadow	GR139

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Cemeteries and churchyards	St Leonard's Churchyard, Iver	CE015
	St Peter's Cemetery	CE017
	St Peter's Churchyard	CE018
Children's play areas	Iver Recreation Ground - Play Area	CH013
Natural and semi-natural green space	Huntsmoor Park Farm	GR023
	Palmer's Moor Open Space	GR157
	St Leonard's Mound	GR024
	Thorney Country Park	GR081
	Fray's Island Nature Reserve	GR002
Waterbodies	Farlows Lake	WA004
	Thorney Weir / Mets Lake	WA006, WA005

Table 1-26: Iver and Richings Park recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	BM|IVE|11/1	BR010
	BM|IVE|30/2	BR026
	BM|IVE|31/1	BR023
	BM|IVE|31/2	BR022
	BM|IVE|33/7	BR034
	BM|IVE|8/1	BR008
	BM|IVE|8/2	BR007
	BM|IVE|8/4	BR005
	BM|IVE|9/1	BR003

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	BM|IVE|13/1	FO043
	BM|IVE|14/1	FO121
	BM|IVE|15/1	FO103
	BM|IVE|15/2	FO101
	BM|IVE|15/3	FO099
	BM|IVE|15A/1	FO248
	BM|IVE|16/1	FO046
	BM|IVE|16/2	FO044
	BM|IVE|16/3	FO041
	BM|IVE|16/4	FO049
	BM|IVE|16/5	FO048
	BM|IVE|17/1	FO023
	BM|IVE|17/2	FO022
	BM|IVE|17/3	FO027
	BM|IVE|17/4	FO026
	BM|IVE|17/5	FO025
	BM|IVE|17/6	FO024
	BM|IVE|17/7	FO029
	BM|IVE|17/8	FO028
	BM|IVE|18/1	FO219
	BM|IVE|20/1	FO054
	BM|IVE|20/2	FO052
	BM|IVE|20/3	FO036

Type	Name	ID
	BM|IVE|21/1	FO245
	BM|IVE|21/2	FO232
	BM|IVE|21/3	FO231
	BM|IVE|24/1	FO120
	BM|IVE|25/1	FO073
	BM|IVE|26/1	FO051
	BM|IVE|27/1	FO124
	BM|IVE|28/1	FO096
	BM|IVE|28/2	FO095
	BM|IVE|28/3	FO102
	BM|IVE|28/4	FO100
	BM|IVE|29/1	FO047
	BM|IVE|34/1	FO197
	BM|IVE|35/1	FO165
	BM|IVE|36/1	FO097
	BM|IVE|4A/1	FO179
	BM|IVE|4A/2	FO177
	IVE/P1(BW)/1	FO168
	IVE/P2(FP)/1	FO233
	IVE/P3(FP)/1	FO068
	Hillingdon Y26	FO060
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005

Type	Name	ID
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.17 Langley Community Area Baseline

Table 1-27: Langley recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Grampian Way Green Space	GR166
	Grampian Way Open Space	GR142
	Grampian Way Play Area	GR141
	Humber Way Open Space	GR121
	Stornaway Road Green Space	GR122
Cemeteries and churchyards	St Mary's Langley	CE022
Parks and gardens	Harvey Park	GR123
	Kederminster Park	GR172
	Langley Memorial Ground	GR167
	Maplin Park Langley	GR169
	Springate Field	GR170
	Ditton Park	GR168
	Upton Court Park	GR175
	Lascelles Park Slough	GR171

Table 1-28: Langley recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	BM|IVE|17/5	FO025

Type	Name	ID
	BM|WEX|18/1	FO135
	BM|WEX|18/2	FO134
	BM|WEX|18/3	FO133
	YT|Slough|37	FO003
	YT|Slough|38	FO002
	YT|Slough|39	FO251
	YT|Slough|40a	FO091
	YT|Slough|40b	FO093
	YT|Slough|40c	FO092
	YT|Slough|41	FO040
	YT|Slough|42	FO039
	YT|Slough|43	FO038
	YT|Slough|47a	FO191
	YT|Slough|47b	FO189
	YT|Slough|69#1	FO171
	YT|Slough|72a	FO105
	YT|Slough|72b	FO104
	YT|Slough|73	FO066
	YT|Slough|74	FO065

1.18 Longford Community Area Baseline

Table 1-29: Longford recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Children's play areas	Heathrow Close Playground	CH007
Natural and semi-natural green space	Heathrow Biodiversity Site – Peggy Bedford	GR025
	Longford Moor	GR087
	Green Space along Longford River	GR097
	Public Open Space southeast of Harmondsworth Moor	GR098
Parks and gardens	Longford Pocket Park	GR063

Table 1-30: Longford recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	SU|Staines|51	BR013
Footpath	Hillingdon Y20	FO058
	Hillingdon Y21	FO057
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.19 North Staines Community Area Baseline

Table 1-31: North Staines recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Staines Riverside	GR127
	The Cog Wraysbury Road	GR138
	St Mary's, Staines	CE013

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Cemeteries and churchyards	Staines Cemetery	CE010
Natural and semi-natural green space	Birch Green	GR135
	Moormede Open Space	GR128
	Open access land to the South-West of Staines Moor	GR124
	Staines Moor	GR083
	Shortwood Common and Birch Green	GR091
Parks and gardens	Lammas Recreation Ground	GR126
Waterbodies	Wraysbury Reservoir	WA010

Table 1-32: North Staines recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	SU|Staines|50	BR012
	SU|Staines|50#2	BR014
Footpath	SU|Staines|11	FO085
	SU|Staines|12	FO084
	SU|Staines|13	FO082
	SU|Staines|14	FO081
	SU|Staines|16	FO132
	SU|Staines|17	FO131
	SU|Staines|18	FO129
	SU|Staines|19	FO137
	SU|Staines|20#1	FO240

Type	Name	ID
	SU|Staines|20#2	FO239
	SU|Staines|21	FO119
	SU|Staines|22	FO127
	SU|Staines|23	FO126
	SU|Staines|24	FO125
	SU|Staines|25	FO123
	SU|Staines|43	FO162
	SU|Staines|44	FO167
	SU|Staines|45	FO166
	SU|Staines|47	FO164
	SU|Staines|49	FO151
	SU|Staines|8	FO188
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	Freedom Trail	TR001
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.20 Poyle Community Area Baseline

Table 1-33: Poyle recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Poyle Poplars	GR018
Parks and gardens	Pippins Park	GR066
	Albany Park	GR067
Waterbodies	Old Slade Lake	WA007

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Orlitts Lake	WA008

Table 1-34: Poyle recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	BM|IVE|31/2	BR022
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|6	BR009
Footpath	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|3	FO136
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|6a	FO154
	YT|Colnbrook with Poyle|7	FO115
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006

1.21 Sipson Community Area Baseline

Table 1-35: Sipson recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Grow Heathrow	GR026
Parks and gardens	Sipson Recreation Ground	GR089

1.22 Stanwell Community Area Baseline

Table 1-36: Stanwell recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Caledonia Road Green	GR027
	Cambria Gardens Green	GR028
	Comet Road Green	GR029

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Diamedes Avenue/ Rose Garden	GR047
	Eddystone Walk Green	GR030
	Elsinore Avenue Green	GR031
	Holywell Way	GR095
	Jordans Close/Town Lane Amenity Space	GR048
	Lauser Road Park - Town Lane Rec Ground	GR050
	Linear POS along Hadrian Way	GR096
	Selwood Gardens	GR056
	Stanwell Village Green	GR032
Cemeteries and churchyards	Ashford Burial Ground	CE011
	Churchyard of St. Mary the Virgin, Stanwell	CE001
	Stanwell Cemetery	CE002
Children's play areas	Hadrian Way - Play Area	CH010
	Holywell Way - Play Area	CH009
	The Nightingales (Nuthatch Close)	CH005
	Victory Close AGS and Play Area	CH008
Natural and semi-natural green space	Oaks Road Biodiversity Site	GR080
Parks and gardens	Hengrove Recreation Ground	GR092
	Lauser Road Pocket Parks	GR049

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Long Lane Recreation Ground	GR046
	Stanwell Recreation Ground	GR044
	Village Park	GR045
Waterbodies	Staines Reservoirs	WA016

Table 1-37: Stanwell recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	SU|Staines|4	FO183
	SU|Staines|5	FO182
	SU|Staines|6	FO192
	SU|Staines|7	FO190
	SU|Staines|7a	FO214
	SU|Staines|8	FO188

1.23 Stanwell Moor Community Area Baseline

Table 1-38: Stanwell Moor recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Hithermoor Pocket Park	GR043
Natural and semi-natural green space	Staines Moor	GR083
Parks and gardens	Stanwell Moor Recreation Ground	GR042
Waterbodies	King George VI Reservoir	WA012

Table 1-39: Stanwell Moor recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	SU|Staines|3	FO185
	SU|Staines|50	BR012
	SU|Staines|50#1	BR015
	SU|Staines|51	BR013
Footpath	SU|Staines|10	FO080
	SU|Staines|11	FO085
	SU|Staines|2	FO186
	SU|Staines|3	FO185
	SU|Staines|43	FO162
	SU|Staines|9	FO187
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.24 West Drayton Community Area Baseline

Table 1-40: West Drayton recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Beech Close Green	GR001
	Bell Farm Green	GR165
	Drayton Hall Grounds	GR027
	Green Space north of M4 at Harmondsworth Road	GR101
	Holly Gardens and Kingston Lane Recreation Ground	GR102
	Parklodge Avenue Courtyards	GR003

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
	Southlands, The Green	GR099
	Spring Green	GR164
	The Closes	GR036
	The Dell	GR038
	Thornton Avenue Green Space	GR116
Cemeteries and churchyards	St Martin's Churchyard	CE021
	West Drayton Cemetery and Woodlands Cemetery	CE009
Children's play areas	Evergreen Drive Playground	CH024
	MUGA west of Milton Way	CH012
	Play Area east of Milton Way	CH011
	Spring Promenade Playground	CH001
Natural and semi-natural green space	Colne Valley Regional Park	GR033
	Open Space east of Colne Valley Park	GR115
	Fray's Island Nature Reserve	GR002
Parks and gardens	Autumn Green	GR159
	Recreation Ground South of Lavender Rise	GR086
	Southlands Arts Centre Gardens	GR100
	Townmead Recreation Ground	GR114

Table 1-41: West Drayton recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Byway	Hillingdon Y9	BY006

Type	Name	ID
Footpath	Hillingdon Y11	FO007
	Hillingdon Y8	FO181
	Hillingdon Y10	FO008
	Hillingdon Y5	FO174
	Hillingdon Y4	FO175
	Hillingdon Y6	FO173
	Hillingdon Y28	FO064
Trail	Middlesex Greenway	TR007

1.25 Wider Recreational Study Area Baseline

1.25.1.1 The receptors shown in this section are those which are located within the wider RecSA (i.e. the area of the RecSA not covered by any of the Community Areas above).

Table 1-42: Wider Recreational Study Area recreational spaces initial baseline

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Amenity green space	Land between Staines by Pass and River Ash	GR144
	Land East of Bedfont Pits	GR133
	Land North of Staines By Pass	GR146
	Leacroft	GR136
	Raleigh Park Open Space	GR147
	Scott Freeman Gardens	GR094
	Wolf Fields	GR156
Children's play areas	Playground in Southall	CH022

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Natural and semi-natural green space	Land North of River Ash	GR145
	Public Open Space South of Little Brittan Lake	GR130
	Public Open Space South of Packet Boat Lane	GR132
	River Crane Open Land	GR018
	Tentelow Lane Meadow	GR017
	Weston Walk	GR160
	Wraysbury Drive Open Space	GR131
	Bedfont Lake and The Pitts	GR073
	Shortwood Common and Birch Green	GR091
Parks and gardens		
	Bridge House Pond	GR148
	Cowley – Recreation Ground	GR134
	Echelforde Recreation Ground	GR093
	Letrim Park	GR149
	Manorcrofts Recreation Ground	GR143
	Osterley Park	GR034
	Rockingham Recreation Ground	GR158
	Runnymede Pleasure Ground	GR173
	Southall Recreation Ground	GR155
	Staines Memorial Gardens	GR137
	Lascelles Park Slough	GR171

Receptor type	Receptor	Receptor ID
Waterbodies	Fishing Lake in Yiewsley	WA003
	Little Britain Lake	WA018
	Woodlands Park Lake	WA002

Table 1-43: Wider Recreational Study Area recreational routes initial baseline

Type	Name	ID
Bridleway	BM|IVE|10/1	BR018
	BM|IVE|33/1	BR033
	BM|IVE|33/2	BR032
	BM|IVE|33/3	BR031
	BM|IVE|33/4	BR030
	BM|IVE|33/5	BR036
	BM|IVE|33/6	BR035
	BM|WEX|24/1	BR029
	BM|WEX|24/2	BR028
	BM|WEX|25/1	BR021
	BM|WEX|25/2	BR020
	BM|WEX|26/1	BR017
	BM|WEX|26/2	BR016
	BM|WEX|27/1	BR004
	SU|Egham|10	BR006
	Bridleway from Avenue Lodge Osterley Lane to South Lodge Osterley Lane	BR024
	Hillingdon Y1	BR019

Type	Name	ID
Byway	SU|Staines|42	BY005
Footpath	BM|IVE|7/1	FO180
	BM|IVE|7/2	FO178
	BM|IVE|7/3	FO176
	BM|IVE|7A/1	FO087
	BM|WEX|10/1	FO071
	BM|WEX|10/2	FO070
	BM|WEX|11/1	FO037
	BM|WEX|12/1	FO236
	BM|WEX|12/2	FO034
	BM|WEX|12/3	FO033
	BM|WEX|13/1	FO017
	BM|WEX|13/2	FO014
	BM|WEX|14/1	FO210
	BM|WEX|16/1	FO211
	BM|WEX|17/1	FO196
	BM|WEX|18/1	FO135
	BM|WEX|28/1	FO079
	BM|WEX|28/2	FO078
	BM|WEX|7/1	FO088
	BM|WEX|9/1	FO246
	Footpath adjacent 102 and 104 Bassett Gardens to Great West Road	FO107

Type	Name	ID
	Footpath between Park Road and Castle Way	FO142
	Footpath from adjacent 109 Jersey Road to rear of 176A Jersey Road	FO122
	Footpath from Osterley Lane in north easterly direction to rear of 34 St Marys Avenue	FO158
	Footpath from Osterley Park Farm in a south westerly directon to adjacent 190 Jersey Road	FO009
	Footpath from rear of 176A Jersey Road in a north westerly direction to Heston School	FO094
	Footpath from South Lodge Osterley Lane to adjacent 382 Jersey Road	FO207
	Footpath from station off footbridge on Spencer Road to Great West Road	FO153
	Footpath from Syon Roundabout to rear of 352 to 382 Jersey Road	FO016
	Footpath opposite Hare and Hounds Ph Windmill Lane to Wyke Green Lodge	FO030
	SU|Egham|32	FO148
	SU|Egham|66	FO161
	SU|Egham|66#1	FO195
	SU|Egham|66#2	FO198

Type	Name	ID
	SU|Egham|82	FO184
	SU|Egham|83	FO194
	SU|Egham|84	FO193
	SU|Staines|26	FO112
	SU|Staines|32	FO106
	SU|Staines|33	FO111
	SU|Staines|34	FO109
	SU|Staines|67	FO201
	SU|Staines|69	FO200
	WC|ETON|50/1	FO053
	WC|OLDW|3/3	FO163
	WC|OLDW|6/1	FO055
	YT|Slough|36	FO247
	YT|Slough|46	FO045
	Hillingdon U64	FO160
	Hillingdon U70	FO141
	Hillingdon U68	FO147
	Hillingdon Y25	FO061
	Hillingdon Y24	FO062
	Hillingdon Y2	FO172
	Hillingdon Y27	FO059
	Hillingdon H69	FO021
	Hillingdon H61	FO224

Type	Name	ID
	Hillingdon U69	FO146
	Hillingdon U79	FO128
	Hillingdon U65	FO157
	Hillingdon U78	FO145
	Hillingdon Y29	FO063
	Footpath from easterly corner south of Osterley Park Farm to wooded Area	FO004
Trail	Colne Valley Way	TR006
	Hillingdon Trail	TR003
	London Outer Orbital Path	TR005
	North-to-South Surrey Walk	TR004
	Freedom Trail	TR001
	Middlesex Greenway	TR007
	Buckinghamshire Way	TR008

Appendix 14.1

Local Planning and Health Policy

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 14.1 - Local Planning and Health Policy

Contents

1 Local Planning and Health Policy Documents 1

1.1 Overview 1
1.2 London Borough of Hillingdon 2
1.3 London Borough of Ealing 4
1.4 London Borough of Hounslow 7
1.5 London Borough of Richmond upon Thames 10
1.6 Slough Borough Council 12
1.7 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 14
1.8 Spelthorne Borough Council 17
1.9 Runnymede Borough Council 19
1.10 Elmbridge Borough Council 20
1.11 Wandsworth Borough Council 21
1.12 Buckinghamshire Council 23

1 Local Planning and Health Policy Documents

1.1 Overview

1.1.1 This Appendix summarises the planning and public health policy context relevant to Health for the Proposed Development. It reviews key health priorities, challenges and objectives identified within Local Plans, Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs), Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies (JHWSs), Annual Public Health Reports and other relevant health strategies across the eleven Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) that comprise the Local Health Study Area.

1.1.2 The review has been undertaken to understand the health profile, inequalities and priorities of communities that may be affected by the Proposed Development and to identify the key health determinants requiring consideration within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Particular attention is given to issues relating to health inequalities, population change, access to healthcare and community infrastructure, housing, employment, transport, environmental quality, open space and wider determinants of health.

1.1.3 The eleven LPAs within the Local Health Study Area are:

- London Borough of Hillingdon;
- London Borough of Ealing;
- London Borough of Hounslow;
- London Borough of Richmond upon Thames;
- Slough Borough Council;
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead;
- Spelthorne Borough Council;
- Runnymede Borough Council;
- Elmbridge Borough Council;
- Wandsworth Borough Council; and
- Buckinghamshire Council.

1.1.4 Collectively, the reviewed policy and evidence documents demonstrate a consistent focus on reducing health inequalities, improving physical and mental wellbeing, promoting healthy lifestyles, supporting sustainable and inclusive economic growth, enhancing access to services and infrastructure, and creating healthy places through high-quality built and natural environments. These priorities have informed the identification of health issues and pathways considered within the Human Scoping Chapter.

1.2 London Borough of Hillingdon

London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies

1.2.1 The London Borough of Hillingdon adopted its Local Plan[1] in November 2012 and provides the strategic planning framework for growth and development across the borough. Given Hillingdon's role as the host borough for Heathrow Airport, the Plan places particular emphasis on managing the environmental and transport impacts of major infrastructure whilst supporting economic growth, employment opportunities and the delivery of community infrastructure. The Plan seeks to promote sustainable communities through the provision of housing, healthcare, educational facilities, open space, sustainable transport and environmental protection. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to population change, accessibility, connectivity, air quality, noise, community infrastructure and socio-economic wellbeing.

1.2.2 Relevant policies include:

- Policy BE1 – Built Environment;
- Policy CI1 – Community Infrastructure Provision;
- Policy CI2 – Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy;
- Policy AM1 – Managing Transport Impacts of Development;
- Policy EM2 – Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Green Chains; and
- Policy EM8 – Land, Water, Air and Noise.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.2.3 Hillingdon's JSNA[2] provides the evidence base for understanding the health and wellbeing needs of residents and identifies existing and emerging health inequalities across the borough. The assessment highlights the influence of wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and access to healthcare. The JSNA notes the importance of Heathrow Airport and associated transport infrastructure in shaping local socio-economic and environmental conditions. The findings are particularly relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide a baseline understanding of communities that may experience both beneficial and adverse health effects associated with airport-related growth and infrastructure development.

1.2.4 Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

[1] London Borough of Hillingdon (2012) *Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies*. Available at: Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (Adopted November 2012) (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[2] London Borough of Hillingdon (2026) *JSNA*. Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment | Needs assessments | Hillingdon Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Health inequalities between wards and population groups across the borough;
- Variations in health outcomes associated with deprivation and socioeconomic disadvantage;
- Mental health and wellbeing challenges;
- High prevalence of cardiovascular and respiratory disease;
- The importance of housing, employment, transport and environmental quality as determinants of health; and
- The need to encourage healthier lifestyles and improve access to health and care services.

Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-3031 (Draft)

1.2.5 The Draft JHWS[3] seeks to improve health outcomes and reduce inequalities through integrated working between the Council, NHS and wider partners. The Strategy promotes prevention, early intervention and a place-based approach to improving health and wellbeing. Its priorities align closely with key health issues relevant to the Heathrow West Project, including inequalities, access to services, healthy ageing, mental wellbeing and creating healthier places and communities. The JHWS focuses on four long-term priorities:

1. Best Start in Life: Supporting children and families from pregnancy through childhood.

2. Live well: Helping adults stay healthy, manage long-term conditions and support their mental wellbeing.

3. Age well: Helping older people live independently for as long as possible, with quicker support at home and better recovery after illness.

4. Healthy places: Creating neighbourhoods that support good health, connection and wellbeing.

Annual Public Health Report 2024-25

1.2.6 The Annual Public Health Report[4] provides insight into emerging health challenges and priorities within Hillingdon. Recent reports emphasise reducing health inequalities, improving population health outcomes and addressing the wider determinants of health through collaborative action. The reports highlight the importance of prevention, healthy lifestyles, mental wellbeing, community resilience and creating healthy environments. These themes are particularly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, transport networks, environmental

[3] Royal Borough of Hillingdon (2026) *Hillingdon Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2031 (Draft).* Available at: health-and-wellbeing-strategy-2026-2031-draft (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[4] Royal Borough of Hillingdon (2025) *Annual Public Health Report.* Available at: Annual Public Health Report (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

quality and community infrastructure have the potential to influence local health and wellbeing outcomes.

1.2.7 Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities and improving outcomes for disadvantaged communities;
- Promoting mental health and emotional wellbeing;
- Encouraging healthier lifestyles and preventing avoidable disease;
- Supporting vulnerable populations and strengthening community resilience; and
- Creating healthier places through coordinated action across housing, transport, environmental and public health sectors.

Best Start in Life Strategy 2026-2031

1.2.8 The Best Start in Life Strategy 2026–2031[5] aims to improve outcomes for children, young people and families across Hillingdon by addressing the wider determinants of health from pregnancy through to adulthood. The Strategy promotes a preventative approach focused on reducing inequalities, improving physical and mental wellbeing, supporting families, and ensuring access to services and opportunities. These objectives are relevant to the Proposed Development particularly in relation to population growth, community infrastructure provision, access to services and the creation of healthy and inclusive communities.

1.2.9 Key priorities include:

- Supporting healthy childhood development and family wellbeing;
- Improving physical, mental and emotional health outcomes;
- Reducing inequalities and improving life opportunities;
- Strengthening community resilience and early intervention; and
- Creating healthy places where children and young people can thrive.

1.3 London Borough of Ealing

Ealing Development (or Core) Strategy 2026 (Development Plan Document)

1.3.1 The council adopted the Development (or Core) Strategy[6] in April 2012. It provides the strategic framework for growth and development across the borough to 2026. The Strategy promotes sustainable development through the delivery of housing, employment opportunities, community infrastructure, environmental protection and improved transport

[5] London Borough of Hillingdon (2026) *Best Start in Life Strategy.* Available at: best-start-in-life-strategy (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[6] London Borough of Ealing (2012) *Development Core Strategy DPD.* Available at: Development core strategy DPD | Ealing Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

connectivity. These objectives are relevant to the Proposed Development as they support healthy, well-connected communities, sustainable travel, access to services and the protection of environmental quality. The borough's proximity to Heathrow also means that transport, air quality and sustainable growth are important considerations for future development.

Emerging Ealing Local Plan 2024-2039

1.3.2 The emerging Ealing Local Plan[7], submitted for examination in 2024, places a stronger emphasis on health, climate resilience, equality and inclusive growth. The Plan seeks to create healthy and sustainable communities through high-quality placemaking, active travel, green infrastructure, improved environmental quality and the provision of social infrastructure. These priorities are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to transport connectivity, environmental quality, health inequalities, access to open space and the delivery of supporting infrastructure for existing and future communities.

- SP2 – Tackling the Climate Crisis;
- SP2.3 – Thriving Communities;
- SP3 – Fighting Inequality;
- SP3.3 – Healthy Lives; and
- SP4 – Creating Good Jobs and Growth.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.3.3 Ealing's JSNA[8] provides the evidence base for understanding current and future health needs across the borough and is used to inform service planning and public health priorities. The assessment highlights the importance of housing, employment, education, environmental conditions and access to healthcare as key determinants of health. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they identify communities that may experience both beneficial and adverse health effects associated with changes to employment, transport networks, environmental conditions and access to services.

1.3.4 Key issues emerging from the JSNA includes:

- Significant health inequalities between different communities and towns within the borough;
- Variations in health outcomes linked to deprivation, ethnicity and socioeconomic circumstances;

[7] London Borough of Ealing (2024) *New Local Plan.* Available at: New Local Plan | New Local Plan | Ealing Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[8] London Borough of Ealing (2026) *Ealing's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.* Available at: Ealing's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment | Ealing's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment | Ealing Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- The need to improve access to healthcare services and preventative health support;
- The importance of housing quality, employment, education and environmental conditions as determinants of health; and
- Ongoing concerns relating to mental health, long-term conditions, air quality and healthy lifestyles.

Together in Ealing: Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023-2028

1.3.5 The Health and Wellbeing Strategy[9] focuses on reducing health inequalities and improving wellbeing through action on the wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, access to services, community connections and environmental quality. The Strategy promotes a prevention-led approach and is relevant to Heathrow West through its emphasis on creating healthier places, reducing inequalities and ensuring communities benefit from growth and investment. The Strategy is organised around three overarching commitments:

1. Putting communities at the heart of everything.
2. Systems and structures that leave no one behind.
3. Connecting the building blocks of health and wellbeing.

Annual Public Health Reports

1.3.6 Recent Annual Public Health Reports[10] provide additional insight into emerging health priorities across Ealing and reinforce the importance of prevention and tackling health inequalities. The reports highlight a range of issues relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly where development may influence environmental conditions, community wellbeing and opportunities for healthier lifestyles. Recent priorities include:

- Vaping among young people and the need for preventative health approaches (2025); and
- Mental health and wellbeing, recognising the influence of social, economic and environmental factors on health outcomes (2024).

[9] Ealing Health and Wellbeing Board (2023) *Together in Ealing: Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023-2028.* Available at: Together in Ealing - Health and wellbeing strategy 2023 to 2028 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[10] London Borough of Ealing (2025) *Annual Public Health Reports.* Available at: Annual public health reports | Ealing Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

1.4 London Borough of Hounslow

Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030

1.4.1 The London Borough of Hounslow adopted its Local Plan[11] was adopted in September 2015, providing the strategic framework for growth and development across the borough to 2030. As a borough that contains part of Heathrow Airport and experiences significant airport-related activity, the Plan seeks to balance economic growth and employment opportunities with environmental protection, sustainable transport, community infrastructure provision and the creation of healthy places. The Plan promotes sustainable development through the delivery of housing, healthcare, education, open space, active travel infrastructure and environmental improvements. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to population change, employment growth, accessibility, connectivity, air quality, noise, green infrastructure and community wellbeing. Relevant policies include:

- Policy C13 – Health Facilities and Healthy Places;
- Policy CI1 – Providing and Protecting Community Facilities;
- Policy EC1 – Strategic Transport Connections;
- Policy EC2 – Developing a Sustainable Local Transport Network;
- Policy EQ2 – Sustainable Design and Construction;
- Policy EQ4 – Air Quality;
- Policy GB4 – The Green Infrastructure Network; and
- Policy IMP1 – Sustainable Development

Hounslow Local Plan 2020-2041 Proposed Submission Version (Regulation 19)

1.4.2 The Hounslow Local Plan 2020–2041 Proposed Submission Version[12] was published in July 2024, with Regulation 19 consultation undertaken between 6 September and 28 October 2024. The Plan represents the Council's proposed planning framework for the borough to 2041 and was the final consultation version before submission for independent examination.

1.4.3 The Plan places a strong emphasis on creating healthy and inclusive communities, reducing health inequalities and ensuring that growth is supported by appropriate community and health infrastructure. Relevant policies address health facilities and healthy places, green infrastructure, air quality, noise, sustainable transport, active travel, employment and skills, and the environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with Heathrow Airport. The Plan is relevant to the Proposed Development particularly in

[11] London Borough of Hounslow (2015) *Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030.* Available at: hounslow-local-plan-part-1-direct (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[12] London Borough of Hounslow (2024) *Hounslow Local Plan 2020-2041: Proposed Submission Version (Regulation 19).* Available at: Local Plan Review – Regulation 19 Consultation on the Hounslow Local Plan 2020-2041 | Local Plan review | London Borough of Hounslow (accessed on: 21/09/2026).

relation to health inequalities, accessibility and connectivity, environmental quality, employment opportunities, community infrastructure and the creation of healthy places.

1.4.4 Relevant policies include:

- Policy CI3: Health Facilities and Healthy Places;
- Policy GB4: The Green Infrastructure Network;
- Policy EQ4: Air Quality;
- Policy EQ5: Noise;
- Policy EC2: Developing a Sustainable Transport Network;
- Policy EC3: Heathrow Airport;
- Policy ED1: Promoting Employment Growth and Development; and
- Policy ED4: Enhancing Local Skills.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.4.5 Hounslow's JSNA[13] provides the evidence base for understanding the current and future health and wellbeing needs of the borough's population and supports the planning and commissioning of health, social care and public health services. The assessment highlights the importance of wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and access to healthcare. Given Hounslow's proximity to Heathrow Airport and major transport corridors, the JSNA identifies environmental and socioeconomic factors that influence health outcomes across the borough. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide a baseline understanding of communities that may experience both positive and negative health effects associated with airport-related development and infrastructure investment. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Health inequalities between communities and population groups;
- High prevalence of long-term conditions, including cardiovascular and respiratory disease;
- Child and adult obesity and low levels of physical activity;
- Mental health challenges and vulnerability amongst some population groups;
- Environmental pressures including air pollution, noise and poor housing; and
- Inequalities in access to healthcare and support services.

[13] London Borough of Hounslow (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.* Available at: Joint strategic needs assessment | London Borough of Hounslow (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

Hounslow Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023-2026

1.4.6 The Hounslow JHWS 2023–2026[14] sets out a shared vision to improve health, wellbeing and life chances across the borough through collaborative working between the Council, NHS and wider partners. The Strategy places a strong emphasis on tackling health inequalities, prevention and early intervention, whilst recognising the importance of wider social, economic and environmental determinants of health. These priorities align closely with key issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including inequalities, access to services, community resilience, healthy environments and economic opportunity. The Strategy is supported by the underlying principles of:

- Promoting a life course approach – Supporting residents' health and wellbeing from early years through to older age.
- Place based and localities focused – Tailoring interventions to the needs of specific communities and neighbourhoods.
- Prevention and early intervention – Addressing issues before they escalate and reducing long-term health inequalities.

Annual Public Health Report 2023/24

1.4.7 The most recent Annual Public Health Report 2023/24[15] provides an overview of emerging health challenges and priorities across Hounslow and highlights opportunities to improve population health through partnership working and preventative action. The Report emphasises the need to reduce health inequalities, improve health outcomes and address the wider determinants of health, recognising the important role that housing, employment, transport, environmental quality and community networks play in shaping wellbeing. These themes are particularly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, transport infrastructure, environmental conditions and community facilities have the potential to influence health outcomes across local communities. Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities and supporting disadvantaged communities;
- Improving mental health and emotional wellbeing;
- Encouraging healthier lifestyles and preventing avoidable illness;
- Strengthening community resilience and social connectedness; and
- Creating healthier environments through coordinated action across planning, housing, transport and public health sectors.

[14] London Borough of Hounslow (2023) *Hounslow Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023-2026.* Available at: Hounslow Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2023 - 2026 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[15] London Borough of Hounslow (2023) *Hounslow Annual Public Health Report 2023-24.* Available at: From the Ground Up: (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

1.5 London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Richmond upon Thames Local Plan 'The Best for our Borough' 2024-2039 (Interim Version)

1.5.1 An interim version of the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan[16] was adopted in October 2025, noting that a final version will be published in due course. The Plan establishes the strategic vision and planning framework for accommodating growth whilst protecting the borough's distinctive character, environmental assets and high quality of life. The Local Plan seeks to address a range of future challenges, including climate change, health, affordability and liveability, whilst supporting sustainable development and the provision of infrastructure and services. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to population change, transport connectivity, environmental quality, access to services, green infrastructure and community wellbeing. The borough's proximity to Heathrow Airport means that airport-related transport, environmental and socio-economic issues remain important considerations for local communities. Relevant policies include:

- Policies relating to healthy and sustainable communities;
- Policies supporting the provision and protection of social and community infrastructure;
- Policies promoting active travel, sustainable transport and accessibility;
- Policies protecting and enhancing parks, open spaces and biodiversity;
- Policies addressing environmental quality, air quality and climate change; and
- Policies supporting high-quality place-making and healthy neighbourhoods.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.5.2 Richmond's JSNA[17] provides the evidence base for understanding the health, care and wellbeing needs of the local population and is used to inform strategic priorities, service planning and commissioning. The assessment considers demographic trends, health outcomes, health inequalities and the wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and access to services. The findings are relevant to the Heathrow West Project as they provide important baseline information regarding the health and wellbeing of communities that may be affected by changes in employment, transport infrastructure, environmental conditions and access to community services

[16] London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (2025) *Richmond upon Thames Local Plan.* Available at: Adopted Local Plan - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[17] London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.* Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

associated with airport-related development. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Health inequalities experienced by specific communities and vulnerable groups;
- The importance of maintaining good physical and mental health across the life course;
- Long-term health conditions and healthy ageing;
- The influence of housing, transport, employment and environmental quality on health outcomes;
- Supporting children and young people to achieve the best start in life; and
- Promoting healthy lifestyles and preventing ill health.

Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024-2029

1.5.3 The Richmond Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024–2029[18], entitled 18 Steps to Health and Wellbeing, sets out a five-year vision for improving health and wellbeing and reducing inequalities across the borough. The Strategy has been developed collaboratively by the Council, NHS, voluntary sector organisations and wider partners and is informed by the priorities identified through the JSNA. It adopts a life-course approach, recognising that health and wellbeing are influenced by a broad range of social, economic and environmental factors. These priorities align closely with key issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including health inequalities, environmental quality, community resilience, access to services and the creation of healthy places. The Strategy is structured around three overarching themes:

- Start Well – Supporting children, young people and families to achieve the best possible outcomes.
- Live Well – Helping residents maintain healthy lifestyles, prevent illness and manage long-term conditions.
- Age Well – Supporting older people to remain healthy, active and independent for longer.

Annual Report of the Director of Public Health

1.5.4 The Annual Report of the Director of Public Health (2026)[19] provides an overview of health outcomes, emerging public health challenges and opportunities to improve population wellbeing across Richmond upon Thames. The report emphasises the importance of prevention, reducing

[18] London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (2024) *Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024-2029.* Available at: 18 Steps to Health and Wellbeing - Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024 - 2029 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[19] London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (2026) *Annual Report of the Director of Public Health.* Available at: Annual Report of the Director of Public Health - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

health inequalities and addressing the wider determinants of health through partnership working. Particular focus is placed on improving mental and physical wellbeing, promoting healthy communities and creating environments that support good health. These themes are highly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, transport networks, environmental quality and community infrastructure have the potential to influence health outcomes across local communities. Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities and supporting vulnerable residents;
- Improving mental health and wellbeing;
- Promoting healthy lifestyles and preventative health measures;
- Supporting healthy ageing and independence;
- Strengthening community resilience and social connectedness; and
- Creating healthy and sustainable places through coordinated action across planning, transport, housing and public health sectors.

1.6 Slough Borough Council

Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2026

1.6.1 The Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy[20] was adopted in December 2008 and forms the principal strategic planning framework for growth and development within the borough. As a key economic hub within the Thames Valley and an area closely linked to Heathrow Airport through employment and transport connections, the Core Strategy seeks to support economic growth whilst delivering sustainable communities, environmental protection and improved infrastructure. It promotes the provision of housing, community facilities, transport infrastructure and environmental improvements necessary to support a growing population. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to employment, transport connectivity, population growth, community infrastructure, accessibility and environmental quality. Relevant policies include:

- Core Policy 1 – Spatial Strategy;
- Core Policy 6 – Infrastructure and Services;
- Core Policy 7 – Transport;
- Core Policy 8 – Sustainability and the Environment; and
- Policies supporting regeneration, housing delivery, economic development and environmental protection.

1.6.2 Slough Borough Council is preparing a new Local Plan.

[20] Slough Borough Council (2008) *Core Strategy Development Plan Document.* Available at: https://www.slough.gov.uk/downloads/file/2273/development-plan-core-strategy-2006-2026 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.6.3 Slough's JSNA[21] provides the evidence base used by the Council, NHS partners and the Health and Wellbeing Board to understand the current and future health needs of local communities. The assessment considers demographic trends, health outcomes, inequalities and the wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and access to services. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide an understanding of the health profile of communities that may experience both beneficial and adverse effects associated with airport-related growth, employment opportunities and infrastructure development. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Significant health inequalities between communities;
- Shorter healthy life expectancy compared with regional and national averages;
- High levels of deprivation and socioeconomic disadvantage;
- Elevated prevalence of long-term health conditions, including cardiovascular disease and diabetes;
- Mental health and wellbeing challenges across population groups; and
- The importance of housing, employment, education and environmental quality as key determinants of health.

Slough Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036

1.6.4 The Slough Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026–2036[22] establishes a ten-year vision for improving health outcomes and reducing inequalities across the borough. Developed through collaboration between the Council, NHS partners, community organisations and residents, the Strategy seeks to address longstanding health challenges through prevention, early intervention and improved partnership working. The Strategy recognises that many residents experience shorter and less healthy lives than might otherwise be expected and promotes coordinated action to address the wider determinants of health. These priorities align closely with issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including inequalities, healthy environments, access to services, community resilience and economic opportunity. The Strategy is structured around three key drivers for change:

- People at the centre – Ensuring services are designed around the needs of residents and communities.
- Prevention, prevention, prevention – Promoting early intervention and addressing the causes of poor health before they escalate.

[21] Slough Borough Council (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.* Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) – Slough Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[22] Slough Borough Council (2026) *Slough Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036.* Available at: Slough Joint Local Health & Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Growing our health and wellbeing system with Slough in mind – Developing integrated, culturally responsive services that reflect the needs of Slough's diverse communities.

1.6.5 These drivers support four overarching themes:

- Start Well;
- Live Well;
- Age Well; and
- Healthy Place.

Director of Public Health Annual Report

1.6.6 The Director of Public Health Annual Report[23] provides insight into emerging health challenges, population health trends and public health priorities within Slough. Recent reports highlight the need to reduce health inequalities, improve healthy life expectancy and address the social, economic and environmental factors influencing health outcomes. Particular emphasis is placed on prevention, community resilience, healthy lifestyles and partnership working to support healthier communities. These themes are highly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, environmental quality, transport networks and community infrastructure have the potential to influence local health and wellbeing outcomes. Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities and improving healthy life expectancy;
- Supporting mental health and emotional wellbeing;
- Promoting healthier lifestyles and preventing avoidable disease;
- Strengthening community resilience and social connectedness;
- Supporting children and young people to achieve the best start in life; and
- Creating healthier places through coordinated action across housing, transport, planning and public health sectors.

1.7 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Royal Borough Council Plan 2013-2033

1.7.1 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead adopted its Borough Local Plan in 2022[24], providing the statutory planning framework for development across the borough to 2033. The Plan seeks to accommodate housing and economic growth whilst protecting the borough's distinctive environmental assets, including the Green Belt, Thames corridor and valued natural and historic environments. It promotes sustainable communities through the

[23] Slough Borough Council (2025) *Director of Public Health Annual Report.* Available at: Director of Public Health Annual report (ADPH) – Slough Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[24] Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (2022) *Borough Local Plan 2013-2033.* Available at: https://consult.rbwm.gov.uk/file/6590159 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

provision of housing, community facilities, transport infrastructure, open space and environmental protection. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to population growth, transport connectivity, environmental quality, community infrastructure and health and wellbeing. The borough's proximity to Heathrow Airport means that airport-related economic, transport and environmental influences remain important considerations for local communities. Relevant policies include:

- Policy SP2 – Sustainability and Placemaking;
- Policy EP2 – Air Pollution;
- Policy EP3 – Artificial Light Pollution;
- Policies supporting sustainable transport and connectivity;
- Policies protecting green infrastructure, biodiversity and open space; and
- Policies supporting the provision of community infrastructure and healthy, sustainable communities.

1.7.2 Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead are preparing a new Local Plan.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.7.3 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead's JSNA[25] provides the evidence base for understanding the current and future health, wellbeing and care needs of local communities. The assessment brings together data, tools and profiles relating to population characteristics, health outcomes, health inequalities and the wider determinants of health. It supports strategic planning, commissioning and decision-making by identifying local priorities, challenges and opportunities for improving population health. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide important baseline information regarding communities that may be affected by changes to employment, transport infrastructure, environmental quality and access to services associated with airport-related development. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Health inequalities that exist despite the borough's generally favourable health profile;
- Variations in health outcomes between neighbourhoods and population groups;
- The importance of supporting healthy ageing within an ageing population;
- The influence of housing, employment, education and environmental quality on health and wellbeing;
- Supporting children and young people to achieve the best start in life; and

[25] Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment*. Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment | Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Addressing obesity, long-term health conditions and lifestyle-related health risks.

Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036

1.7.4 The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036[26] establishes a ten-year vision for improving health and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities across the borough. The Strategy has been developed collaboratively by the Council, NHS partners, community organisations and residents and adopts a strong prevention-focused approach. It promotes a life-course model that seeks to improve outcomes from childhood through to older age, recognising the importance of wider social, economic and environmental determinants of health. These priorities align closely with key issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including healthy environments, health inequalities, community resilience and access to services. The Strategy is structured around four life-course priorities:

1. Start Well – Giving children and young people the best start in life.
2. Live Well – Supporting healthier lives and helping people remain well for longer.
3. Age Well – Enabling older people to remain healthy, independent and connected.
4. Healthy Place – Creating environments that support health and wellbeing in homes, workplaces, communities and green spaces.

1.7.5 The Strategy places particular emphasis on:

- Prevention and early intervention;
- Reducing health inequalities;
- Integrated health and care services;
- Community empowerment and resilience; and
- Partnership working across public, voluntary and community sectors.

Director of Public Health Report

1.7.6 The Director of Public Health Annual Report[27] provides insight into emerging public health issues and priorities affecting residents of Windsor and Maidenhead. The most recent report from 2025 focuses on the hidden harms associated with alcohol consumption and the actions required by health partners, community organisations and residents to reduce alcohol-related harm and improve population health outcomes. More broadly, the

[26] Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (2026) *Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036.* Available at: Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2036 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[27] Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (2025) *Why the Building Blocks of Health Matter: A Focus on the Harm Caused by Alcohol.* Available at: 2025 RBWM Director of Public Health Report (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

report reinforces the importance of prevention, tackling inequalities and addressing the wider determinants of health through coordinated local action. These themes are highly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, transport networks, environmental quality and community infrastructure have the potential to influence local health and wellbeing outcomes. Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities;
- Improving physical and mental wellbeing;
- Preventing avoidable ill health and promoting healthier lifestyles;
- Supporting vulnerable groups and strengthening community resilience;
- Tackling alcohol-related harm and its wider social impacts; and
- Creating healthier and more sustainable places through partnership working across planning, transport, housing and public health sectors.

1.8 Spelthorne Borough Council

Spelthorne Local Plan 2024-2039/40

1.8.1 The Spelthorne Local Plan 2024–2039/40[28] was adopted in March 2026 and provides the statutory planning framework for development across the borough. The Plan seeks to deliver sustainable growth whilst protecting environmental assets, supporting community infrastructure and responding to the challenges associated with climate change. Particular emphasis is placed on creating healthy neighbourhoods, improving access to services, enhancing green and blue infrastructure, promoting active travel and ensuring that growth is supported by appropriate social and community infrastructure. Given Spelthorne's proximity to Heathrow Airport, the Plan also recognises the importance of managing airport-related transport, environmental and socio-economic influences. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to transport connectivity, environmental quality, community infrastructure, green infrastructure and population health. Relevant policy themes include:

- Sustainable development and climate resilience;
- Healthy neighbourhoods and placemaking;
- Community infrastructure and access to services;
- Green and blue infrastructure;
- Sustainable and active travel;
- Environmental quality and pollution control; and
- Heathrow Airport and associated transport infrastructure.

[28] Spelthorne Borough Council (2026) *Spelthorne Local Plan 2024-2039/40*. Available at: Spelthorne Local Plan 2024-2039-40 (March 2026)_0.pdf (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

Surrey Joint Strategy Needs Assessment

1.8.2 As part of Surrey, Spelthorne is informed by the county-wide Surrey JSNA[29]. It provides the evidence base for understanding the current and future health and social care needs of Surrey's population, including Spelthrone, and supports service planning, commissioning and decision-making. It assesses a broad range of health, wellbeing and social issues across the life course, including mental health, physical health, housing, transport, employment, environmental quality and health inequalities. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide important baseline information regarding the health needs and vulnerabilities of communities that may experience changes associated with airport-related growth, infrastructure development and environmental change. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Health inequalities experienced by different population groups and communities;
- Mental health and emotional wellbeing across all ages;
- Housing, transport and economic conditions as key determinants of health;
- Loneliness, social isolation and community resilience;
- Physical activity, healthy lifestyles and prevention of ill health; and
- The importance of creating healthy places and environments.

Spelthorne Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2027

1.8.3 The Spelthorne Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022–2027[30] sets out the borough's priorities for improving health and wellbeing through partnership working between local organisations, healthcare providers and community groups. The Strategy aims to reduce health inequalities and empower residents to improve their own health and wellbeing. The priorities align closely with issues relevant to the Heathrow West Project, including healthy environments, access to services, community resilience and supporting healthier lifestyles. The Strategy is organised around three core themes:

- People – Enabling residents to improve their physical and mental health and increase levels of physical activity.
- Place – Creating healthy environments through good quality housing, attractive neighbourhoods and access to parks and open spaces.
- Community – Building connected, resilient communities and supporting community-led services.

1.8.4 Key priorities include:

[29] Surrey County Council (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment*. Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment | Surrey-i (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[30] Spelthorne Borough Council (2022) *Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2022-2027*. Available at: Health and wellbeing strategy | Spelthorne Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Supporting positive mental health and wellbeing;
- Increasing physical activity;
- Improving housing and neighbourhood quality;
- Maximising the use of parks and open spaces;
- Strengthening community resilience; and
- Improving access to local support services.

Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2030

1.8.5 The Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026–2030[31] provides the wider strategic framework for improving health and wellbeing across Surrey, including Spelthorne. The Strategy seeks to reduce health inequalities, improve population health outcomes and promote integrated health and social care through a preventative and partnership-based approach. It recognises the importance of the wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, transport, environmental quality and community networks. These priorities are particularly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to transport infrastructure, employment opportunities, environmental conditions and access to services may influence local health outcomes. The Strategy focuses on:

- Reducing health inequalities;
- Prevention and early intervention;
- Creating healthy places and communities;
- Supporting community resilience;
- Improving mental and physical wellbeing; and
- Integrated health and care services.

1.9 Runnymede Borough Council

Runnymede 2030 Local Plan

1.9.1 The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan[32] was adopted in July 2020 and forms the statutory planning framework for development within the borough to 2030. The Plan sets out the spatial strategy for accommodating growth, providing housing and employment opportunities, delivering infrastructure and protecting environmental assets. It seeks to ensure that development is supported by appropriate community facilities, sustainable transport infrastructure, high-quality placemaking and environmental protection. Given Runnymede's proximity to Heathrow Airport and its strategic transport connections, the Plan is particularly relevant to Proposed Development in relation to transport infrastructure, community resources, environmental quality, accessibility and population change. Relevant policies include:

[31] Surrey County Council (2026) *Surrey Health and Well-Being Strategy – Update 2026.* Available at: Surrey Health and Well-Being Strategy - update 2026 | Healthy Surrey (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[32] Runnymede Borough Council (2020) *Runnymede 2030 Local Plan*. Available at: Adopted 2030 Local Plan (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Policy SD3 – Active and Sustainable Travel;
- Policy SD5 – Infrastructure Provision and Timing;
- Policy SD6 – Retention of Social and Community Infrastructure;
- Policy SD7 – Sustainable Design;
- Policy SD8 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy; and
- Policy SL1 – Health and Wellbeing, which supports development that promotes community facilities, recreation opportunities and healthy lifestyles.

Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.9.2 As part of Surrey, Runnymede is informed by the county-wide Surrey JSNA which is discussed above within the Spelthorne Borough Council section.

Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2030

1.9.3 Runnymede Borough Council does not have a standalone Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Instead, the Surrey-wide strategy provides the strategic framework for improving health and wellbeing across Surrey, including Runnymede. This is discussed above within the Spelthorne Borough Council section.

1.10 Elmbridge Borough Council

Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011-2026

1.10.1 The Elmbridge Core Strategy[33] forms the principal planning framework for development within the borough and guides growth, infrastructure provision and environmental management to 2026. The Strategy seeks to maintain a high quality of life through sustainable development, coordinated infrastructure delivery, environmental protection and the provision of housing, employment and community facilities. The Plan promotes sustainable transport, protection of green infrastructure, delivery of social and community infrastructure and high-quality place-making. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to transport connectivity, environmental quality, community infrastructure, open space provision and population wellbeing. Relevant policies include:

- Policy CS16 – Social and Community Infrastructure;
- Policy CS25 – Travel and Accessibility;
- Policy CS14 – Green Infrastructure;
- Policy CS17 – Local Character, Density and Design;
- Policy CS26 – Flooding;
- Policy CS27 – Sustainable Buildings; and

[33] Elmbridge Borough Council (2011) *Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011-2026*. Available at: Core Strategy | Elmbridge Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

- Policies supporting sustainable growth, housing provision and environmental protection.

1.10.2 Elmbridge is preparing a new Local Plan to guide development, housing, and land use in the borough, with a focus on sustainability, green belt protection, and meeting housing needs.

Surrey Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.10.3 As part of Surrey, Elmbridge is informed by the county-wide Surrey JSNA which is discussed above within the Spelthorne Borough Council section.

Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2026-2030

1.10.4 Elmbridge Borough Council does not have a standalone Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Instead, the Surrey-wide strategy provides the strategic framework for improving health and wellbeing across Surrey, including Elmbridge. This is discussed above within the Spelthorne Borough Council section.

1.11 Wandsworth Borough Council

Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2038

1.11.1 The Wandsworth Local Plan 2023–2038[34] provides the statutory planning framework for growth and development across the borough. The Plan seeks to accommodate housing and employment growth whilst delivering sustainable communities, supporting infrastructure provision and improving environmental quality. It promotes healthy neighbourhoods through high-quality placemaking, sustainable transport, active travel, access to open space, community facilities and environmental protection. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to transport connectivity, environmental quality, community infrastructure, accessibility and population wellbeing. Relevant policy themes include:

- Healthy and sustainable neighbourhoods;
- Community and social infrastructure provision;
- Active travel and sustainable transport;
- Air quality and environmental protection;
- Green infrastructure and open spaces; and
- Climate resilience and sustainable development.

[34] Wandsworth Borough Council (2023) *The Adopted Local Plan.* Available at: The Adopted Local Plan - Wandsworth Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

Wandsworth Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

1.11.2 Wandsworth's JSNA[35] provides the evidence base for understanding the health, wellbeing and care needs of local communities. The assessment considers demographic trends, health outcomes, inequalities and the wider determinants of health, including housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and access to healthcare. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide important baseline information regarding communities that may experience both beneficial and adverse health effects associated with changes to employment opportunities, transport infrastructure, environmental conditions and access to services. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Health inequalities between communities and population groups;
- Mental health and wellbeing challenges;
- Long-term physical health conditions and healthy ageing;
- The influence of housing, employment and environmental quality on health outcomes;
- The importance of supporting children and young people to achieve the best start in life; and
- Promoting healthier lifestyles and reducing preventable disease.

Wandsworth Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024-2029

1.11.3 The Wandsworth Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024–2029[36], entitled 19 Steps to Health and Wellbeing, sets out a five-year vision for improving health outcomes and reducing inequalities across the borough. Developed collaboratively by the Council, NHS partners, voluntary organisations and local communities, the Strategy adopts a life-course approach to health and wellbeing. It recognises the importance of the wider determinants of health and promotes coordinated action to create healthier and more resilient communities. These priorities align closely with key issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including inequalities, access to services, environmental quality, healthy places and community resilience. The Strategy is structured around three overarching themes:

- Start Well – Supporting children, young people and families.
- Live Well – Promoting healthy lifestyles, prevention and management of long-term conditions.
- Age Well – Helping older people remain healthy, independent and connected.

[35] Wandsworth Borough Council (2026) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment*. Available at: Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) - Wandsworth Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[36] Wandsworth Borough Council (2024) *Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024-2029.* Available at: 19 Steps to Health and Wellbeing - Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2024 - 2029 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

1.11.4 The Strategy places particular emphasis on:

- Prevention and early intervention;
- Reducing health inequalities;
- Improving mental health and wellbeing;
- Supporting healthy ageing;
- Creating healthy places and communities; and
- Strengthening partnership working across services.

Annual Report of the Director of Public Health

1.11.5 The Annual Report of the Director of Public Health[37] provides an overview of population health trends, emerging health challenges and public health priorities within Wandsworth. Recent reports emphasise the importance of prevention, reducing inequalities and addressing the wider determinants of health through collaborative action. Particular focus is placed on improving mental and physical wellbeing, supporting vulnerable communities and creating healthier environments that support long-term wellbeing. These themes are highly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment opportunities, transport infrastructure, environmental quality and community facilities may influence local health outcomes. Recent priorities include:

- Reducing health inequalities and improving outcomes for disadvantaged communities;
- Promoting mental health and emotional wellbeing;
- Encouraging healthier lifestyles and preventing avoidable disease;
- Supporting vulnerable populations and strengthening community resilience;
- Promoting healthy ageing and independent living; and
- Creating healthier places through coordinated action across planning, housing, transport and public health sectors.

1.12 Buckinghamshire Council

The Local Plan for Buckinghamshire

1.12.1 Buckinghamshire Council is preparing a single county-wide Local Plan[38] to provide a consistent planning framework across Buckinghamshire. In the interim, development continues to be guided by the adopted local plans inherited from the former district and county authorities. Collectively, these plans seek to support sustainable growth, deliver housing and employment opportunities, protect environmental assets, improve transport connectivity and ensure that growth is supported by appropriate infrastructure and

[37] Wandsworth Borough Council (2026) *Annual Report of the Director of Public Health. Available* at: Annual Report of the Director of Public Health - Wandsworth Borough Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[38] Buckinghamshire Council (2026) *The Local Plan for Buckinghamshire.* Available at: The Local Plan for Buckinghamshire | Buckinghamshire Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

community facilities. The emerging Buckinghamshire-wide planning framework places increasing emphasis on climate resilience, healthy communities, sustainable transport and high-quality placemaking. These objectives are directly relevant to the Proposed Development, particularly in relation to transport infrastructure, employment, environmental quality, community infrastructure and population change. Relevant policy themes include:

- Sustainable development and placemaking;
- Provision of community and social infrastructure;
- Sustainable and active travel;
- Environmental protection, climate change and air quality;
- Green infrastructure and access to open space; and
- Supporting economic growth and thriving communities.

South Bucks District Local Plan

1.12.2 The South Bucks District Local Plan[39] was adopted in March 1999 and subsequently consolidated in September 2007 and February 2011. It provides detailed planning policies for the former South Bucks District and remains part of the development plan for the area until superseded by the emerging Local Plan for Buckinghamshire.

1.12.3 The Plan seeks to manage development while protecting the Green Belt, landscape character, environmental quality and local amenity. Although it predates the current focus on health in planning policy, its provisions address several determinants of health relevant to the Proposed Development, including noise and air pollution, water quality and flood risk, infrastructure and community facilities, access and traffic generation, public transport, walking and cycling, recreation and access to green space. Policy EP8 is particularly relevant because it seeks to avoid locating noise-sensitive uses, including homes, schools, hospitals and some community facilities, in areas affected by high levels of road, rail, aircraft or industrial noise. Other relevant policies include:

- Policy L7: Protection of Green Space;
- Policy EP3: The Use, Design and Layout of Development;
- Policy EP8: Noise Sensitive Development;
- Policy EP9: Noise Generating Development;
- Policy EP10: Air Pollution;
- Policy EP11: Water Resources and Quality;
- Policy EP12: Protection from Flooding;
- Policy EP13: Infrastructure Provision;
- Policy TR1: Encouraging the Use of Public Transport;
- Policy TR2: Cycling Facilities;

[39] South Bucks District Council (2011) *South Bucks District Local Plan: Adopted March 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011*. Available at: Updated Adopted South Bucks District Local Plan (accessed on: 21/09/2026).

- Policy TR3: Pedestrian Facilities;
- Policy TR4: Provision for Those with Special Needs;
- Policy TR5: Accesses, Highway Works and Traffic Generation;
- Policy COM1: Provision of Community Facilities; and
- Policy COM2: Loss of Community Facilities.

JSNA

1.12.4 Buckinghamshire's JSNA[40] provides the evidence base for understanding the health, wellbeing and care needs of residents across the county. It brings together data relating to population characteristics, health outcomes, inequalities, demographic change and the wider determinants of health, supporting commissioning, service planning and strategic decision-making. The assessment considers issues affecting residents across the life course and highlights the importance of housing, employment, education, transport, environmental quality and community resilience in shaping health outcomes. The findings are relevant to the Proposed Development as they provide important baseline information regarding communities that may be affected by changes in employment opportunities, transport infrastructure, environmental conditions and access to services associated with airport-related development. Key issues emerging from the JSNA include:

- Persistent health inequalities across communities and population groups;
- The importance of improving outcomes across all stages of life;
- Mental health and wellbeing challenges for children, adults and older people;
- Cardiovascular disease and other long-term health conditions;
- Healthy ageing and reducing social isolation; and
- The role of housing, employment, environmental quality and healthy places in supporting wellbeing.

Buckinghamshire Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy – 2035

1.12.5 The Buckinghamshire Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2035[41] sets out a long-term vision to help residents live healthier and more independent lives whilst reducing health inequalities across the county. Developed by the Health and Wellbeing Board and partner organisations, the Strategy recognises the importance of prevention, community resilience and tackling the wider determinants of health. It focuses on improving both physical and mental health whilst ensuring that local communities play an active role in shaping healthier futures. These priorities align closely with key issues relevant to the Proposed Development, including inequalities,

[40] Buckinghamshire Council (2025) *Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.* Available at: Adults data and analysis (JSNA) | Buckinghamshire Council (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

[41] Buckinghamshire Council (2023) *Buckinghamshire Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2035.* Available at: Buckinghamshire Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy - 2035 (accessed on: 16/07/2026).

healthy places, access to opportunities, environmental quality and community wellbeing. The Strategy is structured around three overarching themes:

- Start Well – Improving outcomes during maternity, childhood and early years.
- Live Well – Supporting good physical and mental health throughout adulthood.
- Age Well – Helping older people remain healthy, independent and connected to their communities.

1.12.6 The Strategy places particular emphasis on:

- Tackling health inequalities;
- Prevention and early intervention;
- Improving mental health and wellbeing;
- Supporting healthy ageing;
- Empowering communities; and
- Addressing wider determinants of health including housing, employment and the environment.

Director of Public Health Annual Reports

1.12.7 The Director of Public Health Annual Reports[42] provide an overview of emerging public health issues, trends and priorities affecting Buckinghamshire residents. Reports are published annually and focus on specific themes relevant to population health and wellbeing. Recent reports have addressed topics including supporting families to give children the best start in life and preparing for future health and wellbeing challenges. The reports emphasise prevention, reducing inequalities and strengthening collaboration across organisations and communities to improve long-term health outcomes. These themes are highly relevant to the Proposed Development, where changes to employment, transport networks, environmental quality and community infrastructure may influence local health and wellbeing.

1.12.8 Recent priorities include:

- Supporting children and families to achieve the best start in life;
- Reducing health inequalities across communities;
- Improving mental and physical wellbeing;
- Supporting healthier ageing and independent living;
- Strengthening community resilience and preventative approaches; and
- Creating healthy environments that support long-term wellbeing.

[42] Buckinghamshire Council (2025) *Director of Public Health Annual Reports*. Available at: Director of Public Health annual reports | Buckinghamshire Council [(accessed on: 16/07/2026).

Appendix 14.2

Health: Baseline

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 14.2: Health Baseline (Part 1)

Contents

1	**Health Baseline**		**1**
	1.1	Introduction	1
	1.2	Health Study Areas	1
2	**West Drayton**		**9**
	2.1	West Drayton Demographic Baseline Data	9
	2.2	West Drayton Housing Baseline Data	14
	2.3	West Drayton Economic Baseline Data	19
3	**Hayes**		**24**
	3.1	Hayes Demographic Baseline Data	24
	3.2	Hayes Housing Baseline Data	29
	3.3	Hayes Economic Baseline Data	34
4	**Longford**		**39**
	4.1	Longford Demographic Baseline Data	39
	4.2	Longford Housing Baseline Data	44
	4.3	Longford Economic Baseline Data	49
5	**Harmondsworth**		**54**
	5.1	Harmondsworth Demographic Baseline Data	54
	5.2	Harmondsworth Housing Baseline Data	59
	5.3	Harmondsworth Economic Baseline Data	64
6	**Sipson**		**69**
	6.1	Sipson Demographic Baseline Data	69
	6.2	Sipson Housing Baseline Data	74
	6.3	Sipson Economic Baseline Data	79
7	**Cranford Cross**		**84**
	7.1	Cranford Cross Demographic Baseline Data	84
	7.2	Cranford Cross Housing Baseline Data	89
	7.3	Cranford Cross Economic Baseline Data	94
8	**Cranford**		**99**
	8.1	Cranford Demographic Baseline Data	99
	8.2	Cranford Housing Baseline Data	104
	8.3	Cranford Economic Baseline Data	109
9	**Heston**		**114**

9.1 Heston Demographic Baseline Data 114
9.2 Heston Housing Baseline Data 119
9.3 Heston Economic Baseline Data 124
10 Feltham North 129
10.1 Feltham North Demographic Baseline Data 129
10.2 Feltham North Housing Baseline Data 134
10.3 Feltham North Economic Baseline Data 139
11 Bedfont 144
11.1 Bedfont Demographic Baseline Data 144
11.2 Bedfont Housing Baseline Data 149
11.3 Bedfont Economic Baseline Data 154
12 Stanwell 159
12.1 Stanwell Demographic Baseline Data 159
12.2 Stanwell Housing Baseline Data 164
12.3 Stanwell Economic Baseline Data 169
13 Stanwell Moor 174
13.1 Stanwell Moor Demographic Baseline Data 174
13.2 Stanwell Moor Housing Baseline Data 179
13.3 Stanwell Moor Economic Baseline Data 184

Tables

Table 1.1: Site-Specific Health Study Area – Community Areas 2
Table 2.1: West Drayton Demographic Baseline Data 11
Table 2.2: West Drayton Housing Baseline Data 15
Table 2.3: West Drayton Economic Baseline Data 21
Table 3.1: Hayes Demographic Baseline Data 26
Table 3.2: Hayes Housing Baseline Data 30
Table 3.3: Hayes Economic Baseline Data 36
Table 4.1: Longford Demographic Baseline Data 41
Table 4.2: Longford Housing Baseline Data 45
Table 4.3: Longford Economic Baseline Data 51
Table 5.1: Harmondsworth Demographic Baseline Data 56
Table 5.2: Harmondsworth Housing Baseline Data 61
Table 5.3: Harmondsworth Economic Baseline Data 66
Table 6.1: Sipson Demographic Baseline Data 71
Table 6.2: Sipson Housing Baseline Data 76
Table 6.3: Sipson Economic Baseline Data 81

Table 7.1: Cranford Cross Demographic Baseline Data 86
Table 7.2: Cranford Cross Housing Baseline Data 90
Table 7.3: Cranford Cross Economic Baseline Data 96
Table 8.1: Cranford Demographic Baseline Data 101
Table 8.2: Cranford Housing Baseline Data 105
Table 8.3: Cranford Economic Baseline Data 111
Table 9.1: Heston Demographic Baseline Data 116
Table 9.2: Heston Housing Baseline Data 120
Table 9.3: Heston Economic Baseline Data 126
Table 11.1: Feltham North Demographic Baseline Data 131
Table 11.2: Feltham North Housing Baseline Data 135
Table 11.3: Feltham North Economic Baseline Data 141
Table 12.1: Bedfont Demographic Baseline Data 146
Table 12.2: Bedfont Housing Baseline Data 151
Table 12.3: Bedfont Economic Baseline Data 156
Table 13.1: Stanwell Demographic Baseline Data 161
Table 13.2: Stanwell Housing Baseline Data 165
Table 13.3: Stanwell Economic Baseline Data 171
Table 14.1: Stanwell Moor Demographic Baseline Data 176
Table 14.2: Stanwell Moor Housing Baseline Data 180
Table 14.3: Stanwell Moor Economic Baseline Data 186

1 Health Baseline

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Appendix presents the baseline health conditions for the Health assessment of the Proposed Development. It provides an evidence base describing the population, communities and health-related characteristics of the areas that may experience health effects during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The baseline has been developed using the most recent publicly available data from national, regional and local sources and considers a range of health determinants, including demographics, housing, socio-economic conditions, deprivation, community infrastructure, crime, and health and wellbeing indicators.

1.1.2 The baseline has been prepared across four geographic levels ('Study Areas'), to reflect the nature and scale of potential health effects: the Site-Specific Health Study Area, Local Health Study Area, Regional Health Study Area and National Health Study Area. These Study Areas provide an appropriate framework for understanding existing health conditions, identifying potentially sensitive populations and informing the assessment of effects on health and wellbeing.

1.1.3 At the Site-Specific Health Study Area level, baseline information is presented for individual community areas surrounding the Proposed Development. This is supplemented by local authority-level health and wellbeing information and wider regional and national contextual data to enable comparison and interpretation of community health characteristics and vulnerabilities. Together, this information establishes the baseline against which the likely significant health effects of the Proposed Development will be assessed.

1.2 Health Study Areas

Site-Specific Health Study Area

1.2.1 The Site-Specific Health Study Area comprises 23 community areas, as illustrated in Figure 10.1 of **Chapter 10: Community**. These community areas are defined using Output Areas (OAs), the smallest geographical units for which Census and other national statistical data are published.

1.2.2 The Site-Specific Study Area has been delineated to capture communities that may experience direct effects from the Proposed Development, as well as neighbouring areas with clear physical or functional links to them. Community area boundaries have been informed by the existing settlement pattern around Heathrow and, where necessary, aligned to the nearest Output Area boundaries.

1.2.3 Where baseline data is not available at the Output Area level, this is reported at the Local Authority level. For future additional datasets, where Output Area-level data are unavailable, the assessment will utilise the smallest geographic unit available, typically Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) or Middle Super Output Areas (MSOAs).

Table 1.1: Site-Specific Health Study Area – Community Areas

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
West Drayton	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012174, E00012203, E00012204, E00012205, E00012206, E00012207, E00012208, E00012566, E00012567, E00012568, E00012569, E00012570, E00012571, E00012572, E00012573, E00012574, E00012575, E00012576, E00012577, E00012578, E00012579, E00012580, E00012581, E00012582, E00012583, E00012584, E00012585, E00012587, E00012590, E00012591, E00012592, E00012593, E00012594, E00012595, E00012596, E00012597, E00012599, E00012600, E00012601, E00012602, E00012603, E00176471, E00176472, E00176473, E00184388, E00184396, E00184405, E00184412, E00184419, E00184423, E00184425, E00184444, E00184458, E00184463, E00184465, E00184479, E00184507, E00184524.
Hayes	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012384, E00012385, E00012386, E00012387, E00012388, E00012389, E00012390, E00012391, E00012392, E00012393, E00012394, E00012395, E00012396, E00012397, E00012398, E00012399, E00012400, E00012401, E00012402, E00012403, E00012404, E00012405, E00012406, E00012407, E00012408, E00012409, E00012410, E00012411, E00012412, E00012413, E00012414, E00012415, E00012416, E00012417, E00012418, E00012419.
Longford	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012179, E00012202.

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
Harmondsworth	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012181, E00012184, E00012185, E00012188, E00012198.
Sipson	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012175, E00012183, E00012191.
Cranford Cross	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012196, E00012200, E00012201, E00184410, E00184476.
Cranford	London Borough of Hounslow	E00012858, E00012860, E00012862, E00012864, E00012879, E00012880, E00012881, E00012882, E00012883, E00012884, E00012885, E00012886, E00012887, E00012888, E00013089, E00013091, E00013112.
Heston	London Borough of Hounslow	E00013024, E00013025, E00013026, E00013027, E00013028, E00013029, E00013030, E00013031, E00013032, E00013035, E00013036, E00013037, E00013038, E00013039, E00013040, E00013041, E00013043, E00013044, E00013045, E00013046, E00013047, E00013048, E00013049,E00013050, E00013051, E00013052, E00013053, E00013054, E00013055, E00013056, E00013057, E00013058, E00013059, E00013060, E00013061, E00013062, E00013063, E00013064, E00013065, E00013066, E00013067, E00013068, E00013070, E00013071, E00013072, E00013074, E00013075, E00013076, E00013078, E00013079, E00013080, E00013081, E00013082, E00013083, E00013084, E00013085, E00013086, E00013087, E00013088, E00013090, E00013092, E00013093, E00013094, E00013095, E00013096, E00013097, E00013098, E00013099, E00013100, E00013101, E00013102, E00013103, E00013104, E00013105, E00013106, E00013107, E00013108, E00013109, E00013110, E00013111, E00013113, E00013114, E00013115, E00179103,

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
		E00179111, E00179130, E00179158, E00179159, E00179183, E00179200, E00179202, E00179209, E00179245, E00179256, E00179269, E00179273.
Feltham North	London Borough of Hounslow	E00012889, E00012890, E00012891, E00012892, E00012893, E00012894, E00012895, E00012896, E00012897, E00012898, E00012899, E00012900, E00012902, E00012903, E00012904, E00012905, E00012906, E00012907, E00012908, E00012909, E00012910, E00012911, E00012912, E00012913, E00012914, E00012915, E00012916, E00012917, E00012918, E00012919, E00179142, E00179240, E00179270.
Bedfont	London Borough of Hounslow	E00012713, E00012714, E00012715, E00012716, E00012717, E00012719, E00012720, E00012721, E00012722, E00012723, E00012724, E00012725, E00012726, E00012727, E00012728, E00012729, E00012730, E00012731, E00012732, E00012733, E00012734, E00012735, E00012736, E00012738, E00012739, E00012740, E00012742, E00012744, E00012745, E00166034, E00168182, E00168863, E00168873, E00168894, E00012741, E00012743.
Stanwell	Spelthorne Borough Council	E00156590, E00156591, E00156592, E00156594, E00156595, E00156596, E00156597, E00156598, E00156599, E00156600, E00156601, E00156602, E00156603, E00156604, E00156605, E00156606, E00156607, E00156608, E00156609, E00156610, E00156611, E00156612, E00156776, E00156777, E00156778, E00156779, E00156780, E00156781, E00156782, E00156783, E00156784, E00156785, E00156786, E00156787, E00156788, E00156789, E00156790, E00156791, E00156792, E00156794, E00156798, E00156799, E00156800, E00156801, E00167804,

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
		E00167805, E00167806, E00180580, E00180622, E00180646.
Stanwell Moor	Spelthorne Borough Council	E00156793, E00156795, E00156796, E00156797.
Poyle	Slough Borough Council	E00083225, E00083227, E00083228, E00083229, E00083230.
Colnbrook	Slough Borough Council	E00083215, E00083216, E00083221, E00083223, E00083224, E00083226.
Brands Hill	Slough Borough Council	E00083214, E00083217, E00083218, E00083219, E00083220, E00083231, E00083222.
Hounslow (West and Heath)	London Borough of Hounslow	E00013150, E00013152, E00013153, E00013154, E00013155, E00013156, E00013157, E00013158, E00013159, E00013160, E00013161, E00013162, E00013163, E00013164, E00013166, E00013167, E00013168, E00013169, E00013170, E00013171, E00013172, E00013174, E00013175, E00013177, E00013178, E00013179, E00013180, E00013181, E00013182, E00013214, E00013215, E00013217, E00013221, E00013222, E00013223, E00013224, E00013225, E00013226, E00013227, E00013228, E00013232, E00013233, E00013234, E00013235, E00013236, E00013237, E00013238, E00013239, E00013241, E00166036, E00166037, E00168199, E00168850, E00168852, E00168853, E00168855, E00179088, E00179090, E00179094, E00179095, E00179098, E00179101, E00179104, E00179122, E00179132, E00179137, E00179143, E00179165, E00179168, E00179171, E00179179, E00179190, E00179217, E00179228, E00179231, E00179242, E00179244, E00179272, E00012859, E00012861, E00012863, E00012865, E00012866, E00012867, E00012868, E00012869, E00012870,

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
		E00012871, E00012872, E00012873, E00012875, E00012876, E00012877, E00012878, E00179121, E00179155.
Iver and Richings Park	Buckinghamshire Council	E00089949, E00089950, E00089951, E00089952, E00089953, E00089954, E00089955, E00089956, E00089957, E00089958, E00089959, E00089960, E00089961, E00089962, E00089963.
Harlington	London Borough of Hillingdon	E00012176, E00012177, E00012178, E00012180, E00012182, E00012186, E00012187, E00012189, E00012190, E00012192, E00012194, E00012195, E00012197, E00012199.
North Staines	Spelthorne Borough Council	E00156727, E00156737, E00156740, E00156741, E00156742, E00156743, E00156744, E00156745, E00156747, E00156748, E00180601, E00180610, E00180612, E00180618, E00180627.
Horton and Wraysbury	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	E00083680, E00083681, E00083682, E00083683, E00083684, E00083685, E00083686, E00083687, E00083688, E00083689, E00083690, E00083691, E00083692, E00083693, E00083694.
Langley	Slough Borough Council	E00083258, E00083259, E00083260, E00083261, E00083262, E00083263, E00083264, E00083265, E00083266, E00083267, E00083268, E00083269, E00083270, E00083271, E00083272, E00083273, E00083274, E00083275, E00083276, E00083278, E00083279, E00083312, E00083313, E00083314, E00083315, E00083316, E00083317, E00083318, E00083319, E00083320, E00083321, E00083322, E00083323, E00083324, E00083325, E00083326, E00083327, E00083328, E00083329, E00083330, E00083331, E00083332, E00083333, E00083334, E00083335, E00083337, E00083338, E00083339, E00083340, E00083342, E00083343,

Community Area	Local Planning Authority	Output Areas (2021)
		E00083344, E00083345, E00083347, E00083348, E00083349, E00083350, E00083351, E00083352, E00083353, E00083354, E00083356, E00083357, E00083358, E00083359, E00083360, E00083373, E00083379, E00083381, E00083382, E00083383, E00083384, E00083386, E00166701, E00166702, E00166703, E00166704, E00166705, E00166706, E00166708, E00166719, E00166720, E00188348, E00188356, E00188359, E00188380, E00188409, E00188454, E00188456, E00188460, E00188510, E00188514, E00188522, E00188528.

Local Health Study Area

1.2.4 The Local Health Study Area comprises the 11 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) shown in Figure 10.2 of **Chapter 10: Community**. This study area aligns with local authority boundaries and provides the geographic extent for assessing population characteristics, health outcomes and community health sensitivities at the local level.

1.2.5 The Local Health Study Area has been defined to encompass the authorities most likely to experience health-related effects associated with the Proposed Development. The 11 LPAs are:

- London Borough of Ealing
- London Borough of Hillingdon
- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
- Slough Borough Council
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Wandsworth Borough Council
- Buckinghamshire Council

Regional Health Study Area

1.2.6 The Regional Health Study Area comprises the wider geographic areas of London and the South East. This study area provides the spatial extent for

assessing broader population health determinants and strategic factors that may influence health outcomes beyond the local authority level.

1.2.7 The Regional Health Study Area has been defined to capture the wider area within which the Proposed Development may give rise to indirect and longer-ranging effects. This includes changes relating to economic activity, employment and labour markets, transport patterns, airport use and strategic connectivity, as well as the potential for cumulative interactions with other major developments where relevant.

National Health Study Area

1.2.8 The National Health Study Area comprises England and provides the geographic extent for considering strategic determinants of health that operate at a national scale. This study area supports the assessment of population health effects that extend beyond regional and local authority boundaries.

1.2.9 The National Health Study Area has been defined to capture wider health-related influences associated with the Proposed Development, including national economic effects, strategic connectivity, climate change considerations and relevant national policy objectives. It also provides an appropriate framework for considering cumulative and far-reaching effects that may be experienced across the country.

2 West Drayton

2.1 West Drayton Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

2.1.1 West Drayton had a population of 23,542 residents in mid-2024 and is one of the more densely populated community areas within the Site-Specific Health Study Area, with a population density of 5,218 residents per km² compared with 2,710 residents per km² across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 433 residents per km² nationally.

2.1.2 The population has grown substantially since 2011 (+40%), exceeding growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (+25%), Hillingdon (+19%), the regional health study area (+11%) and England (+10%). This indicates that West Drayton has experienced comparatively rapid population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

2.1.3 West Drayton has a relatively young population profile. The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (10.1%) is lower than Hillingdon (13.5%), the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%), whilst being broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%). The proportion of working-age residents aged 16-64 (66.5%) is broadly comparable with Hillingdon (65.6%) and the regional health study area (65.5%), although slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%).

2.1.4 The proportion of children aged 0-15 years (23.3%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Hillingdon (20.9%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Overall, the age profile suggests a younger population than is observed regionally and nationally, characterised by a greater proportion of children and a lower proportion of older residents.

Ethnicity and Religion

2.1.5 The leading ethnicity within West Drayton is White, accounting for 50.5% of the population. Whilst this remains the largest ethnic group within the community area, the proportion is lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

2.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 30.1% of the population. This proportion is higher than the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages. People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 9.2% of the population, which is above the national average (4.2%).

2.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within West Drayton (40.0%), followed by No Religion (22.6%), Islam (15.3%) and Hinduism (9.3%). The proportions of residents identifying as Muslim and Hindu are higher than the regional (9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages.

Health Characteristics

2.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. Over four-fifths of residents (84.3%) report their health as very good or good, which is broadly comparable with local and regional comparator areas and slightly higher than the national average (82.2%). Conversely, the proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.4%) remains below the national average (5.2%).

2.1.9 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (5.8%) or limited a little (6.7%) is lower than the national averages of 6.2% and 8.5%, respectively. Whilst the proportion of residents reporting activity-limiting conditions is slightly higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area overall, levels remain below those observed regionally and nationally. This is consistent with the comparatively young age profile of the community area.

2.1.10 For further details, see Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: West Drayton Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	23,542	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	5,218	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+6,691 (40%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	23.3%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	66.5%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	10.1%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	49.5%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	50.5%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	50.5%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.9%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	30.1%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	9.2%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	5.3%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	40.0%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	22.6%	17.0%	19.4%	33.7%	36.7%
Hindu	9.3%	8.1%	10.8%	3.4%	1.8%
Muslim	15.3%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	84.3%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health	4.4%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems					

Measure		Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.8%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.7%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

2.2 West Drayton Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

2.2.1 West Drayton contains 7,368 households. Household sizes are generally larger than those recorded regionally and nationally, with lower proportions of one-person (22.4%) and two-person households (26.5%) than the regional health study area (28.8% and 32.1%, respectively) and England (30.1% and 34.0%, respectively).

2.2.2 Conversely, households containing three or more people account for a greater proportion of households, particularly three-person (21.0%) and four-person households (17.6%). Household composition reflects this trend, with single-family households accounting for 65.8% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (59.7%) and the regional health study area (61.5%).

Accommodation Type

2.2.3 The most common accommodation types within West Drayton are purpose-built flats (33.2%), semi-detached properties (32.2%) and terraced properties (21.3%). The proportion of residents living in purpose-built flats is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%), Hillingdon (26.2%) and England (17.1%), whilst detached accommodation accounts for a comparatively smaller proportion of households (8.3%) than across Hillingdon (13.9%) and England (22.9%). This indicates a greater prevalence of higher-density accommodation within the community area.

Accommodation Tenure

2.2.4 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within West Drayton (46.2%), although this proportion is lower than Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%). The proportion of households living in socially rented accommodation (25.0%) is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%), Hillingdon (16.1%) and England (17.1%). Private renting accounts for 26.4% of households and is broadly aligned with Hillingdon (25.9%), indicating a relatively mixed tenure profile across the community area.

Occupancy Rating

2.2.5 The majority of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (83.3%), which is broadly comparable with the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%). Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 16.7% of households, aligning closely with regional (16.4%) and national (16.6%) averages, whilst remaining below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) and Hillingdon (19.5%). Overall, occupancy patterns within West Drayton are broadly consistent with wider comparator areas.

2.2.6 For further details see Table 2.2 below.

Table 2.2: West Drayton Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	7,368	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	22.4%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	26.5%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	21.0%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.6%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
5 People in Household	7.3%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	3.3%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.9%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	8.3%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	32.2%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	21.3%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	33.2%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.6%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.8%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	46.2%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	25.0%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	26.4%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	2.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	83.3%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	16.7%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Household Composition					
One-person Household	22.4%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	65.8%	59.7%	11.6%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	11.8%	15.7%	64.0%	9.7%	6.9%

2.3 West Drayton Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

2.3.1 West Drayton contains 13,959 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (59.5%) is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%) and the regional health study area (59.4%), and exceeds the proportions recorded for Hillingdon (57.2%) and England (55.7%).

2.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.8%) is the same as the Site-Specific Health Study Area, but higher than Hillingdon (3.9%), the regional health study area (4.1%) and England (2.9%). Overall, levels of economic activity are broadly consistent with comparator areas, although unemployment is comparatively higher than local, regional and national averages.

Qualifications

2.3.3 The qualification profile of West Drayton is broadly similar to the comparator areas. Over one-third of residents hold Level 4 qualifications or above (36.9%), exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%) and England (33.9%), although remaining below the regional health study area (41.3%).

2.3.4 Residents with no formal qualifications account for 20.2% of the population, which is slightly higher than Hillingdon (18.2%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%). This suggests that whilst a relatively high proportion of residents hold higher-level qualifications, a notable proportion of residents also have no formal qualifications.

Occupation

2.3.5 Professional occupations represent the largest occupational group within West Drayton (20.3%), consistent with England (20.3%) and exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%). However, this proportion remains below Hillingdon (21.1%) and the regional health study area (23.5%).

2.3.6 Process, plant and machine operatives account for 9.4% of occupations within West Drayton, compared with 5.3% across the regional health study area and 6.9% nationally. The proportion of residents employed in caring, leisure and other service occupations (9.4%) is also slightly above the regional average (8.4%). In contrast, managers, directors and senior officials account for 11.4% of occupations, below Hillingdon (13.0%) and the regional health study area (14.8%). Overall, the occupation profile reflects a mix of professional, service and operational occupations.

Car or Van Availability

2.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 46.0% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

2.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 23.7% of households, which is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), Hillingdon (22.3%) and England (23.5%), but lower than the regional health study area (29.5%). Overall, vehicle availability within the community area is broadly comparable with local and national trends.

Industry

2.3.9 The largest industries of employment within West Drayton are wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (14.7%), transport and storage (12.6%), and human health and social work activities (11.8%).

2.3.10 Employment in wholesale and retail trade is broadly consistent with comparator areas, ranging from 13.1% within the regional health study area to 15.0% nationally. In contrast, employment in transport and storage (12.6%) is notably higher than Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), indicating that transport-related employment forms an important component of the local economy. Employment in human health and social work activities (11.8%) is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) and Hillingdon (12.7%), although lower than the regional health study area (13.4%) and England (14.6%).

2.3.11 For further information see Table 2.3 below

Table 2.3: West Drayton Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	13,959	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	59.5%	60.3%	57.2%	59.4%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.8%	4.8%	3.9%	4.1%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	20.2%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	10.0%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.0%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.2%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	13.3%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	36.9%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	3.4%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	11.4%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	20.3%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	11.6%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.4%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.4%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	9.4%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	7.6%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	9.4%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	11.5%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	46.0%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%

Measure	Community Area: West Drayton	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 Cars or Vans in Household	22.6%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	7.7%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	23.7%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	14.3%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Human health and social work activities	12.2%	10.1%	12.7%	13.4%	14.6%
Transport and Storage	11.8%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%

3 Hayes

3.1 Hayes Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

3.1.1 Hayes had a population of 16,924 residents in mid-2024 and is one of the most densely populated community areas within the Site-Specific Health Study Area, with a population density of 5,582 residents per km² compared with 2,710 residents per km² across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 433 residents per km² nationally.

3.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 14% (+2,031 residents), exceeding population growth recorded across the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%), although remaining below growth observed across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and Hillingdon (19%). This indicates that Hayes has experienced a moderate level of population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

3.1.3 Hayes has a relatively young population profile. The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (9.8%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%), Hillingdon (13.5%), the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). The proportion of working-age residents aged 16-64 (67.6%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) and higher than the remaining comparator areas.

3.1.4 The proportion of children aged 0-15 years (22.5%) is higher than Hillingdon (20.9%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Overall, the age profile suggests a younger population than is observed regionally and nationally, characterised by a greater proportion of children and a lower proportion of older residents.

Ethnicity and Religion

3.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Hayes is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 54.2% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%), Hillingdon (33.3%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

3.1.6 White ethnicity is the second most represented ethnic group, accounting for 21.7% of the population. This proportion is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%), Hillingdon (48.2%), the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 10.8% of the population, exceeding both the regional (8.0%) and national (4.2%) averages. Other Ethnic Groups account for 10.1% of the population, which is also higher than the regional (3.9%) and national (2.2%) averages.

3.1.7 Sikhism is the most commonly reported religion within Hayes, accounting for 26.3% of the population, compared with 12.4% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 8.6% across Hillingdon and less than 1.2% regionally and nationally. Christianity (24.8%) and Islam (23.0%) are also prominent religions within the community area. The proportion of residents identifying as Muslim exceeds both the regional (9.2%) and national (6.7%) averages, whilst the proportion identifying as Hindu (10.6%) is notably higher than the regional (3.4%) and national (1.8%) averages.

Health Characteristics

3.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (85.0%) report their health as very good or good, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.0%), Hillingdon (85.2%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), and higher than the national average (82.2%). The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.0%) is aligned with Hillingdon (4.0%) and below the national average (5.2%).

3.1.9 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.5%) is lower than Hillingdon (4.9%), the regional health study area (5.3%) and England (6.2%), and aligns with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a little (5.6%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), Hillingdon (6.5%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). This is consistent with the comparatively young age profile of the community area.

3.1.10 For further information see Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Hayes Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	16,924	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	5,582	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	(+2,031) 14%	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	22.5%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	67.6%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	9.8%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.4%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.6%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	21.7%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.2%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	54.2%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	10.8%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	10.1%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Sikh	26.3%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Christian	24.8%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	23.0%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Hindu	10.6%	8.1%	10.8%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health					

Measure		Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Very Good or Good Health		85.0%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.0%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.6%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

3.2 Hayes Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

3.2.1 Hayes contains 4,715 households. Household sizes are generally larger than those recorded across the comparator areas, with lower proportions of one-person (18.2%) and two-person households (19.7%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6% and 25.4%, respectively), Hillingdon (24.4% and 27.1%, respectively), the regional health study area (28.8% and 32.1%, respectively) and England (30.1% and 34.0%, respectively).

3.2.2 Conversely, larger households account for a greater proportion of households within Hayes. Households comprising four people (20.7%), five people (11.3%) and six people (6.5%) are notably more prevalent than across the regional health study area (14.1%, 5.2% and 1.8%, respectively) and England (12.9%, 4.5% and 1.5%, respectively). Household composition reflects this trend, with one-person households accounting for a smaller proportion of households (18.2%) than across all comparator areas.

Accommodation Type

3.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Hayes, accounting for 48.8% of households. This proportion is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.7%), Hillingdon (35.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

3.2.4 Terraced properties account for 24.5% of accommodation and purpose-built flats account for 16.9%. The proportion of residents living in detached accommodation (6.5%) is lower than across all comparator areas, particularly England (22.9%). Overall, accommodation within Hayes is characterised by a high proportion of semi-detached housing and comparatively low levels of detached accommodation.

Accommodation Tenure

3.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Hayes, accounting for 50.7% of households. This is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (49.2%), although lower than Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%).

3.2.6 Private renting accounts for 29.8% of households and is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hillingdon (25.9%) and the regional health study area (30.0%). The proportion of households living in socially rented accommodation (18.3%) exceeds Hillingdon (16.1%) and England (17.1%), although remains below the regional health study area average (23.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Hayes reflects a relatively balanced mix of owner occupation and rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

3.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (72.9%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.6%), Hillingdon (80.5%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

3.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 27.1% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hillingdon (19.5%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger households are more common within Hayes compared with the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

3.2.9 For further information see Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2: Hayes Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	4,715	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Person in Household	18.2%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	19.7%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	19.3%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	20.7%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	11.3%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	6.5%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.7%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	6.5%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	48.8%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	24.5%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	16.9%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.1%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.2%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.8%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	50.7%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	18.3%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	29.8%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	0.7%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	72.9%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	27.1%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	18.2%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	63.3%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	18.5%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

3.3 Hayes Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

3.3.1 Hayes contains 10,601 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (54.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hillingdon (57.2%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), and is broadly aligned with the national average (55.7%).

3.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (5.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Hillingdon (3.9%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, the data indicates lower levels of economic activity and higher levels of unemployment than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

3.3.3 The qualification profile of Hayes indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment than the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 23.8% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hillingdon (18.2%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

3.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 29.3% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Hillingdon (37.5%) and the regional health study area (41.3%), although broadly comparable with England (33.9%). This suggests that Hayes has a lower proportion of residents holding higher-level qualifications than is observed across the local and regional comparator areas.

Occupation

3.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Hayes, accounting for 17.5% of occupations. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hillingdon (10.5%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

3.3.6 Process, plant and machine operatives account for 11.9% of occupations, compared with 9.8% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 5.3% across the regional health study area. Sales and customer service occupations also account for a relatively high proportion of occupations (10.7%) compared with Hillingdon (7.5%), the regional health study area (6.6%) and England (7.5%). In contrast, professional occupations account for 12.7% of occupations, which is notably lower than Hillingdon (21.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile contains a relatively greater proportion of operational and service-based occupations than the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

3.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 39.4% of households. This is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

3.3.8 Households with two cars or vans account for 26.4% of households, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25.3%), Hillingdon (24.8%) and the regional health study area (22.1%). Similarly, households with three or more cars or vans account for 10.4% of households, exceeding Hillingdon (8.9%) and the regional health study area (7.9%). Households with no access to a car or van account for 23.8% of households, broadly aligning with England (23.5%).

Industry

3.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Hayes are wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (18.2%), transport and storage (14.5%), and human health and social work activities (10.8%).

3.3.10 Employment in wholesale and retail trade (18.2%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.5%), Hillingdon (14.5%), the regional health study area (13.1%) and England (15.0%). Transport and storage also accounts for a relatively high proportion of employment (14.5%), notably exceeding Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). This suggests that retail and transport-related activities make an important contribution to the local economy. Employment in human health and social work activities (10.8%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%), although lower than Hillingdon (12.7%), the regional health study area (13.4%) and England (14.6%).

3.3.11 For further information see Table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Hayes Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	10,601	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	54.7%	60.3%	57.2%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	5.4%	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	23.8%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.2%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	11.8%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.7%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	13.6%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	29.3%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	5.7%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	9.0%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	12.7%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	9.6%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.5%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.4%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	9.6%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	10.7%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	11.9%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%

Measure	Community Area: Hayes	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Elementary Occupations	17.5%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	39.4%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	26.4%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	10.4%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	23.8%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	18.2%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	14.5%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	10.8%	10.1%	12.7%	13.4%	14.6%

4 Longford

4.1 Longford Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

4.1.1 Longford had a population of 1,220 residents in mid-2024 and is the smallest community area within the Site-Specific Health Study Area. The community area has a population density of 58 residents per km², which is substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Hillingdon (2,637 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²).

4.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 67% (+489 residents), exceeding growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Hillingdon (19%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Longford has experienced substantial population growth over recent years, albeit from a relatively small population base.

Age Profile

4.1.3 Longford has a distinct age profile characterised by a high proportion of working-age residents and relatively low proportions of children and older people. Residents aged 16-64 account for 77.7% of the population, compared with 67.9% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 65.6% across Hillingdon and 63.0% nationally.

4.1.4 In contrast, the proportion of children aged 0-15 years (13.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Hillingdon (20.9%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Similarly, residents aged 65 years and over account for 8.6% of the population, compared with 11.9% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 18.4% nationally. Overall, the age profile suggests a predominance of working-age residents within the community area.

Ethnicity and Religion

4.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Longford is White, accounting for 50.8% of the population. Whilst this remains the largest ethnic group within the community area, the proportion is lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

4.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 31.6% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages, although slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 6.9% of the population, exceeding the national average (4.2%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 6.3% of the population, compared with 3.9% regionally and 2.2% nationally.

4.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Longford (51.1%), followed by Islam (16.7%), No Religion (13.0%) and Sikhism (6.2%). The proportion of residents identifying as Muslim is higher than the regional (9.2%) and national (6.7%) averages, whilst the proportion reporting No Religion (13.0%) is considerably lower than the regional (33.7%) and national (36.7%) averages.

Health Characteristics

4.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy, although some indicators are less favourable than those observed across the wider study area. The majority of residents (80.0%) report their health as very good or good, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Hillingdon (85.2%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), and below the national average (82.2%).

4.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (5.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Hillingdon (4.0%) and the regional health study area (4.2%). Whilst the proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.2%) is below comparator averages, the proportion reporting that activities are limited a little (10.9%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), Hillingdon (6.5%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). This suggests comparatively higher levels of less severe activity-limiting health conditions within the community area.

4.1.10 For further information see Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Longford Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	1,220	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	58	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+489 (67%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	13.7%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	77.7%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	8.6%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	62.5%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	37.6%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	50.8%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.5%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	31.6%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	6.9%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	6.3%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	51.1%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	13.0%	17.0%	19.4%	33.7%	36.7%
Sikh	6.2%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Muslim	16.7%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
General Health					

Measure		Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area: England
Very Good or Good Health		80.0%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		5.4%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.2%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	10.9%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

4.2 Longford Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

4.2.1 Longford contains 249 households and has a distinct household profile compared with the wider comparator areas. One-person households account for 42.4% of households, substantially exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6%), Hillingdon (24.4%), the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%).

4.2.2 This is reflected in the household composition data, with one-person households accounting for 43.9% of households, whilst single-family households account for 43.8% compared with 59.7% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 63.0% nationally. Overall, the data indicates a greater prevalence of smaller households and fewer family households than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Accommodation Type

4.2.3 Purpose-built flats are the most common accommodation type within Longford, accounting for 48.8% of households. This proportion is considerably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (26.8%), Hillingdon (26.2%), the regional health study area (28.6%) and England (17.1%).

4.2.4 Semi-detached properties account for 23.6% of accommodation, whilst detached properties account for 12.0%. Terraced accommodation represents 10.8% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.3%), Hillingdon (19.9%) and England (23.0%). Overall, accommodation within Longford is characterised by a relatively high proportion of residents living in purpose-built flats.

Accommodation Tenure

4.2.5 Private renting is the predominant tenure type within Longford, accounting for 62.2% of households. This is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hillingdon (25.9%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (20.5%).

4.2.6 In contrast, owner occupation accounts for 24.7% of households, which is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%). Social rented accommodation accounts for 12.2% of households and is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.2%) and Hillingdon (16.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Longford is characterised by a high proportion of privately rented households and comparatively low levels of owner occupation

Occupancy Rating

4.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (80.0%) is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hillingdon (80.5%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

4.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 20.0% of households, which is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) and Hillingdon (19.5%), although slightly higher than the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). Overall, occupancy patterns within Longford are generally comparable with the wider comparator areas.

4.2.9 For further information see Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Longford Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area
Households					
Total Number of Households	249	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area
1 Person in Household	42.4%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	25.6%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	12.0%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	13.2%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	4.8%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	1.6%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	0.4%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.0%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	12.0%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	23.6%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	10.8%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	48.8%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.2%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	24.7%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	12.2%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	62.2%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and Southeast	National Health Study Area
Shared Ownership	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	1.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	80.0%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	20.0%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	43.9%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	43.8%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	12.5%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

4.3 Longford Economic Baseline Data

Economic Overview

4.3.1 Longford contains 447 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (51.8%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hillingdon (57.2%), the regional health study area (58.5%) and England (55.7%).

4.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.1%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Hillingdon (3.9%), although it exceeds the regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) averages. Overall, the data suggests comparatively lower levels of economic activity within the community area.

Qualifications

4.3.3 The qualification profile of Longford is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas, although some variation is evident. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 23.6% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hillingdon (18.2%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

4.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 33.8% of the population, which is broadly aligned with England (33.9%) and the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.8%), although lower than Hillingdon (37.5%) and the regional health study area (41.3%). Overall, the data indicates a relatively mixed qualification profile, with a comparatively high proportion of residents holding no formal qualifications alongside a substantial proportion holding higher-level qualifications.

Occupation

4.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Longford, accounting for 22.2% of occupations. This proportion is considerably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hillingdon (10.5%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

4.3.6 Sales and customer service occupations (11.3%), administrative and secretarial occupations (11.9%) and process, plant and machine operatives (10.9%) also account for notable proportions of employment. In contrast, professional occupations account for 9.9% of occupations, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%), Hillingdon (21.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a greater prevalence of operational, administrative and elementary occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

4.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 50.0% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.3%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

4.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 28.5% of households, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), Hillingdon (22.3%) and England (23.5%), although broadly aligned with the regional health study area (29.5%). Conversely, households with two cars or vans (16.7%) account for a lower proportion of households than across the comparator areas. This suggests a greater reliance on either single-vehicle households or households without access to a car or van.

Industry

4.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Longford are transport and storage (18.0%), construction (12.3%), and wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (12.0%).

4.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a notably higher proportion of employment than across Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), reflecting the community area's proximity to Heathrow Airport and associated employment opportunities. Construction also accounts for a higher proportion of employment (12.3%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (8.8%), Hillingdon (9.8%) and England (8.7%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (12.0%) is broadly aligned with the wider comparator areas. Overall, transport and storage forms a particularly important component of the local economy.

4.3.11 For further information see Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: Longford Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	447	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	51.8%	60.3%	57.2%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.1%	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	23.6%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	10.0%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.2%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.8%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.6%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	33.8%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	5.0%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	8.6%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	9.9%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	10.6%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	11.9%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.9%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	4.6%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	11.3%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	10.9%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	22.2%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%

Measure	Community Area: Longford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	50.0%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	16.7%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	4.9%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	28.5%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	18.0%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles	12.0%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Construction	12.3%	8.8%	9.8%	8.4%	8.7%

5 Harmondsworth

5.1 Harmondsworth Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

5.1.1 Harmondsworth had a population of 2,121 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 341 residents per km², which is substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Hillingdon (2,637 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²).

5.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 14% (+266 residents), exceeding growth recorded across the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%), although remaining below growth observed across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24%) and Hillingdon (19%). This indicates a moderate level of population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

5.1.3 Harmondsworth has a broadly similar age profile to the wider study area, although a slightly greater proportion of older residents is present. Residents aged 65 years and over account for 13.3% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and broadly aligning with Hillingdon (13.5%).

5.1.4 The proportion of working-age residents aged 16-64 (67.8%) is consistent with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) and higher than both the regional health study area (65.5%) and England (63.0%). Children aged 0-15 years account for 18.9% of the population, which is broadly aligned with the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%), although slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%) and Hillingdon (20.9%).

Ethnicity and Religion

5.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Harmondsworth is White, accounting for 48.3% of the population. Whilst this remains the largest ethnic group within the community area, the proportion is lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

5.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 39.2% of the population. This proportion exceeds the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages and is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 5.1% of the population, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (5.7%) and above the national average (4.2%).

5.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Harmondsworth (47.8%), followed by No Religion (18.7%), Islam (13.7%) and Sikhism (9.9%). The proportion of residents identifying as Sikh is notably higher than the regional (1.2%) and national (0.9%) averages. Similarly, the proportion of residents identifying as Muslim exceeds the regional (9.2%) and national (6.7%) averages.

Health Characteristics

5.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (83.8%) report their health as very good or good, which is broadly comparable with the regional health study area (84.7%) and higher than the national average (82.2%), although slightly below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%) and Hillingdon (85.2%).

5.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.1%) is broadly aligned with Hillingdon (4.0%) and the regional health study area (4.2%), and remains below the national average (5.2%).

5.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.5%) aligns with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and is lower than the regional (5.3%) and national (6.2%) averages. Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (5.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), Hillingdon (6.5%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%), indicating comparatively lower levels of activity-limiting health conditions.

5.1.11 For further information see Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: Harmondsworth Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	2,121	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	341	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+266 (14%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	18.9%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	67.8%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	13.3%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.8%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.2%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	48.3%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.3%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	39.2%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	5.1%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	3.0%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	47.8%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	18.7%	17.0%	19.4%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	13.7%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Sikh	9.9%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
General Health					

Measure		Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Very Good or Good Health		83.8%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.1%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.7%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

5.2 Harmondsworth Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

5.2.1 Harmondsworth contains 678 households. The household profile is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hillingdon, although larger households are slightly more prevalent. One-person households account for 22.3% of households, which is lower than the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%), whilst households comprising five or more people account for 17.6% of households compared with 8.9% across the regional health study area and 7.3% nationally.

5.2.2 Household composition reflects this trend, with single-family households accounting for 58.6% of households, broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (59.7%) and the regional health study area (61.5%). Other household types account for 19.7% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%), Hillingdon (11.6%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

5.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Harmondsworth, accounting for 54.0% of households. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hillingdon (35.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

5.2.4 Purpose-built flats account for 9.9% of accommodation, which is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%), Hillingdon (26.2%) and the regional health study area (28.6%). Detached properties account for 13.9% of accommodation and are broadly aligned with both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%) and Hillingdon (13.9%). Overall, accommodation within Harmondsworth is characterised by a relatively high proportion of semi-detached properties and a comparatively low proportion of flats.

Accommodation Tenure

5.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Harmondsworth, accounting for 49.1% of households. This is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), although lower than Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%).

5.2.6 Private renting accounts for 32.2% of households and exceeds Hillingdon (25.9%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (20.5%). Social rented accommodation accounts for 18.3% of households, which is broadly comparable with Hillingdon (16.1%) and England (17.1%), although lower than the regional health study area (23.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Harmondsworth reflects a relatively balanced mix of owner-occupied and rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

5.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (66.0%) is notably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hillingdon (80.5%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

5.2.8 Conversely, households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 34.0% of households, substantially exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hillingdon (19.5%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger households are more prevalent within Harmondsworth than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

5.2.9 For further information see Table 5.2 below.

Table 5.2: Harmondsworth Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	678	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	22.3%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	26.7%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	16.2%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.2%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	8.9%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	4.0	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.8%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.9%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Detached	13.9%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	54.0%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	15.7%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	9.9%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	4.7%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Owner-Occupied	49.1%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	18.3%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	32.2%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy rating of bedrooms: -1	66.0%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy rating of bedrooms: -2 or less	34.0%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	21.7%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	58.6%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	19.7%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

5.3 Harmondsworth Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

5.3.1 Harmondsworth contains 1,423 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (58.7%) is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hillingdon (57.2%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), and exceeds the national average (55.7%).

5.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (5.2%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Hillingdon (3.9%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, levels of economic activity are broadly aligned with the wider comparator areas, although unemployment is comparatively higher.

Qualifications

5.3.3 The qualification profile of Harmondsworth indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment than the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 25.4% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (19.7%), Hillingdon (18.2%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

5.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 26.9% of the population, compared with 34.7% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 37.5% across Hillingdon and 41.3% across the regional health study area. This suggests a lower proportion of residents holding higher-level qualifications than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Occupation

5.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Harmondsworth, accounting for 19.7% of occupations. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hillingdon (10.5%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

5.3.6 Process, plant and machine operatives account for 11.4% of occupations, compared with 9.8% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 5.3% across the regional health study area. Administrative and secretarial occupations also

account for a relatively high proportion of employment (12.1%) compared with the regional health study area (8.9%). In contrast, professional occupations account for 9.9% of occupations, which is substantially lower than Hillingdon (21.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a greater prevalence of elementary, administrative and operational occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

5.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 39.8% of households, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

5.3.8 Households with two cars or vans account for 28.0% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25.4%), Hillingdon (24.8%) and the regional health study area (22.1%). Households with no access to a car or van account for 21.7% of households, which is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), Hillingdon (22.3%) and England (23.5%), and below the regional health study area average (29.5%).

Industry

5.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Harmondsworth are transport and storage (17.0%), administrative and support service activities (11.9%), and wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (11.6%).

5.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a notably higher proportion of employment than across Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), reflecting the importance of transport-related activities within the local economy. Administrative and support service activities also account for a higher proportion of employment (11.9%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.4%), Hillingdon (6.3%), the regional health study area (5.9%) and England (5.3%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (11.6%) is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Overall, transport and airport-related sectors appear to form an important component of employment within the community area.

5.3.11 For further information see Table 5.3 below.

Table 5.3: Harmondsworth Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	1,423	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	58.7%	60.3%	57.2%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	5.2%	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	25.4%	19.7%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	13.4%	11.3%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	13.7%	11.9%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	5.1%	4.4%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.4%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	26.9%	34.7%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	4.1%	4.6%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	9.0%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	9.9%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	9.3%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	12.1%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.1%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	10.3%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	9.0%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	11.4%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%

Measure	Community Area: Harmondsworth	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Elementary Occupations	19.7%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	39.8%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	28.0%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	10.5%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	21.7%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	17.0%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Administrative and Support Service Activities	11.9%	8.5%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles	11.6%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%

6 Sipson

6.1 Sipson Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

6.1.1 Sipson had a population of 1,402 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 2,171 residents per km², which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Hillingdon (2,637 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²), although substantially higher than the national average (433 residents per km²).

6.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 42% (+413 residents), exceeding growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Hillingdon (19%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Sipson has experienced substantial population growth over recent years, albeit from a relatively small population base.

Age Profile

6.1.3 Sipson has a relatively young population profile. Residents aged 16-64 account for 70.8% of the population, compared with 67.9% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 65.6% across Hillingdon and 63.0% nationally.

6.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (7.5%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%), Hillingdon (13.5%), the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Children aged 0-15 years account for 21.7% of the population, exceeding the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Overall, the age profile suggests a younger population than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Ethnicity and Religion

6.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Sipson is White, accounting for 47.5% of the population. Whilst this remains the largest ethnic group within the community area, the proportion is lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

6.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 38.2% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages and is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 5.5% of the population, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (5.7%) and exceeds the national average (4.2%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 5.9% of the population, compared with 3.9% regionally and 2.2% nationally.

6.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Sipson (54.5%), followed by No Religion (17.2%), Islam (11.4%) and Sikhism (6.4%). The proportion of residents identifying as Muslim exceeds the regional (9.2%) and national (6.7%) averages, whilst the proportion identifying as Sikh is notably higher than the regional (1.2%) and national (0.9%) averages. The proportion of residents reporting No Religion (17.2%) is considerably lower than the regional (33.7%) and national (36.7%) averages.

Health Characteristics

6.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (85.2%) report their health as very good or good, aligning with both the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hillingdon averages (85.2%), and exceeding the regional health study area (84.7%) and England (82.2%).

6.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (3.6%) is slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Hillingdon (4.0%), the regional health study area (4.2%) and England (5.2%).

6.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.5%) aligns with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and remains below the regional (5.3%) and national (6.2%) averages. Similarly, the proportion of residents whose

activities are limited a little (5.0%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), Hillingdon (6.5%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). This is consistent with the comparatively young age profile of the community area.

6.1.11 For further information see Table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1: Sipson Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	1,402	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	2,171	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+413 (42%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	21.7%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	70.8%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	7.5%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Male	50.8%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.2%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	47.5%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	2.9%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	38.2%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	5.5%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	5.9%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4 in Sipson)					
Christian	54.5%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	17.2%	17.0%	19.4%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	11.4%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Sikh	6.4%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%

Measure		Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		85.2%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.6%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.5%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.0%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

6.2 Sipson Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

6.2.1 Sipson contains 379 households. Household sizes are generally larger than those recorded across the comparator areas, with lower proportions of one-person (19.8%) and two-person households (20.6%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6% and 25.7%, respectively), Hillingdon (24.4% and 27.1%, respectively), the regional health study area (28.8% and 32.1%, respectively) and England (30.1% and 34.0%, respectively).

6.2.2 Conversely, household composition in Sipson differs from the wider comparator areas. Households classified as 'other household types' account for 27.2% of households, significantly exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.3%), Hillingdon (11.6%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%). Consistent with the larger household sizes observed within the area, one-person households account for a comparatively smaller proportion of households (19.4%) than across all comparator areas.

Accommodation Type

6.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Sipson, accounting for 45.1% of households. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hillingdon (35.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

6.2.4 Terraced accommodation accounts for 29.0% of households, which is also higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.3%), Hillingdon (19.9%), the regional health study area (21.3%) and England (23.0%). In contrast, purpose-built flats account for just 6.3% of accommodation, considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%), Hillingdon (26.2%) and the regional health study area (28.6%). Overall, accommodation within Sipson is characterised by a high proportion of semi-detached and terraced properties, with relatively few residents living in flats.

Accommodation Tenure

6.2.5 Private renting is the predominant tenure type within Sipson, accounting for 60.4% of households. This is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hillingdon (25.9%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (20.5%).

6.2.6 In contrast, owner occupation accounts for 28.4% of households, which is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%). Social rented accommodation accounts for 10.4% of households, below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%), Hillingdon (16.1%) and England (17.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Sipson is characterised by a high proportion of privately rented households and comparatively low levels of owner occupation.

Occupancy Rating

6.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (65.7%) is notably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hillingdon (80.5%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

6.2.8 Conversely, households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 34.4% of households, substantially exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hillingdon (19.5%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger and more densely occupied households are more prevalent within Sipson than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

6.2.9 For further information see Table 6.2 below.

Table 6.2: Sipson Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	379	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	19.8%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	20.6%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.5%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.5%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	13.0%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	6.1%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.9%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	2.6%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Detached	14.8%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	45.1%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	29.0%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	6.3%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	1.8%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	2.4%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.5%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	28.4%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Social Rented	10.4%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	60.4%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.8%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	65.7%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	34.4%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	19.4%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	53.4%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	27.2%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

6.3 Sipson Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

6.3.1 Sipson contains 851 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (63.0%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hillingdon (57.2%), the regional health study area (59.4%) and England (55.7%).

6.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (7.1%) is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Hillingdon (3.9%), the regional health study area (4.1%) and England (2.9%). This suggests that whilst economic participation is relatively high within Sipson, a greater proportion of economically active residents are unemployed compared with the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

6.3.3 The qualification profile of Sipson is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 17.3% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hillingdon (18.2%) and England (18.1%), although slightly higher than the regional health study area (15.8%).

6.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 32.9% of the population, broadly aligning with England (33.9%) and the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), but remaining below Hillingdon (37.5%) and the regional health study area (41.3%). Apprenticeships account for 6.1% of qualifications, exceeding all comparator areas.

Occupation

6.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Sipson, accounting for 21.6% of occupations. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hillingdon (10.5%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

6.3.6 Process, plant and machine operatives account for 12.9% of occupations, compared with 9.8% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 7.5% across Hillingdon and 5.3% across the regional health study area. Sales and customer service occupations also account for a relatively high proportion of employment (10.2%) compared with Hillingdon (7.5%), the regional health study area (6.6%) and England (7.5%). In contrast, professional occupations account for 9.6% of occupations, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%), Hillingdon (21.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a greater prevalence of operational and elementary occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

6.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 40.8% of households, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

6.3.8 Households with two or more cars or vans account for 37.9% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (35.7%), Hillingdon (33.7%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (35.2%). Conversely, households with no access to a car or van account for 21.3% of households, which is below the proportions recorded across Hillingdon (22.3%), the regional health study area (29.5%) and England (23.5%), and broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%).

Industry

6.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Sipson are transport and storage (20.1%), wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (15.7%), and construction (10.8%).

6.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than across Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), indicating that transport-related activities are an important component of the local economy. Employment in wholesale and retail trade (15.7%) also exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.5%), Hillingdon (14.5%) and the regional health study area (13.1%). Construction accounts for 10.8% of employment, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (8.8%), Hillingdon (9.8%), the regional

health study area (8.4%) and England (8.7%). Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport, retail and construction sectors within the community area.

6.3.11 For further information see Table 6.3 below.

Table 6.3: Sipson Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	851	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	63.0%	60.3%	57.2%	59.4%	55.7%
Unemployed	7.1%	4.8%	3.9%	4.1%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	17.3%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.2%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.2%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Apprenticeship	6.1%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	1325%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	32.9%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	6.2%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	9.2%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	9.6%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	10.7%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	8.9%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	10.0%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	6.9%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	10.2%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5%

Measure	Community Area: Sipson	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	12.9%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	21.6%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	40.8%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	26.6%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	11.3%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	21.3%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	20.1%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	15.7%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Construction	10.8%	8.8%	9.8%	8.4%	8.7%

7 Cranford Cross

7.1 Cranford Cross Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

7.1.1 Cranford Cross had a population of 2,321 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 772 residents per km², which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Hillingdon (2,637 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²), although higher than the national average (433 residents per km²).

7.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 41% (+676 residents), exceeding growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Hillingdon (19%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Cranford Cross has experienced substantial population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

7.1.3 Cranford Cross has a relatively young population profile. Residents aged 16-64 account for 72.5% of the population, compared with 67.9% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 65.6% across Hillingdon and 63.0% nationally.

7.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (8.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%), Hillingdon (13.5%), the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). The proportion of children aged 0-15 years (18.8%) is broadly aligned with the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%), although slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%) and Hillingdon (20.9%). Overall, the age profile is characterised by a high proportion of working-age residents and a relatively small older population.

Ethnicity and Religion

7.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Cranford Cross is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 59.7% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%), Hillingdon (33.3%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

7.1.6 White ethnicity is the second most represented ethnic group, accounting for 25.1% of the population. This proportion is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%), Hillingdon (48.2%), the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 7.5% of the population, exceeding both the regional (3.9%) and national (2.2%) averages. People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 4.2% of the population, aligning with the national average.

7.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Cranford Cross (42.7%), followed by Sikhism (16.6%), Islam (16.5%) and Hinduism (9.5%). The proportions of residents identifying as Sikh, Muslim and Hindu are substantially higher than the regional (1.2%, 9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (0.9%, 6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages.

Health Characteristics

7.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (88.3%) report their health as very good or good, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Hillingdon (85.2%), the regional health study area (84.7%) and England (82.2%).

7.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (2.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Hillingdon (4.0%), the regional health study area (4.2%) and England (5.2%).

7.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (2.9%) is significantly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Hillingdon (4.9%), the regional health study area (5.3%) and England (6.2%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (4.6%) is lower than all comparator areas. These findings suggest comparatively favourable health outcomes within the community area, which is consistent with its relatively young population profile.

7.1.11 For further information see Table 7.1 below.

Table 7.1: Cranford Cross Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	2,321	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	772	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+676 (41%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	18.8%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	72.5%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	8.7%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	51.3%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	48.7%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	25.1%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.4%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	59.7%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	4.2%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	7.5%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	42.7%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Sikh	16.6%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Muslim	16.5%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Hindu	9.5%	8.1%	10.8%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health					

Measure		Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Very Good or Good Health		88.3%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		2.7%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	2.9%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	4.6%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

7.2 Cranford Cross Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

7.2.1 Cranford Cross contains 685 households. The household size profile is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hillingdon, although larger households are slightly more prevalent. One-person households account for 21.9% of households, which is lower than the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%), whilst households comprising five or more people account for 15.7% of households compared with 8.5% across the regional health study area and 7.3% nationally.

7.2.2 Household composition is broadly aligned with the wider comparator areas, with single-family households accounting for 59.2% of households. However, other household types account for 19.0% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%), Hillingdon (11.6%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

7.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Cranford Cross, accounting for 41.0% of households. This proportion is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hillingdon (35.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

7.2.4 Purpose-built flats account for 34.0% of accommodation, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%), Hillingdon (26.2%), the regional health study area (28.6%) and England (17.1%). In contrast, detached properties account for just 4.8% of accommodation, considerably lower than Hillingdon (13.9%) and England (22.9%). Overall, accommodation within Cranford Cross is characterised by a high proportion of semi-detached properties and purpose-built flats.

Accommodation Tenure

7.2.5 Private renting is the predominant tenure type within Cranford Cross, accounting for 54.7% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hillingdon (25.9%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (20.5%).

7.2.6 Owner occupation accounts for 43.0% of households, which is broadly comparable with the regional health study area (45.2%) but lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Hillingdon (56.6%) and England (61.3%). Social rented accommodation accounts for just 2.1% of households, substantially lower than all comparator areas. Overall, accommodation tenure within Cranford Cross is characterised by a high proportion of privately rented households and comparatively low levels of social rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

7.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (76.1%) is slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hillingdon (80.5%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

7.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 23.9% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hillingdon (19.5%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger households are more common within Cranford Cross than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

7.2.9 For further information see Table 7.2 below.

Table 7.2: Cranford Cross Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	685	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	21.9%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	26.9%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	19.0%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	16.5%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	6.9%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	4.0%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.2%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	2.6%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	4.8%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Semi-detached	41.0%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	16.1%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	34.0%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	1.2%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	1.2%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.6%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	43.0%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Social Rented	2.1%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	54.7%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	76.1%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	23.9%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	21.9%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	59.2%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	19.0%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

7.3 Cranford Cross Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

7.3.1 Cranford Cross contains 1,361 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (62.9%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hillingdon (57.2%), the regional health study area (58.5%) and England (55.7%).

7.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (6.9%) is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Hillingdon (3.9%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). This suggests that whilst economic participation is relatively high within Cranford Cross, a greater proportion of economically active residents are unemployed compared with the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

7.3.3 The qualification profile of Cranford Cross is mixed. Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 35.9% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%) and England (33.9%), although remaining below Hillingdon (37.5%) and the regional health study area (41.3%).

7.3.4 Residents with no formal qualifications account for 20.5% of the population, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hillingdon (18.2%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%). This indicates that whilst a relatively high proportion of residents hold higher-level qualifications, a notable proportion also have no formal qualifications.

Occupation

7.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Cranford Cross, accounting for 25.6% of occupations. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hillingdon (10.5%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

7.3.6 Sales and customer service occupations account for 11.1% of occupations, whilst process, plant and machine operatives account for 10.1%, both exceeding the proportions recorded across the wider comparator areas. In contrast, professional occupations account for 11.1% of occupations, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%), Hillingdon (21.1%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a greater prevalence of elementary, service and operational occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

7.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 44.7% of households. This is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hillingdon (44.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

7.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 27.9% of households, which is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), Hillingdon (22.3%) and England (23.5%), although lower than the regional health study area (29.5%). Conversely, households with two or more cars or vans account for a smaller proportion of households than recorded across the wider comparator areas. This suggests a relatively greater reliance on households with either one or no vehicles.

Industry

7.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Cranford Cross are wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (17.4%), transport and storage (16.7%), and administrative and support service activities (12.0%).

7.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than across Hillingdon (9.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). Similarly, employment in administrative and support service activities (12.0%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (8.8%), Hillingdon (6.3%), the regional health study area (5.9%) and England (5.3%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (17.4%) also exceeds all comparator areas. Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport, retail and support service sectors within the local economy.

7.3.11 See Table 7.3 below for further information.

Table 7.3: Cranford Cross Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	1,361	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	62.9%	60.3%	57.2%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	6.9%	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	20.5%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.0%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	10.3%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.2%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	10.1%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	35.9%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	7.0%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	7.8%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	11.1%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	11.3%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	7.9%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.1%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	7.1%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	11.1%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	10.1%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford Cross	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Elementary Occupations	25.6%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	44.7%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	20.3%	25.3%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	7.2%	10.4%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	27.9%	21.8%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	17.4%	14.5%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	16.7%	15.7%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Administrative and Support Service Activities	12.0%	8.5%	6.3%	5.9%	5.3%

8 Cranford

8.1 Cranford Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

8.1.1 Cranford had a population of 8,144 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 3,848 residents per km², which exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²), although it remains lower than Hounslow (5,150 residents per km²).

8.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 20% (+1,338 residents), exceeding growth recorded across Hounslow (17%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Cranford has experienced notable population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

8.1.3 Cranford has a relatively young population profile. Residents aged 16-64 account for 69.1% of the population, compared with 67.9% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 67.6% across Hounslow and 63.0% nationally.

8.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (11.6%) is aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and Hounslow (11.8%), although lower than the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Children aged 0-15 years account for 19.3% of the population, which is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Overall, the age profile is characterised by a relatively high proportion of working-age residents and a lower proportion of older residents than observed regionally and nationally.

Ethnicity and Religion

8.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Cranford is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 65.5% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%), Hounslow (36.7%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

8.1.6 White ethnicity is the second most represented ethnic group, accounting for 19.2% of the population. This proportion is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%), Hounslow (44.1%), the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 8.5% of the population, exceeding both the regional (3.9%) and national (2.2%) averages. People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 4.2% of the population, which aligns with the national average.

8.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Cranford (37.7%), followed by Sikhism (23.9%), Islam (18.8%) and Hinduism (8.9%). The proportions of residents identifying as Sikh, Muslim and Hindu are substantially higher than the regional (1.2%, 9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (0.9%, 6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages. The proportion of residents identifying as Sikh is particularly notable, accounting for almost one-quarter of the population.

Health Characteristics

8.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (84.5%) report their health as very good or good, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Hounslow (85.3%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), and exceeds the national average (82.2%).

8.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (3.8%) is below the regional health study area (4.2%) and England (5.2%), and aligns with the Site-Specific Health Study Area.

8.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.3%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Hounslow (4.8%), the regional health study area (5.3%) and England (6.2%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (5.3%) is lower than all comparator areas. These findings suggest comparatively favourable health outcomes within the community area.

8.1.11 For further information see Table 8.1 below.

Table 8.1: Cranford Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	8,144	256,775	299,424	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	3,848	2,710	5,150	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+1,338 (20%)	+47,086 (25%)	+44,497 (17%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	19.3%	20.5%	20.7%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	69.1%	67.9%	67.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	11.6%	11.6%	11.8%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.7%	50.7%	49.7%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.3%	49.3%	50.3%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	19.2%	45.6%	44.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	2.6%	3.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	65.5%	38.0%	36.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	4.2%	5.7%	7.2%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	8.5%	6.0%	7.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	37.7%	41.1%	38.3%	43.6%	46.3%
Sikh	23.9%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Muslim	18.8%	14.1%	16.7%	9.2%	6.7%
Hindu	8.9%	8.1%	9.5%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health					

Measure		Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Very Good or Good Health		84.5%	85.1%	85.3%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.8%	3.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.3%	4.5%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.3%	6.0%	6.1%	7.6%	8.5%

8.2 Cranford Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

8.2.1 Cranford contains 2,350 households. Household sizes are generally larger than those recorded across the comparator areas, with lower proportions of one-person (19.1%) and two-person households (20.5%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6% and 25.4%, respectively), Hounslow (25.5% and 25.9%, respectively), the regional health study area (28.8% and 32.1%, respectively) and England (30.1% and 34.0%, respectively).

8.2.2 Households categorised as 'other household types' account for 26.0% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%), Hounslow (14.5%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%). Conversely, single-family households account for 54.9% of households, compared with 59.7% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 60.0% across Hounslow, 61.5% across the regional health study area and 63.0% nationally.

Accommodation Type

8.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Cranford, accounting for 32.7% of households, followed by terraced properties (27.2%) and purpose-built flats (22.8%). Compared with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hounslow, Cranford has a higher proportion of terraced accommodation and a lower proportion of purpose-built flats.

8.2.4 Detached properties account for 10.8% of accommodation, which is notably higher than Hounslow (4.9%), although lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%) and England (22.9%). Overall, accommodation within Cranford comprises a relatively even mix of semi-detached, terraced and flatted accommodation.

Accommodation Tenure

8.2.5 Private renting is the most common tenure type within Cranford, accounting for 41.5% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hounslow (30.9%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (20.5%).

8.2.6 Owner occupation accounts for 42.8% of households and is broadly aligned with Hounslow (45.7%) and the regional health study area (45.2%), although lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (49.2%) and England (61.3%). Social rented accommodation accounts for 14.9% of households, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%) but remaining below Hounslow (21.0%) and the regional health study area (23.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Cranford is characterised by a relatively even split between owner-occupied and privately rented households.

Occupancy Rating

8.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (66.7%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.6%), Hounslow (77.0%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

8.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 33.3% of households, substantially exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hounslow (23.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger and more densely occupied households are more prevalent within Cranford than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

8.2.9 For further information see Table 8.2 below.

Table 8.2: Cranford Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	2,350	80,047	102,953	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Person in Household	19.1%	24.6%	25.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	20.5%	25.4%	25.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	17.6%	18.5%	18.6%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	18.2%	17.0%	16.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	11.3%	7.9%	7.4%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	6.5%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.9%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	4.0%	1.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	10.8%	12.7%	4.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	32.7%	34.0%	28.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	27.2%	21.3%	20.5%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	22.8%	27.0%	37.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	4.4%	2.9%	6.4%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.9%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	42.8%	48.5%	45.7%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	14.9%	15.4%	21.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	41.5%	34.6%	30.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	0.7%	1.2%	2.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	66.7%	78.0%	77.0%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	33.3%	22.0%	23.0%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	19.1%	24.5%	25.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	54.9%	59.7%	60.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	26.0%	15.7%	14.5%	9.7%	6.9%

8.3 Cranford Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

8.3.1 Cranford contains 5,454 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (55.1%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hounslow (58.8%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), although it is broadly aligned with the national average (55.7%).

8.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (5.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Hounslow (4.5%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, the data suggests comparatively lower levels of economic activity and higher levels of unemployment than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

8.3.3 The qualification profile of Cranford indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment than the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 24.6% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hounslow (18.6%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

8.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 30.0% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Hounslow (41.6%) and the regional health study area (41.3%), although broadly comparable with England (33.9%). Overall, the qualification profile suggests a lower proportion of residents holding higher-level qualifications than is observed across the local and regional comparator areas.

Occupation

8.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Cranford, accounting for 24.9% of occupations. This proportion is considerably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hounslow (13.4%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

8.3.6 Process, plant and machine operatives (10.7%) and sales and customer service occupations (10.3%) also account for a relatively high proportion of employment compared with the wider comparator areas. In contrast, professional occupations account for 10.9% of occupations, substantially lower than Hounslow (20.0%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a greater prevalence of elementary, operational and service occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

8.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 38.4% of households, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hounslow (44.2%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

8.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 30.9% of households, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%) and England (23.5%), although slightly lower than Hounslow (32.8%). Conversely, households with two or more cars or vans account for 30.8% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (35.7%) and England (35.2%). This suggests a relatively greater reliance on households with either one or no vehicles.

Industry

8.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Cranford are transport and storage (17.4%), wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (15.9%), and accommodation and food service activities (12.7%).

8.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than across Hounslow (10.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). Similarly, accommodation and food service activities account for a considerably higher proportion of employment (12.7%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (7.6%), Hounslow (7.0%), the regional health study area (5.0%) and England (4.9%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (15.9%) is also slightly higher than across the wider comparator areas. Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport, retail, and hospitality-related sectors within the local economy.

8.3.11 For further information see Table 8.3 below.

Table 8.3: Cranford Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	5,454	160,219	194,709	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	55.1%	60.3%	58.8%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	5.4%	4.8%	4.5%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	24.6%	20.1%	18.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	13.4%	11.5%	9.5%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	10.4%	12.1%	10.2%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.3%	4.5%	3.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.5%	13.3%	12.3%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	30.0%	33.9%	41.6%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	6.8%	4.7%	4.3%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	8.4%	11.2%	12.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	10.9%	14.8%	20.0%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	8.5%	11.5%	12.7%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.6%	10.4%	8.8%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.6%	9.2%	8.7%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	8.1%	8.4%	8.2%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	10.3%	8.6%	8.0%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	10.7%	9.8%	7.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	24.9%	16.1%	13.4%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					

Measure	Community Area: Cranford	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Car or Van in Household	38.4%	42.5%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	21.6%	25.3%	17.4%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	9.2%	10.4%	5.6%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	30.9%	21.8%	32.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	17.4%	15.7%	10.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	15.9%	14.5%	14.3%	13.1%	15.0%
Accommodation and Food Service Activities	12.7%	7.8%	7.0%	5.0%	4.9%

9 Heston

9.1 Heston Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

9.1.1 Heston had a population of 43,163 residents in mid-2024 and is one of the largest community areas within the study area. The community area has a population density of 6,169 residents per km², which exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Hounslow (5,150 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²).

9.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 19% (+6,842 residents), exceeding growth recorded across Hounslow (17%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Heston has experienced notable population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

9.1.3 Heston has a broadly similar age profile to the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hounslow. Residents aged 16-64 account for 66.8% of the population, which is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) and Hounslow (67.6%), and higher than the regional health study area (65.5%) and England (63.0%).

9.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (12.2%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and Hounslow (11.8%), although lower than the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Children aged 0-15 years account for 21.0% of the population, slightly exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Hounslow (20.7%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%).

Ethnicity and Religion

9.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Heston is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 59.9% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%), Hounslow (36.7%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

9.1.6 White ethnicity is the second most represented ethnic group, accounting for 18.8% of the population. This proportion is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%), Hounslow (44.1%), the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 11.2% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), Hounslow (7.3%), the regional health study area (3.9%) and England (2.2%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 7.0% of the population, which is broadly aligned with Hounslow (7.2%) and exceeds the national average (4.2%).

9.1.7 Sikhism is the most commonly reported religion within Heston, accounting for 25.8% of the population, followed by Christianity (24.7%), Islam (23.0%) and Hinduism (13.2%). The proportions of residents identifying as Sikh, Muslim and Hindu are substantially higher than the regional (1.2%, 9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (0.9%, 6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages. Together, these faith groups account for over 60% of the population.

Health Characteristics

9.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (84.1%) report their health as very good or good, which is broadly comparable with the regional health study area (84.7%) and higher than England (82.2%), although slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%) and Hounslow (85.3%).

9.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.6%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Hounslow (4.1%) and the regional health study area (4.2%), although lower than the national average (5.2%).

9.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (5.1%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%) and Hounslow (4.8%), although below the regional health study area (5.3%) and England (6.2%). The proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (5.6%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%),

Hounslow (6.1%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, health outcomes within Heston are broadly comparable with the wider study area.

9.1.11 For further information see Table 9.1 below.

Table 9.1: Heston Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	43,163	256,775	299,424	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	6,169	2,710	5,150	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+6,842 (19%)	+47,086 (25%)	+44,497 (17%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	21.0%	20.5%	20.7%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	66.8%	67.9%	67.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	12.2%	11.6%	11.8%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Male	50.0%	50.7%	49.7%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	50.0%	49.3%	50.3%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	18.8%	45.6%	44.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.0%	3.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	59.9%	38.0%	36.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	7.0%	5.7%	7.2%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	11.2%	6.0%	7.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Sikh	25.8%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Christian	24.7%	41.1%	38.3%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	23.0%	14.1%	16.7%	9.2%	6.7%

Measure		Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Hindu		13.2%	8.1%	9.5%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		84.1%	85.1%	85.3%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.6%	3.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.1%	4.5%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.6%	6.0%	6.1%	7.6%	8.5%

9.2 Heston Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

9.2.1 Heston contains 12,577 households. Household sizes are generally larger than those recorded across the comparator areas, with lower proportions of one-person (19.1%) and two-person households (19.5%) than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6% and 25.4%, respectively), Hounslow (25.5% and 25.9%, respectively), the regional health study area (28.8% and 32.1%, respectively) and England (30.1% and 34.0%, respectively).

9.2.2 Conversely, larger households are more prevalent within Heston. Households comprising five or more people account for 22.0% of households, compared with 14.5% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 13.5% across Hounslow and 9.0% nationally. Household composition reflects this trend, with one-person households accounting for a smaller proportion of households than across all comparator areas. Other household types account for 21.2% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%), Hounslow (14.5%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

9.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Heston, accounting for 43.4% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hounslow (28.6%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

9.2.4 Purpose-built flats account for 30.8% of accommodation, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%) and the regional health study area (28.6%), although remaining below Hounslow (37.4%). Detached properties account for just 5.7% of accommodation, which is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%), the regional health study area (17.0%) and England (22.9%). Overall, accommodation within Heston is characterised by a high proportion of semi-detached properties and purpose-built flats.

Accommodation Tenure

9.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Heston, accounting for 48.1% of households. This is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Hounslow (45.7%) and the regional health study area (45.2%), although lower than England (61.3%).

9.2.6 Private renting accounts for 30.6% of households, broadly comparable with Hounslow (30.9%) and the regional health study area (30.0%), and lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%). Social rented accommodation accounts for 19.3% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%) and England (17.1%), although remaining below Hounslow (21.0%) and the regional health study area (23.1%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Heston reflects a relatively balanced mix of owner-occupied, privately rented and socially rented housing.

Occupancy Rating

9.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (71.4%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hounslow (77.0%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

9.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 28.6% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hounslow (23.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger and more densely occupied households are more prevalent within Heston than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

9.2.9 For further information see Table 9.2 below.

Table 9.2: Heston Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	12,577	80,047	102,953	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	19.1%	24.6%	25.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	19.5%	25.4%	25.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	19.3%	18.5%	18.6%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	20.2%	17.0%	16.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	11.0%	7.9%	7.4%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	5.9%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.6%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	2.5%	1.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	5.7%	12.7%	4.9%	17.0%	22.9%

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Semi-detached	43.4%	34.0%	28.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	15.8%	21.3%	20.5%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	30.8%	27.0%	37.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	3.0%	2.9%	6.4%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.9%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	48.1%	48.5%	45.7%	45.2%	61.3%

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Social Rented	19.3%	15.4%	21.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	30.6%	34.6%	30.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	1.6%	1.2%	2.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy rating of bedrooms: -1	71.4%	78.0%	77.0%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy rating of bedrooms: -2 or less	28.6%	22.0%	23.0%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	19.0%	24.5%	25.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	59.8%	59.7%	60.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	21.2%	15.7%	14.5%	9.7%	6.9%

9.3 Heston Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

9.3.1 Heston contains 27,588 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (53.4%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hounslow (58.8%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), and is also slightly below the national average (55.7%).

9.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.8%) is aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Hounslow (4.5%), although it exceeds the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, the data indicates comparatively lower levels of economic activity than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

9.3.3 The qualification profile of Heston is mixed. Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 35.6% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%) and England (33.9%), although remaining below Hounslow (41.6%) and the regional health study area (41.3%).

9.3.4 Residents with no formal qualifications account for 22.6% of the population, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hounslow (18.6%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%). This indicates that whilst a relatively high proportion of residents hold higher-level qualifications, a notable proportion of residents also have no formal qualifications.

Occupation

9.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Heston, accounting for 16.4% of occupations. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hounslow (13.4%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

9.3.6 Sales and customer service occupations account for 11.4% of occupations, compared with 8.6% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 8.0% across Hounslow and 6.6% across the regional health study area. Process, plant and machine operatives also account for a relatively high proportion of occupations (9.0%) compared with Hounslow (7.3%) and the regional health study area (5.3%). Professional occupations account for 15.7% of occupations, aligning closely with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%) but remaining below Hounslow (20.0%) and the regional health study area (23.5%). Overall, the occupational profile reflects a mix of professional, service and operational occupations.

Car or Van Availability

9.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 41.0% of households, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hounslow (44.2%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

9.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 26.9% of households, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%) and England (23.5%), although lower than Hounslow (32.8%). Households with two or more cars or vans account for 32.1% of households, exceeding Hounslow (23.0%) and the regional health study area (30.0%), whilst remaining below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (35.7%). Overall, vehicle availability within Heston is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas.

Industry

9.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Heston are wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (19.2%), transport and storage (13.2%), and human health and social work activities (10.2%).

9.3.10 Employment in wholesale and retail trade accounts for a higher proportion of employment than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.5%), Hounslow (14.3%), the regional health study area (13.1%) and England (15.0%). Transport and storage also accounts for a relatively high proportion of employment (13.2%), exceeding Hounslow (10.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). Employment in human health and social work activities (10.2%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) but lower than Hounslow (10.9%), the regional health study area

(13.4%) and England (14.6%). Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of retail and transport-related sectors within the local economy.

9.3.11 For further information see Table 9.3 below.

Table 9.3: Heston Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	27,588	160,219	194,709	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	53.4%	60.3%	58.8%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.8%	4.8%	4.5%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	22.6%	20.1%	18.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	10.4%	11.5%	9.5%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	10.7%	12.1%	10.2%	12.0%	13.3%

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Apprenticeship	3.2%	4.5%	3.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	12.3%	13.3%	12.3%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	35.6%	33.9%	41.6%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	5.2%	4.7%	4.3%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	10.9%	11.2%	12.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	15.7%	14.8%	20.0%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	10.5%	11.5%	12.7%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.7%	10.4%	8.8%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.5%	9.2%	8.7%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	7.8%	8.4%	8.2%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	11.4%	8.6%	8.0%	6.6%	7.5%

Measure	Community Area: Heston	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	9.0%	9.8%	7.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	16.4%	16.1%	13.4%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	41.0%	42.5%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	22.5%	25.3%	17.4%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	9.6%	10.4%	5.6%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	26.9%	21.8%	32.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	19.2%	14.5%	14.3%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	13.2%	15.7%	10.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	10.2%	10.1%	10.9%	13.4%	14.6%

10 Feltham North

10.1 Feltham North Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

10.1.1 Feltham North had a population of 15,799 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 4,009 residents per km², which exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²), although remaining below Hounslow (5,150 residents per km²).

10.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 37% (+4,231 residents), exceeding growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Hounslow (17%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Feltham North has experienced substantial population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

10.1.3 Feltham North has a broadly similar age profile to the wider study area, although a slightly greater proportion of older residents is present. Residents aged 65 years and over account for 13.3% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and Hounslow (11.8%), although remaining below the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%).

10.1.4 The proportion of working-age residents aged 16-64 (65.9%) is broadly aligned with Hounslow (67.6%) and the regional health study area (65.5%), whilst children aged 0-15 years account for 20.8% of the population, broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%) and Hounslow (20.7%). Overall, the age profile is generally consistent with the wider comparator areas.

Ethnicity and Religion

10.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Feltham North is White, accounting for 45.4% of the population. This proportion is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%) and Hounslow (44.1%), although lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

10.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 37.0% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages and broadly aligned with Hounslow (36.7%) and the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 7.4% of the population, which is broadly aligned with Hounslow (7.2%) and exceeds the national average (4.2%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 6.6% of the population, compared with 3.9% regionally and 2.2% nationally.

10.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Feltham North (42.8%), followed by No Religion (16.3%), Islam (14.5%) and Hinduism (10.2%). The proportions of residents identifying as Muslim and Hindu exceed the regional (9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages. The proportion of residents reporting No Religion (16.3%) is lower than both the regional (33.7%) and national (36.7%) averages.

Health Characteristics

10.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy, although some indicators are less favourable than those observed across the wider study area. The majority of residents (82.9%) report their health as very good or good, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Hounslow (85.3%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), although slightly higher than England (82.2%).

10.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.7%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Hounslow (4.1%) and the regional health study area (4.2%), although remaining below the national average (5.2%).

10.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (5.3%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%) and Hounslow (4.8%), whilst aligning with the regional health study area (5.3%). Similarly, the proportion of

residents whose activities are limited a little (6.8%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%) and Hounslow (6.1%), although remaining below the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, these findings suggest slightly poorer health outcomes than those observed across the wider study area.

10.1.11 For further information see Table 11.1 below.

Table 11.1: Feltham North Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	15,799	256,775	299,424	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	4,009	2,710	5,150	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+4,231 (37%)	+47,086 (25%)	+44,497 (17%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	20.8%	20.5%	20.7%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	65.9%	67.9%	67.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	13.3%	11.6%	11.8%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Male	49.8%	50.7%	49.7%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	50.2%	49.3%	50.3%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	45.4%	45.6%	44.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.7%	3.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	37.0%	38.0%	36.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	7.4%	5.7%	7.2%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	6.6%	6.0%	7.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	42.8%	41.1%	38.3%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	16.3%	17.0%	18.6%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	14.5%	14.1%	16.7%	9.2%	6.7%

Measure		Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Hindu		10.2%	8.1%	9.5%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		82.9%	85.1%	85.3%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.7%	3.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.3%	4.5%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.8%	6.0%	6.1%	7.6%	8.5%

10.2 Feltham North Housing Baseline Data

Housing Size and Composition

10.2.1 Feltham North contains 4,443 households. The household size profile is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hounslow, although larger households are slightly more prevalent. One-person households account for 24.6% of households, aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6%) and broadly comparable with Hounslow (25.5%), whilst remaining below the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%).

10.2.2 Households comprising five or more people account for 19.1% of households, compared with 14.5% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 13.5% across Hounslow and 9.0% nationally. Household composition reflects this trend, with other household types accounting for 18.4% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%), Hounslow (14.5%), the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

10.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Feltham North, accounting for 38.0% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hounslow (28.6%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

10.2.4 Purpose-built flats account for 26.2% of accommodation, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%) and exceeding England (17.1%), although remaining below Hounslow (37.4%). Terraced properties account for 23.5% of accommodation, which is slightly higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.9%) and Hounslow (20.5%). Overall, accommodation within Feltham North is characterised by a mix of semi-detached housing, terraced properties and flats.

Accommodation Tenure

10.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Feltham North, accounting for 51.7% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Hounslow (45.7%) and the regional health study area (45.2%), although remaining below England (61.3%).

10.2.6 Social rented accommodation accounts for 24.0% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%), Hounslow (21.0%) and England (17.1%), and broadly aligning with the regional health study area (23.1%). In contrast, private renting accounts for 22.3% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Hounslow (30.9%) and the regional health study area (30.0%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Feltham North is characterised by relatively high levels of owner occupation and social rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

10.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (73.5%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), Hounslow (77.0%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

10.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 26.5% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hounslow (23.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger and more densely occupied households are more prevalent within Feltham North than across the wider comparator areas, which is consistent with the household size profile observed within the community area.

10.2.9 For further information see Table 11.2 below.

Table 11.2: Feltham North Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	4,443	80,047	102,953	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Person in Household	24.6%	24.6%	25.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	22.5%	25.4%	25.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.0%	18.5%	18.6%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.8%	17.0%	16.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	8.8%	7.9%	7.4%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	4.0%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.2%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	2.2%	1.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	6.6%	12.7%	4.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	38.0%	34.0%	28.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	23.5%	21.3%	20.5%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	26.2%	27.0%	37.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	3.9%	2.9%	6.4%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	51.7%	48.5%	45.7%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	24.0%	15.4%	21.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	22.3%	34.6%	30.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	1.1%	1.2%	2.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	73.5%	78.0%	77.0%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	26.5%	22.0%	23.0%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	24.5%	24.5%	25.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	57.2%	59.7%	60.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	18.4%	15.7%	14.5%	9.7%	6.9%

10.3 Feltham North Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

10.3.1 Feltham North contains 9,052 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (56.3%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hounslow (58.8%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), although it is broadly aligned with the national average (55.7%).

10.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.2%) is slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Hounslow (4.5%), although it remains above the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, levels of economic activity are lower than those observed across the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

10.3.3 The qualification profile of Feltham North indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment than the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 26.1% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hounslow (18.6%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

10.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 30.3% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Hounslow (41.6%) , the regional health study area (41.3%), and England (33.9%). Overall, the data indicates a lower proportion of residents holding higher-level qualifications and a greater proportion with no formal qualifications than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Occupation

10.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Feltham North, accounting for 18.6% of occupations. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hounslow (13.4%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

10.3.6 Skilled trades occupations (10.5%) and caring, leisure and other service occupations (10.2%) also account for relatively high proportions of employment compared with the wider comparator areas. In contrast, professional occupations account for 13.5% of employment, remaining below Hounslow (20.0%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile reflects a greater prevalence of elementary, skilled trades and service-based occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

10.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 42.1% of households, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hounslow (44.2%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

10.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 28.3% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%) and England (23.5%), although remains below Hounslow (32.8%). Overall, the data suggests relatively lower levels of vehicle ownership than those observed across the wider comparator areas.

Industry

10.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Feltham North are wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (15.9%), transport and storage (13.4%), and human health and social work activities (12.0%).

10.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a notably higher proportion of employment than Hounslow (10.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). Employment in human health and social work activities (12.0%) also exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) and Hounslow (10.9%), although remains below the regional health study area (13.4%) and England (14.6%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (15.9%) is slightly higher than across the wider comparator areas. Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of retail, transport and health-related sectors within the local economy.

10.3.11 For further information see Table 11.3 below.

Table 11.3: Feltham North Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	9,052	160,219	194,709	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	56.3%	60.3%	58.8%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.2%	4.8%	4.5%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	26.1%	20.1%	18.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.0%	11.5%	9.5%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	11.1%	12.1%	10.2%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.3%	4.5%	3.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.8%	13.3%	12.3%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	30.3%	33.9%	41.6%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	4.4%	4.7%	4.3%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	8.9%	11.2%	12.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	13.5%	14.8%	20.0%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	10.0%	11.5%	12.7%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.8%	10.4%	8.8%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	10.5%	9.2%	8.7%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	10.2%	8.4%	8.2%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	8.9%	8.6%	8.0%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	9.6%	9.8%	7.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	18.6%	16.1%	13.4%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					

Measure	Community Area: Feltham North	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Car or Van in Household	42.1%	42.5%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	22.1%	25.3%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	7.5%	10.4%	17.4%	22.1%	26.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	28.3%	21.8%	5.6%	7.9%	9.1%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	15.9%	14.5%	14.3%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	13.4%	15.7%	10.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	12.0%	10.1%	10.9%	13.4%	14.6%

11 Bedfont

11.1 Bedfont Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

11.1.1 Bedfont had a population of 15,189 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 3,266 residents per km², which exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and the national average (433 residents per km²), although remaining below Hounslow (5,150 residents per km²).

11.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 19% (+2,434 residents), exceeding growth recorded across Hounslow (17%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Bedfont has experienced notable population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

11.1.3 Bedfont has a broadly similar age profile to the wider study area. Children aged 0-15 years account for 22.3% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Hounslow (20.7%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%).

11.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (11.2%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and Hounslow (11.8%), although lower than the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Residents aged 16-64 account for 66.6% of the population, which is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas.

Ethnicity and Religion

11.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Bedfont is White, accounting for 51.2% of the population. Whilst this remains the largest ethnic group within the community area, the proportion is lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%).

11.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 31.1% of the population. This proportion is substantially higher than the regional (13.9%) and national (9.6%) averages, although lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) and Hounslow (36.7%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 8.7% of the population, exceeding both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (5.7%) and the national average (4.2%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 5.1% of the population, which is higher than the regional (3.9%) and national (2.2%) averages.

11.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Bedfont (39.4%), followed by No Religion (20.9%), Islam (15.9%) and Hinduism (9.4%). The proportions of residents identifying as Muslim and Hindu exceed the regional (9.2% and 3.4%, respectively) and national (6.7% and 1.8%, respectively) averages. The proportion of residents reporting No Religion (20.9%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%) and Hounslow (18.6%), although lower than the regional health study area (33.7%) and England (36.7%).

Health Characteristics

11.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy, although some indicators are less favourable than those observed across the wider study area. The majority of residents (83.9%) report their health as very good or good, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Hounslow (85.3%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), although higher than England (82.2%).

11.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.3%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%) and Hounslow (4.1%), although remaining below the national average (5.2%).

11.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (5.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Hounslow (4.8%) and the regional health study area (5.3%), whilst remaining below England (6.2%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (6.7%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%) and Hounslow (6.1%), although remains below the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, these findings suggest slightly poorer health outcomes than those observed across the wider study area.

11.1.11 For further information see Table 12.1 below.

Table 12.1: Bedfont Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	15,189	256,775	299,424	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	3,266	2,710	5,150	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+2,434 (19%)	+47,086 (25%)	+44,497 (17%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	22.3%	20.5%	20.7%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	66.6%	67.9%	67.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	11.2%	11.6%	11.8%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	48.6%	50.7%	49.7%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	51.4%	49.3%	50.3%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
White	51.2%	45.6%	44.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.0%	3.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	31.1%	38.0%	36.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	8.7%	5.7%	7.2%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	5.1%	6.0%	7.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	39.4%	41.1%	38.3%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	20.9%	17.0%	18.6%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	15.9%	14.1%	16.7%	9.2%	6.7%
Hindu	9.4%	8.1%	9.5%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	83.9%	85.1%	85.3%	84.7%	82.2%

Measure		Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.3%	3.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.4%	4.5%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.7%	6.0%	6.1%	7.6%	8.5%

11.2 Bedfont Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

11.2.1 Bedfont contains 5,088 households. The household size profile is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and Hounslow. One-person households account for 25.9% of households, aligning closely with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6%) and Hounslow (25.5%), whilst remaining below the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%).

11.2.2 Larger households are slightly more prevalent than across the wider comparator areas. Households comprising five or more people account for 16.7% of households, compared with 14.5% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area, 13.5% across Hounslow and 9.0% nationally. Household composition is broadly aligned with the wider comparator areas, with single-family households accounting for 60.6% of households. Other household types account for 13.6% of households, exceeding the regional health study area (9.7%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

11.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Bedfont, accounting for 41.8% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Hounslow (28.6%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (31.5%).

11.2.4 Purpose-built flats account for 30.8% of accommodation, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%) and the regional health study area (28.6%), although remaining below Hounslow (37.4%). Detached properties account for just 4.9% of accommodation, which is considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%), the regional health study area (17.0%) and England (22.9%). Overall, accommodation within Bedfont is characterised by a high proportion of semi-detached properties and purpose-built flats.

Accommodation Tenure

11.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Bedfont, accounting for 44.3% of households. This is broadly aligned with Hounslow (45.7%) and the regional health study area (45.2%), although lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%) and England (61.3%).

11.2.6 Social rented accommodation accounts for 26.7% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%), Hounslow (21.0%), the regional health study area (23.1%) and England (17.1%). In contrast, private renting accounts for 23.2% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.2%), Hounslow (30.9%) and the regional health study area (30.0%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Bedfont is characterised by relatively high levels of social rented accommodation and lower levels of private renting.

Occupancy Rating

11.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (75.5%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%) and Hounslow (77.0%), although lower than the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%).

11.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 24.5% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Hounslow (23.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests that larger and more densely occupied households are more prevalent within Bedfont than across the wider regional and national comparator areas.

11.2.9 For further information see Table 12.2 below.

Table 12.2: Bedfont Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	5,088	80,047	102,953	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	25.9%	24.6%	25.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	24.1%	25.4%	25.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.4%	18.5%	18.6%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.1%	17.0%	16.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	8.1%	7.9%	7.4%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	3.3%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.3%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.8%	1.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Detached	4.9%	12.7%	4.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	41.8%	34.0%	28.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	18.6%	21.3%	20.5%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	30.8%	27.0%	37.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.7%	2.9%	6.4%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Owner-Occupied	44.3%	48.5%	45.7%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	26.7%	15.4%	21.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	23.2%	34.6%	30.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	5.6%	1.2%	2.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	75.5%	78.0%	77.0%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	24.5%	22.0%	23.0%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	25.8%	24.5%	25.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	60.6%	59.7%	60.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	13.6%	15.7%	14.5%	9.7%	6.9%

11.3 Bedfont Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

11.3.1 Bedfont contains 9,602 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (59.2%) is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Hounslow (58.8%) and the regional health study area (58.5%), and exceeds the national average (55.7%).

11.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.6%) is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Hounslow (4.5%), although it exceeds the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, levels of economic activity within Bedfont are broadly consistent with the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

11.3.3 The qualification profile of Bedfont indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment than the wider comparator areas. Residents with no formal qualifications account for 22.9% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Hounslow (18.6%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

11.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 29.9% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Hounslow (41.6%), the regional health study area (41.3%) and England (33.9%). Overall, the data suggests a lower proportion of residents holding higher-level qualifications than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Occupation

11.3.5 Elementary occupations represent the largest occupational group within Bedfont, accounting for 17.3% of occupations. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), Hounslow (13.4%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%).

11.3.6 Caring, leisure and other service occupations (10.4%), administrative and secretarial occupations (10.8%), and process, plant and machine operatives (10.3%) also account for relatively high proportions of employment compared with many of the comparator areas. In contrast, professional occupations account for 11.7% of employment, substantially lower than Hounslow (20.0%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Overall, the occupational profile reflects a greater prevalence of elementary, service and operational occupations than is observed across the wider comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

11.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 45.3% of households. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Hounslow (44.2%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

11.3.8 Households with no access to a car or van account for 25.0% of households, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) and England (23.5%), although lower than Hounslow (32.8%) and the regional health study area (29.5%). Households with two or more cars or vans account for 29.6% of households, indicating a broadly mixed pattern of vehicle ownership across the community area.

Industry

11.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Bedfont are transport and storage (16.9%), wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (15.6%), and human health and social work activities (11.4%).

11.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than Hounslow (10.2%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (15.6%) is also slightly higher than across the wider comparator areas. Human health and social work activities account for 11.4% of employment, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) and Hounslow (10.9%), although remaining below the regional health study area (13.4%) and England (14.6%). Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport, retail and health-related sectors within the local economy.

11.3.11 For further information see Table 12.3 below.

Table 12.3: Bedfont Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	9,602	160,219	194,709	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	59.2%	60.3%	58.8%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.6%	4.8%	4.5%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	22.9%	20.1%	18.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.6%	11.5%	9.5%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.0%	12.1%	10.2%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.4%	4.5%	3.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	13.4%	13.3%	12.3%	15.3%	16.9%

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	29.9%	33.9%	41.6%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	4.9%	4.7%	4.3%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	9.3%	11.2%	12.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	11.7%	14.8%	20.0%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	10.8%	11.5%	12.7%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	10.8%	10.4%	8.8%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.8%	9.2%	8.7%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	10.4%	8.4%	8.2%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	9.6%	8.6%	8.0%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	10.3%	9.8%	7.3%	5.3%	6.9%

Measure	Community Area: Bedfont	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Elementary Occupations	17.3%	16.1%	13.4%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	45.3%	42.5%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	21.8%	25.3%	17.4%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	7.8%	10.4%	5.6%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	25.0%	21.8%	32.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	16.9%	15.7%	10.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	15.6%	14.5%	14.3%	13.1%	15.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	11.4%	10.1%	10.9%	13.4%	14.6%

12 Stanwell

12.1 Stanwell Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

12.1.1 Stanwell had a population of 17,959 residents in mid-2024. The community area has a population density of 2,760 residents per km², which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and exceeds Spelthorne (2,013 residents per km²), although remaining below the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²).

12.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 23% (+3,325 residents), closely aligning with growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and exceeding growth recorded across Spelthorne (12%), the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Stanwell has experienced substantial population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

12.1.3 Stanwell has a relatively young population profile. Children aged 0-15 years account for 21.7% of the population, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Spelthorne (19.0%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%).

12.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 65 years and over (12.9%) is lower than Spelthorne (18.1%), the regional health study area (15.7%) and England (18.4%), although slightly higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%). Residents aged 16-64 account for 65.3% of the population, broadly aligning with the regional health study area (65.5%). Overall, the age profile is characterised by a relatively high proportion of children and a lower proportion of older residents than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Ethnicity and Religion

12.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Stanwell is White, accounting for 64.0% of the population. Whilst this remains lower than the regional health study area (70.1%) and England (81.0%), it is notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%).

12.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 23.6% of the population. This proportion exceeds Spelthorne (12.8%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%), although remains below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 4.3% of the population, broadly aligning with the national average (4.2%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 4.3% of the population, exceeding both Spelthorne (2.4%) and England (2.2%).

12.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Stanwell (45.9%), followed by No Religion (26.2%), Islam (7.4%) and Hinduism (6.8%). The proportions of residents identifying as Muslim and Hindu exceed the national averages (6.7% and 1.8%, respectively). The proportion of residents reporting No Religion (26.2%) is considerably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%), although lower than the regional health study area (33.7%) and England (36.7%).

Health Characteristics

12.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy, although some indicators are slightly less favourable than those recorded across the wider study area. The majority of residents (83.4%) report their health as very good or good, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Spelthorne (84.8%) and the regional health study area (84.7%), although higher than England (82.2%).

12.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (4.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Spelthorne (3.9%) and the regional health study area (4.2%), although remains below the national average (5.2%).

12.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (5.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Spelthorne (4.9%) and the regional health study area (5.3%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (7.4%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%) and is broadly aligned with

Spelthorne (7.5%) and the regional health study area (7.6%). Overall, these findings suggest slightly poorer health outcomes than those observed across the wider study area.

12.1.11 For further information see Table 13.1 below.

Table 13.1: Stanwell Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	17,959	256,775	107,074	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	2,760	2,710	2,013	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+3,325 (23%)	+47,086 (25%)	+11,222 (12%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	21.7%	20.5%	19.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	65.3%	67.9%	62.9%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	12.9%	11.6%	18.1%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Male	50.1%	50.7%	49.2%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.9%	49.3%	50.8%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	64.0%	45.6%	78.7%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	23.6%	38.0%	12.8%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	4.3%	5.7%	2.5%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	4.3%	6.0%	2.4%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	45.9%	41.1%	50.9%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	26.2%	17.0%	31.2%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	7.4%	14.1%	4.0%	9.2%	6.7%

Measure		Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Hindu		6.8%	8.1%	4.2%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		83.4%	85.1%	84.8%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.4%	3.8%	3.9%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.4%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	7.4%	6.0%	7.5%	7.6%	8.5%

12.2 Stanwell Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

12.2.1 Stanwell contains 6,382 households. The household size profile is broadly comparable with Spelthorne and the wider comparator areas. One-person households account for 26.9% of households, which aligns closely with Spelthorne (27.9%), although remaining below the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%).

12.2.2 Households comprising three or more people account for 45.9% of households, exceeding the regional health study area (39.3%) and England (36.9%). Household composition is broadly aligned with the wider comparator areas, with single-family households accounting for 62.4% of households. Other household types account for 10.8% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%) but higher than Spelthorne (7.2%) and England (6.9%).

Accommodation Type

12.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Stanwell, accounting for 34.3% of households. Purpose-built flats account for 30.5% of accommodation, exceeding both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.%) and Spelthorne (22.8%).

12.2.4 Detached properties account for 10.0% of accommodation, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%), Spelthorne (19.0%) and England (22.9%). Terraced properties account for 21.8% of accommodation and are broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Overall, accommodation within Stanwell is characterised by a relatively high proportion of flats and a lower proportion of detached housing.

Accommodation Tenure

12.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Stanwell, accounting for 54.0% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), the regional health study area (45.2%) and England (61.3%), although remaining below Spelthorne (68.1%).

12.2.6 Social rented accommodation accounts for 22.9% of households, exceeding both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.4%) and Spelthorne (12.7%), whilst aligning closely with the regional health study area (23.1%). In contrast, private renting accounts for 20.6% of households, substantially below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%) and the regional health study area (30.0%). Overall, accommodation tenure within Stanwell is characterised by relatively high levels of owner occupation and social rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

12.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (86.0%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%), and is broadly aligned with Spelthorne (87.8%).

12.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 14.0% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%), although slightly higher than Spelthorne (12.2%). Overall, occupancy patterns suggest comparatively lower levels of overcrowding than those observed across the wider comparator areas.

12.2.9 For further information see Table 13.2 below.

Table 13.2: Stanwell Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	6,382	80,047	41,790	7,230,536	23,434,230

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	26.9%	24.6%	27.9%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	27.1%	25.4%	31.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.8%	18.5%	17.9%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.2%	17.0%	15.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	6.3%	7.9%	4.7%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	2.2%	3.6%	1.3%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	0.8%	1.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.6%	1.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	10.0%	12.7%	19.0%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	34.3%	34.0%	34.2%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	21.8%	21.3%	19.7%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	30.5%	27.0%	22.8%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.4%	2.9%	1.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.4%	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.5%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.1%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	54.0%	48.5%	68.1%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	22.9%	15.4%	12.7%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	20.6%	34.6%	17.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	2.4%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	86.0%	78.0%	87.8%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	14.0%	22.0%	12.2%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	26.9%	24.5%	27.9%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	62.4%	59.7%	64.9%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	10.8%	15.7%	7.2%	9.7%	6.9%

12.3 Stanwell Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

12.3.1 Stanwell contains 11,002 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (61.9%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Spelthorne (60.7%), the regional health study area (58.5%) and England (55.7%).

12.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (4.2%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), although higher than Spelthorne (3.2%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, levels of economic activity within Stanwell are relatively high compared with the wider comparator areas.

Qualifications

12.3.3 The qualification profile of Stanwell is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas, although residents with no formal qualifications account for a relatively large proportion of the population (20.8%), exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Spelthorne (16.8%), the regional health study area (15.8%) and England (18.1%).

12.3.4 Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 30.6% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Spelthorne (33.6%) and the regional health study area (41.3%), although broadly aligned with England (33.9%). Overall, the qualification profile suggests lower levels of higher educational attainment than observed across the wider comparator areas.

Occupation

12.3.5 Professional occupations represent the largest occupational group within Stanwell, accounting for 15.7% of occupations. This is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%), although lower than Spelthorne (19.5%), the regional health study area (23.5%) and England (20.3%).

12.3.6 Associate professional and technical occupations (12.6%), elementary occupations (12.6%), administrative and secretarial occupations (11.0%), and caring, leisure and other service occupations (10.3%) also account for notable proportions of employment. Compared with the wider comparator areas, Stanwell has relatively higher proportions of residents employed in caring, leisure and other service occupations and process, plant and machine operative roles. Overall, the occupational profile reflects a mix of professional, administrative and service-based occupations.

Car or Van Availability

12.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 43.7% of households, which is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Spelthorne (42.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

12.3.8 Households with two or more cars or vans account for 38.3% of households, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (35.7%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (35.2%). Conversely, households with no access to a car or van account for 18.0% of households, which is lower than all comparator areas. This suggests comparatively high levels of vehicle ownership within the community area.

Industry

12.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Stanwell are transport and storage (17.2%), wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (14.4%), and human health and social work activities (13.6%).

12.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than Spelthorne (11.9%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), indicating the importance of transport-related employment within the local economy. Employment in human health and social work activities (13.6%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) and Spelthorne (10.6%), and is broadly aligned with the regional health study area (13.4%). Employment in wholesale and retail trade (14.4%) is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport, retail and health-related sectors within Stanwell.

12.3.11 For further information please see Table 13.3 below.

Table 13.3: Stanwell Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	11,002	160,219	64,773	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	61.9%	60.3%	60.7%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.2%	4.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	20.8%	20.1%	16.8%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.3%	11.5%	11.1%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	13.9%	12.1%	14.4%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	5.1%	4.5%	5.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	13.6%	13.3%	15.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	30.6%	33.9%	33.6%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	3.8%	4.7%	3.0%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	10.2%	11.2%	14.5%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	15.7%	14.8%	19.5%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	12.6%	11.5%	15.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	11.0%	10.4%	11.7%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	10.2%	9.2%	9.8%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	10.3%	8.4%	8.6%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	7.8%	8.6%	6.6%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	9.6%	9.8%	6.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	12.6%	16.1%	8.0%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Car or Van in Household	43.7%	42.5%	42.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	28.2%	25.3%	31.2%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	10.1%	10.4%	12.0%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	18.0%	21.8%	14.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	17.2%	15.7%	11.9%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	14.4%	14.5%	13.0%	13.1%	15.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	13.6%	10.1%	10.6%	13.4%	14.6%

13 Stanwell Moor

13.1 Stanwell Moor Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

13.1.1 Stanwell Moor had a population of 1,534 residents in mid-2024 and is one of the smaller community areas within the study area. The community area has a population density of 349 residents per km², which is substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Spelthorne (2,013 residents per km²) and the regional health study area (3,041 residents per km²).

13.1.2 Since 2011, the population has increased by 11% (+154 residents), aligning with growth recorded across the regional health study area (11%) and England (10%), although remaining below growth observed across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and Spelthorne (12%). This indicates a relatively modest level of population growth over recent years.

Age Profile

13.1.3 Stanwell Moor has an older age profile than the Site-Specific Health Study Area and the regional health study area. Residents aged 65 years and over account for 16.4% of the population, compared with 11.6% across the Site-Specific Health Study Area and 15.7% across the regional health study area.

13.1.4 The proportion of residents aged 16-64 (64.3%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) and the regional health study area (65.5%), whilst children aged 0-15 years account for 19.3% of the population, broadly aligning with Spelthorne (19.0%), the regional health study area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Overall, the age profile is characterised by a relatively larger older population than is observed across the wider study area.

Ethnicity and Religion

13.1.5 The leading ethnicity within Stanwell Moor is White, accounting for 65.4% of the population. Whilst this proportion is lower than Spelthorne (78.7%) and England (81.0%), it exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%) and the regional health study area (70.1%).

13.1.6 The next most represented ethnic group is Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 22.6% of the population. This proportion exceeds Spelthorne (12.8%), the regional health study area (13.9%) and England (9.6%), although remains below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%). Other Ethnic Groups account for 6.9% of the population, which exceeds both Spelthorne (2.4%) and the regional health study area (3.9%). People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African account for 1.5% of the population, which is lower than the comparator areas.

13.1.7 Christianity is the most commonly reported religion within Stanwell Moor (42.5%), followed by No Religion (25.3%), Sikhism (13.4%) and Islam (7.1%). The proportion of residents identifying as Sikh is substantially higher than Spelthorne (2.5%), the regional health study area (1.2%) and England (0.9%). The proportion of residents reporting No Religion (25.3%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%), although remains below the regional health study area (33.7%) and England (36.7%).

Health Characteristics

13.1.8 Health indicators suggest that the population is generally healthy. The majority of residents (85.8%) report their health as very good or good, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Spelthorne (84.8%), the regional health study area (84.7%) and England (82.2%).

13.1.9 The proportion of residents reporting bad or very bad health (3.0%) is lower than all comparator areas, including the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Spelthorne (3.9%), the regional health study area (4.2%) and England (5.2%).

13.1.10 The proportion of residents whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot (4.4%) is slightly lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Spelthorne (4.9%), the regional health study area (5.3%) and England (6.2%). Similarly, the proportion of residents whose activities are limited a little (5.8%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%),

Spelthorne (7.5%), the regional health study area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, the health indicators suggest comparatively favourable health outcomes within the community area.

13.1.11 For further information see Table 14.1 below.

Table 14.1: Stanwell Moor Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	1,534	256,775	107,074	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	349	2,710	2,013	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+154 (11%)	+47,086 (25%)	+11,222 (12%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	19.3%	20.5%	19.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	64.3%	67.9%	62.9%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	16.4%	11.6%	18.1%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Male	51.8%	50.7%	49.2%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	48.2%	49.3%	50.8%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	65.4%	45.6%	78.7%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	22.6%	38.0%	12.8%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	1.5%	5.7%	2.5%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	6.9%	6.0%	2.4%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	42.5%	41.1%	50.9%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	25.3%	17.0%	31.2%	33.7%	36.7%
Sikh	13.4%	12.4%	2.5%	1.2%	0.9%

Measure		Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Muslim		7.1%	14.1%	4.0%	9.2%	6.7%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		85.8%	85.1%	84.8%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.0%	3.8%	3.9%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.4%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.8%	6.0%	7.5%	7.6%	8.5%

13.2 Stanwell Moor Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

13.2.1 Stanwell Moor contains 567 households. The household size profile is broadly comparable with Spelthorne and the wider comparator areas. One-person households account for 26.1% of households, which is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.6%) and Spelthorne (27.9%), whilst remaining below the regional health study area (28.8%) and England (30.1%).

13.2.2 Two-person households account for 32.3% of households, making them the most common household size within the community area. Households comprising three or more people account for 45.1% of households, exceeding the regional health study area (39.3%) and England (36.9%). Household composition is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas, with single-family households accounting for 63.4% of households.

Accommodation Type

13.2.3 Semi-detached properties are the most common accommodation type within Stanwell Moor, accounting for 34.2% of households. Terraced properties account for 31.7% of accommodation, considerably exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.3%), Spelthorne (19.7%), the regional health study area (21.3%) and England (23.0%).

13.2.4 Detached properties account for 18.1% of accommodation, broadly aligning with Spelthorne (19.0%) and exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%). In contrast, purpose-built flats account for 10.6% of accommodation, substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (27.0%), Spelthorne (22.8%) and the regional health study area (28.6%). Overall, accommodation within Stanwell Moor is characterised by a predominance of houses rather than flats.

Accommodation Tenure

13.2.5 Owner occupation is the most common tenure type within Stanwell Moor, accounting for 69.7% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), the regional health study area (45.2%) and England (61.3%), and is broadly aligned with Spelthorne (68.1%).

13.2.6 Private renting accounts for 24.1% of households, exceeding Spelthorne (17.9%) and England (20.5%), although remaining below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%) and the regional health study area (30.0%). Social rented accommodation accounts for just 6.0% of households, substantially lower than all comparator areas. Overall, accommodation tenure within Stanwell Moor is characterised by high levels of owner occupation and relatively low levels of social rented housing.

Occupancy Rating

13.2.7 The proportion of households with an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1 (82.5%) is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%), the regional health study area (83.7%) and England (83.4%), although slightly lower than Spelthorne (87.8%).

13.2.8 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 17.5% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), the regional health study area (16.4%) and England (16.6%), although higher than Spelthorne (12.2%). Overall, occupancy patterns suggest comparatively lower levels of overcrowding than those observed across the wider comparator areas.

13.2.9 For further information see Table 14.2 below.

Table 14.2: Stanwell Moor Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	567	80,047	41,790	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	26.1%	24.6%	27.9%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	32.3%	25.4%	31.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.0%	18.5%	17.9%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	15.4%	17.0%	15.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	5.1%	7.9%	4.7%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	1.4%	3.6%	1.3%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.2%	1.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.4%	1.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	18.1%	12.7%	19.0%	17.0%	22.9%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Semi-detached	34.2%	34.0%	34.2%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	31.7%	21.3%	19.7%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	10.6%	27.0%	22.8%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.8%	2.9%	1.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.7%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	69.7%	48.5%	68.1%	45.2%	61.3%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Social Rented	6.0%	15.4%	12.7%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	24.1%	34.6%	17.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	82.5%	78.0%	87.8%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	17.5%	22.0%	12.2%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	26.5%	24.5%	27.9%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	63.4%	59.7%	64.9%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	10.1%	15.7%	7.2%	9.7%	6.9%

13.3 Stanwell Moor Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

13.3.1 Stanwell Moor contains 942 working-age residents aged 16-64. The proportion of economically active residents (63.7%) exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), Spelthorne (60.7%), the regional health study area (58.5%) and England (55.7%).

13.3.2 The proportion of unemployed residents (2.6%) is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), Spelthorne (3.2%), the regional health study area (3.3%) and England (2.9%). Overall, the data indicates relatively high levels of economic activity and comparatively low levels of unemployment within the community area.

Qualifications

13.3.3 The qualification profile of Stanwell Moor is broadly comparable with the wider comparator areas. Residents holding Level 4 qualifications or above account for 28.7% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Spelthorne (33.6%) and the regional health study area (41.3%), although broadly aligned with England (33.9%).

13.3.4 Residents with no formal qualifications account for 18.7% of the population, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%) but higher than Spelthorne (16.8%) and the regional health study area (15.8%). Levels of Level 2 qualifications (14.4%), Level 3 qualifications (15.8%) and apprenticeships (5.4%) are broadly aligned with or exceed comparator averages, indicating a varied qualification profile.

Occupation

13.3.5 Managers, directors and senior officials represent the largest occupational group within Stanwell Moor, accounting for 16.4% of occupations. This proportion exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.2%), Spelthorne (14.5%), the regional health study area (14.8%) and England (12.9%).

13.3.6 Administrative and secretarial occupations (13.6%), associate professional and technical occupations (13.5%) and professional occupations (13.2%) also account for notable proportions of employment. Elementary occupations account for 8.4% of occupations, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), the regional health study area (9.0%) and England (10.5%). Overall, the occupational profile suggests a relatively strong representation of managerial, professional and administrative occupations.

Car or Van Availability

13.3.7 The most common level of car or van availability is one vehicle per household, accounting for 40.1% of households, broadly aligning with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (42.5%), Spelthorne (42.0%), the regional health study area (40.6%) and England (41.3%).

13.3.8 Households with two or more cars or vans account for 51.6% of households, substantially exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (35.7%), Spelthorne (43.2%), the regional health study area (30.0%) and England (35.2%). Conversely, households with no access to a car or van account for just 8.3% of households, considerably lower than all comparator areas. This indicates comparatively high levels of vehicle ownership within the community area.

Industry

13.3.9 The largest industries of employment within Stanwell Moor are transport and storage (21.4%), wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles (12.7%), and construction (8.8%).

13.3.10 Employment in transport and storage accounts for a substantially higher proportion of employment than Spelthorne (11.9%), the regional health study area (4.8%) and England (5.0%), indicating that transport-related activities form an important component of the local economy. Employment in wholesale and retail trade (12.7%) is broadly aligned with the comparator areas, whilst employment in construction (8.8%) closely aligns with Spelthorne (8.9%) and England (8.7%). Overall, the employment profile reflects the importance of transport-related sectors within the community area.

13.3.11 For further information see Table 14.3 below.

Table 14.3: Stanwell Moor Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	942	160,219	64,773	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	63.7%	60.3%	60.7%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	2.6%	4.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	18.7%	20.1%	16.8%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	13.5%	11.5%	11.1%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	14.4%	12.1%	14.4%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	5.4%	4.5%	5.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	15.8%	13.3%	15.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	28.7%	33.9%	33.6%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	3.5%	4.7%	3.0%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	16.4%	11.2%	14.5%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	13.2%	14.8%	19.5%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	13.5%	11.5%	15.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	13.6%	10.4%	11.7%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.8%	9.2%	9.8%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	7.5%	8.4%	8.6%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	7.4%	8.6%	6.6%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	10.1%	9.8%	6.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	8.4%	16.1%	8.0%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					

Measure	Community Area: Stanwell Moor	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Car or Van in Household	40.1%	42.5%	42.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	37.9%	25.3%	31.2%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	13.7%	10.4%	12.0%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	8.3%	21.8%	14.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	21.4%	15.7%	11.9%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	12.7%	14.5%	13.0%	13.1%	15.0%
Construction	8.8%	8.7%	8.9%	8.4%	8.7%

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 14.2: Health Baseline (Part 2)

Contents

15	**Poyle**	**1**
	15.1 Poyle Demographic Baseline Data	1
	15.2 Poyle Housing Baseline Data	6
	15.3 Poyle Economic Baseline Data	11
16	**Colnbrook**	**16**
	16.1 Colnbrook Demographic Baseline Data	16
	16.2 Colnbrook Housing Baseline Data	21
	16.3 Colnbrook Economic Baseline Data	26
17	**Brands Hill**	**31**
	17.1 Brands Hill Demographic Baseline Data	31
	17.2 Brands Hill Housing Baseline Data	36
	17.3 Brands Hill Economic Baseline Data	41
18	**Hounslow (West and Heath)**	**46**
	18.1 Hounslow (West and Heath) Demographic Baseline Data	46
	18.2 Hounslow (West and Heath) Housing Baseline Data	51
	18.3 Hounslow (West and Heath) Economic Baseline Data	56
19	**Iver and Richings Park**	**61**
	19.1 Iver and Richings Park Demographic Baseline Data	61
	19.2 Iver and Richings Park Housing Baseline Data	66
	19.3 Iver and Richings Park Economic Baseline Data	71
20	**Harlington**	**76**
	20.1 Harlington Demographic Baseline Data	76
	20.2 Harlington Housing Baseline Data	81
	20.3 Harlington Economic Baseline Data	86
21	**North Staines**	**91**
	21.1 North Staines Demographic Baseline Data	91
	21.2 North Staines Housing Baseline Data	96
	21.3 North Staines Economic Baseline Data	101
22	**Horton and Wraysbury**	**106**
	22.1 Horton and Wraysbury Demographic Baseline Data	106
	22.2 Horton and Wraysbury Housing Baseline Data	111
	22.3 Horton and Wraysbury Economic Baseline Data	116
23	**Langley**	**121**

23.1 Langley Demographic Baseline Data 121
23.2 Langley Housing Baseline Data 126
23.3 Langley Economic Baseline Data 131
24 Local Health Study Area 136
24.1 Health and Wellbeing Baseline Data 136
24.2 Demographic and Economic Baseline Data 147
24.3 Crime Baseline Data 151

Tables

Table 15.1: Poyle Demographic Baseline Data 3
Table 15.2: Poyle Housing Baseline Data 7
Table 15.3: Poyle Economic Baseline Data 12
Table 16.1: Colnbrook Demographic Baseline Data 18
Table 16.2: Colnbrook Housing Baseline Data 22
Table 16.3: Colnbrook Economic Baseline Data 27
Table 17.1: Brands Hill Demographic Baseline Data 33
Table 17.2: Brands Hill Housing Baseline Data 37
Table 17.3: Brands Hill Economic Baseline Data 42
Table 18.1: Hounslow (West and Heath) Demographic Baseline Data 48
Table 18.2: Hounslow (West and Heath) Housing Baseline Data 52
Table 18.3: Hounslow (West and Heath) Economic Baseline Data 57
Table 19.1: Iver and Richings Park Demographic Baseline Data 63
Table 19.2: Iver and Richings Park Housing Baseline Data 67
Table 19.3: Iver and Richings Park Economic Baseline Data 72
Table 20.1: Harlington Demographic Baseline Data 78
Table 20.2: Harlington Housing Baseline Data 82
Table 20.3: Harlington Economic Baseline Data 87
Table 21.1: North Staines Demographic Baseline Data 93
Table 21.2: North Staines Housing Baseline Data 97
Table 21.3: North Staines Economic Baseline Data 102
Table 22.1: Horton and Wraysbury Demographic Baseline Data 108
Table 22.2: Horton and Wraysbury Housing Baseline Data 112
Table 22.3: Horton and Wraysbury Economic Baseline Data 117
Table 24.1: Langley Demographic Baseline Data 123
Table 24.2: Langley Housing Baseline Data 127
Table 24.3: Langley Economic Baseline Data 132
Table 25.1: Health and Wellbeing Baseline Data 138
Table 25.2: Demographic and Economic Baseline Data 148
Table 25.3: Crime Baseline Data 152

15 Poyle

15.1 Poyle Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

15.1.1 The Poyle Community Area had a resident population of 2,134 people in mid-2024. Population density was 563 residents per km², substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Slough Borough Council area (4,873 residents per km²) and the Regional Health Study Area (3,041 residents per km²), indicating a comparatively less densely populated community.

15.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 392 residents, representing growth of 23%. This rate of growth was broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and exceeded growth recorded across Slough Borough Council (19%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Poyle has experienced sustained population growth over the period.

Age Profile

15.1.3 The age profile of Poyle is characterised by a relatively large working-age population. Residents aged 16-64 years accounted for 69.7% of the population, higher than all comparator areas, while those aged 65 years and over represented 10.9% of residents, lower than the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%).

15.1.4 Children and young people aged 0-15 years comprised 19.4% of the population, broadly comparable with the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%) and slightly above the national average (18.6%). Overall, the age structure indicates a younger population profile than that observed regionally and nationally, with a greater proportion of working-age residents and a smaller proportion of older people.

15.1.5 The gender profile was balanced, with males accounting for 50.5% of the population and females 49.5%, closely aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area.

Ethnicity and Religion

15.1.6 The largest ethnic group in Poyle was people identifying as White (51.2%). This proportion was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%) and Slough Borough Council (36.1%), although lower than the Regional Health Study Area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). The second largest ethnic group was people identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, representing 36.6% of residents, broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) but lower than across Slough Borough Council (46.7%). Other ethnic groups each accounted for less than 5% of the population.

15.1.7 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion in Poyle, with 41.9% of residents identifying as Christian, broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (41.1%). Sikhism was the second most common religion, accounting for 17.0% of residents, higher than the Regional Health Study Area (1.2%) and England (0.9%). Residents reporting no religion accounted for 16.3% of the population, notably lower than the Regional Health Study Area (33.7%) and England (36.7%). People identifying as Muslim represented 10.9% of residents, lower than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.1%) and Slough Borough Council (29.4%).

Health Characteristics

15.1.8 General health outcomes in Poyle were positive overall. The majority of residents (86.3%) reported their health as very good or good, slightly exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Slough Borough Council (85.7%), the Regional Health Study Area (84.7%) and England (82.2%). Conversely, only 3.4% of residents reported bad or very bad health, lower than all comparator areas.

15.1.9 Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also comparatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 4.3% of the population, while 5.1% reported that their activities were limited a little. Both measures were below regional and national averages, indicating relatively lower levels of activity limitation and disability within the community area. Overall, the available data suggests that health outcomes in Poyle are broadly favourable when compared with wider regional and national populations.

15.1.10 For further information see Table 15.1 below.

Table 15.1: Poyle Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	2,134	256,775	167,359	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	563	2,710	4,873	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+392 (23%)	+47,086 (25%)	+26,646 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	19.4%	20.5%	25.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	69.7%	67.9%	65.4%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	10.9%	11.6%	9.7%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.5%	50.7%	49.5%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.5%	49.3%	50.5%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
White	51.2%	45.6%	36.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.7%	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	36.6%	38.0%	46.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	3.3%	5.7%	7.6%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	4.3%	6.0%	5.7%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	41.9%	41.1%	32.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Sikh	17.0%	12.4%	11.4%	1.2%	0.9%
No Religion	16.3%	17.0%	13.1%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	10.9%	14.1%	29.4%	9.2%	6.7%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	86.3%	85.1%	85.7%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health	3.4%	3.8%	3.7%	4.2%	5.2%

Measure		Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.3%	4.5%	4.5%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.1%	6.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.5%

15.2 Poyle Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

15.2.1 Poyle contains 670 households and is characterised by a relatively mixed household profile. One-person households account for 28.0% of households, which is broadly comparable with the regional (28.8%) and national (30.1%) proportions. Household sizes of three people (22.3%) are more prevalent than across the wider region (16.7%) and England (16.0%), indicating a greater proportion of medium-sized households. Larger households containing five or more people represent 9.5% of households, lower than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.5%) and Slough Borough Council (17.3%).

15.2.2 In terms of household composition, single family households are the dominant household type (59.8%), broadly aligned with comparator areas. Other household types account for 12.1% of households, which is higher than the regional (9.7%) and national (6.9%) averages, suggesting a slightly more varied household structure within the community area.

Accommodation Type

15.2.3 The housing stock in Poyle is predominantly composed of semi-detached properties, which account for 44.9% of dwellings. This is notably higher than the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.0%), Slough Borough Council (29.6%), the wider region (23.5%) and England (31.5%). Detached properties represent a relatively small proportion of housing stock (7.2%), considerably lower than the regional (17.0%) and national (22.9%) averages.

15.2.4 Flats within purpose-built blocks account for 25.1% of dwellings, broadly aligned with comparator areas, while terraced properties comprise 17.3% of the housing stock, lower than both Slough Borough Council (26.3%) and England (23.0%). A small proportion of households occupy caravans or other mobile or temporary structures (1.0%), which is above comparator averages but remains a minor component of the local housing stock.

Accommodation Tenure

15.2.5 Owner-occupation is the most common tenure in Poyle, accounting for 54.0% of households. This is higher than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Slough Borough Council (48.4%) and the wider region (45.2%), although lower

than the national average (61.3%). Private renting is also a significant tenure type, representing 41.4% of households, which is notably higher than regional (30.0%) and national (20.5%) levels. In contrast, social rented accommodation accounts for only 4.1% of households, substantially lower than all comparator areas. This indicates a housing market characterised by a combination of owner occupation and a relatively large private rented sector.

Occupancy Rating

15.2.6 Occupancy ratings indicate that the majority of households in Poyle have one spare bedroom, with 86.5% of households recorded as having an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1. This is higher than across comparator areas and suggests that households generally have some additional bedroom capacity. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 13.5%, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), Slough Borough Council (20.8%), the wider region (16.4%) and England (16.6%).

15.2.7 For further information see Table 15.2 below.

Table 15.2: Poyle Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	670	80,047	52,421	7,230,563	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	28.0%	24.6%	22.8%	28.8%	30.1%

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 People in Household	25.4%	25.4%	22.8%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	22.3%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	14.7%	17.0%	18.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	6.3%	7.9%	8.9%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	2.2%	3.6%	4..5%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	0.3%	1.5%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.7%	1.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	7.2%	12.7%	10.4%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	44.9%	34.0%	29.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	17.3%	21.3%	26.3%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	25.1%	27.0%	29.6%	28.6%	17.1%

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.1%	2.9%	2.7%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	1.5%	0.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.9%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	54.0%	48.5%	48.4%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	4.1%	15.4%	19.6%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	41.4%	34.6%	30.7%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.6%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	86.5%	78.0%	79.2%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	13.5%	22.0%	20.8%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	28.0%	24.5%	22.8%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	59.8%	59.7%	63.6%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	12.1%	15.7%	13.7%	9.7%	6.9%

15.3 Poyle Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

15.3.1 Poyle has 1,208 working-age residents and displays comparatively high levels of economic participation. Around 68.0% of working-age residents are economically active, which exceeds the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 3.9%, remaining below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Slough Borough Council (4.4%), although slightly above regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) levels.

Qualifications

15.3.2 Qualification levels in Poyle are mixed. Nearly one-third of residents (30.7%) hold Level 4 qualifications or above, although this is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Slough Borough Council (34.8%) and the wider region (41.3%). The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications is 17.7%, broadly aligned with England (18.1%) and slightly lower than local comparator areas. Apprenticeships are relatively common, accounting for 6.5% of residents, compared with between 4.2% and 5.3% across comparator areas. Residents holding Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications are generally comparable with wider benchmarks.

Occupation

15.3.3 The occupational profile indicates a relatively strong representation of lower and middle-skilled occupations. Elementary occupations account for 16.5% of employment and process, plant and machine operative roles account for 12.6%, both of which exceed regional and national averages. Administrative and secretarial occupations also represent a relatively large proportion of employment (12.9%). Conversely, professional occupations account for 12.5% of employment, notably lower than the regional average of 23.5% and national average of 20.3%. Managers, directors and senior officials comprise 10.0% of employment, broadly aligned with local comparator areas.

Car or Van Availability

15.3.4 Levels of car and van availability are relatively high within Poyle. Only 14.5% of households have no access to a car or van, substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), the wider region (29.5%) and England (23.5%). Households with one vehicle represent 45.0% of all households, while 40.5% have access to two or more vehicles. Overall, the data suggests a comparatively high level of private vehicle access within the community area.

Industry

15.3.5 Employment in Poyle is strongly associated with the transport and storage sector, which accounts for 20.2% of employment. This is considerably higher than across all comparator areas and reflects the sector's importance to the local economy.

15.3.6 Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, represents the second largest employment sector at 12.9%, broadly aligned with comparator areas. Construction accounts for 8.2% of employment and is also comparable with wider benchmarks. In contrast, human health and social work activities account for 8.2% of employment, notably lower than regional (13.4%) and national (14.6%) levels.

15.3.7 For further information see Table 15.3 below.

Table 15.3: Poyle Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	1,208	160,219	103,613	11,811,043	36,605,551

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	68.0%	60.3%	60.1%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	3.9%	4.8%	4.4%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	17.7%	20.1%	20.1%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	12.2%	11.5%	10.7%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.7%	12.1%	12.1%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	6.5%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	14.9%	13.3%	13.6%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	30.7%	33.9%	34.8%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	5.4%	4.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	10.0%	11.2%	9.9%	14.8%	12.9%

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Professional Occupations	12.5%	14.8%	18.9%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	11.6%	11.5%	11.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	12.9%	10.4%	9.2%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.7%	9.2%	8.5%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	8.8%	8.4%	9.3%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	6.5%	8.6%	8.3%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	12.6%	9.8%	10.4%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	16.5%	16.1%	14.6%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	45.0%	42.5%	42.6%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	28.3%	25.3%	27.0%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	12.2%	10.4%	10.1%	7.9%	9.1%

Measure	Community Area: Poyle	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
No Cars or Vans in Household	14.5%	21.8%	20.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	20.2%	15.7%	12.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	12.9%	14.5%	14.4%	13.1%	15.0%
Construction	8.2%	8.8%	7.5%	8.4%	8.7%
Human health and social work activities	8.2%	10.1%	13.3%	13.4%	14.6%

16 Colnbrook

16.1 Colnbrook Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

16.1.1 The Colnbrook Community Area had a resident population of 1,951 people in mid-2024. Population density was 1,001 residents per km², higher than Poyle but substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Slough Borough Council (4,873 residents per km²) and the Regional Health Study Area (3,041 residents per km²), indicating a relatively less densely populated community.

16.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 106 residents, representing growth of 6%. This was considerably lower than population growth across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Slough Borough Council (19%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%), indicating that Colnbrook has experienced comparatively limited population growth over the period.

Age Profile

16.1.3 Colnbrook has a relatively young age profile. Children and young people aged 0-15 years accounted for 22.7% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). Residents aged 16-64 years comprised 69.5% of the population, higher than all comparator areas, while those aged 65 years and over accounted for only 7.8% of residents, lower than both Slough Borough Council (9.7%), the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the community is characterised by a relatively large proportion of children and working-age residents and a comparatively small older population.

Ethnicity and Religion

16.1.4 The largest ethnic group in Colnbrook was people identifying as White, accounting for 66.8% of residents. This proportion was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%) and Slough Borough Council (36.1%), although lower than the national average (81.0%). People identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh represented 18.9% of the population, forming the second largest ethnic group. This was lower than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) and Slough Borough Council (46.7%). All other ethnic groups each accounted for less than 6% of residents.

16.1.5 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion in Colnbrook, with 50.0% of residents identifying as Christian, higher than all comparator areas. Residents reporting no religion accounted for 23.8% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%) and Slough Borough Council (13.1%), although remaining below regional and national averages. People identifying as Muslim represented 9.7% of residents, broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (9.2%), while 7.3% of residents identified as Sikh, higher than regional and national averages but lower than the proportion recorded across Slough Borough Council (29.4%).

Health Characteristics

16.1.6 General health outcomes in Colnbrook were broadly positive and aligned with comparator areas. The majority of residents (85.4%) reported their health as very good or good, consistent with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%) and Slough Borough Council (85.7%), and slightly above regional and national averages. Conversely, 3.9% of residents reported bad or very bad health, comparable with wider areas and lower than the national average (5.2%).

16.1.7 Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also relatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 5.1% of the population, broadly aligned with regional levels and below the national average. A further 5.6% reported that their activities were limited a little, lower than the Regional Health Study Area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, the available data indicates generally favourable health characteristics, with levels of activity limitation and poor health remaining below regional and national averages.

16.1.8 For further information see Table 16.1 below.

Table 16.1: Colnbrook Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	1,951	256,775	167,359	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	1,001	2,710	4,873	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+106 (6%)	+47,086 (25%)	+26,646 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	22.7%	20.5%	25.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	69.5%	67.9%	65.4%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	7.8%	11.6%	9.7%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.8%	50.7%	49.5%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	49.2%	49.3%	50.5%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
White	66.8%	45.6%	36.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.4%	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	18.9%	38.0%	46.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	5.5%	5.7%	7.6%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	4.3%	6.0%	5.7%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	50.0%	41.1%	32.0%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	23.8%	17.0%	13.1%	33.7%	36.7%
Muslim	9.7%	14.1%	29.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Sikh	7.3%	12.4%	11.4%	1.2%	0.9%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	85.4%	85.1%	85.7%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health	3.9%	3.8%	3.7%	4.2%	5.2%

Measure		Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.1%	4.5%	4.5%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.6%	6.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.5%

16.2 Colnbrook Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

16.2.1 Colnbrook contains 792 households and is characterised by relatively small household sizes. Two-person households are the most common household type, accounting for 35.5% of households, which is notably higher than across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25.4%), Slough Borough Council (22.8%) and the wider region (32.1%). One-person households represent 28.5% of households, broadly aligned with regional (28.8%) and national (30.1%) levels.

16.2.2 Larger households are comparatively less common, with households containing five or more people accounting for just 3.9% of households, substantially lower than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.5%) and Slough Borough Council (17.3%). Household composition is dominated by single family households (58.9%), which is broadly comparable with wider areas. Other household types account for 7.5% of households, lower than local comparator areas and broadly aligned with the regional average.

Accommodation Type

16.2.3 The housing stock in Colnbrook is characterised by a relatively high proportion of flats. Purpose-built flats or tenements account for 39.5% of dwellings, considerably higher than across comparator areas and more than double the national average (17.1%). Semi-detached properties comprise 26.2% of the housing stock and terraced properties account for 24.8%, together representing around half of all dwellings. Detached properties are relatively uncommon, accounting for only 5.2% of dwellings, substantially lower than both the regional (17.0%) and national (22.9%) averages. Other accommodation types, including converted buildings and commercial premises, represent only a small proportion of the housing stock.

Accommodation Tenure

16.2.4 The tenure profile in Colnbrook differs notably from wider comparator areas. Owner-occupation accounts for 31.4% of households, substantially lower than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Slough Borough Council (48.4%) and England (61.3%). Private renting is the largest tenure category, representing 37.7% of households, while social rented

accommodation accounts for a further 27.4%. Both tenure types are higher than comparator areas, indicating a greater reliance on rented accommodation. Shared ownership represents 3.6% of households, more than double the proportion observed across comparator areas, although it remains a relatively small component of the overall housing market.

Occupancy Rating

16.2.5 Occupancy ratings indicate that most households in Colnbrook have one spare bedroom, with 87.0% of households recorded as having an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1. This is higher than across all comparator areas.

16.2.6 Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 13.0%, considerably lower than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) and Slough Borough Council (20.8%). Overall, the data suggests comparatively lower levels of under-occupancy within the community area.

16.2.7 For further information see Table 16.2 below.

Table 16.2: Colnbrook Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	792	80,047	52,421	7,230,563	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	28.5%	24.6%	22.8%	28.8%	30.1%

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 People in Household	35.5%	25.4%	22.8%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	19.1%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	12.6%	17.0%	18.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	2.7%	7.9%	8.9%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	1.2%	3.6%	4..5%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	0.0%	1.5%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.0%	1.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	5.2%	12.7%	10.4%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	26.2%	34.0%	29.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	24.8%	21.3%	26.3%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	39.5%	27.0%	29.6%	28.6%	17.1%

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.9%	2.9%	2.7%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.3%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	31.4%	48.5%	48.4%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	27.4%	15.4%	19.6%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	37.7%	34.6%	30.7%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	3.6%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	87.0%	78.0%	79.2%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	13.0%	22.0%	20.8%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	33.6%	24.5%	22.8%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	58.9%	59.7%	63.6%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	7.5%	15.7%	13.7%	9.7%	6.9%

16.3 Colnbrook Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

16.3.1 Colnbrook has 1,286 working-age residents and demonstrates relatively strong economic participation. Around 65.9% of working-age residents are economically active, exceeding the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 5.3%, which is higher than comparator areas, indicating that while participation in the labour market is relatively high, a greater proportion of economically active residents are seeking work.

Qualifications

16.3.2 Qualification attainment in Colnbrook is mixed. Around 30.8% of residents hold Level 4 qualifications or above, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Slough Borough Council (34.8%), the wider region (41.3%), and England (33.9%). The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications (20.1%) is broadly comparable with Slough Borough Council (20.1%) and slightly above the national average (18.1%). Level 2 qualifications are relatively common at 14.6%, compared with 12.0% nationally, while apprenticeship attainment is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Overall, the qualification profile suggests a balance of higher-level and vocational qualifications, alongside a relatively notable proportion of residents with no formal qualifications.

Occupation

16.3.3 The occupational profile indicates a relatively strong representation of operational and service-based occupations. Elementary occupations account for 15.7% of employment and process, plant and machine operative roles account for 12.1%, both notably higher than regional and national averages. Caring, leisure and other service occupations (10.1%) are also slightly more prevalent than in comparator areas. Professional occupations account for 11.1% of employment, substantially lower than the regional (23.5%) and national (20.3%) averages. Managers, directors and senior officials represent 11.3% of employment, broadly aligned with local comparator areas. Overall, the occupational structure reflects a greater concentration of operational occupations relative to professional roles.

Car or Van Availability

16.3.4 Car and van ownership is relatively common in Colnbrook. Over half of households (51.2%) have access to one car or van, while a further 30.1% have access to two or more vehicles. Consequently, only 18.7% of households have no access to a car or van, below the levels recorded across all comparator areas. The data indicates generally high levels of vehicle availability within the community area.

Industry

16.3.5 The local economy is strongly influenced by the transport and storage sector, which accounts for 21.2% of employment. This is considerably higher than all comparator areas and highlights the sector's importance to the workforce. Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, represents the second largest employment sector at 13.2%, broadly aligned with comparator areas. Human health and social work activities account for 10.4% of employment, comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) but lower than the regional (13.4%) and national (14.6%) averages. Overall, the employment profile reflects a concentration in transport-related activities, supported by a diverse range of service-sector employment.

16.3.6 For further information see Table 16.3 below.

Table 16.3: Colnbrook Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	1,286	160,219	103,613	11,811,043	36,605,551

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	65.9%	60.3%	60.1%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	5.3%	4.8%	4.4%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	20.1%	20.1%	20.1%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	10.5%	11.5%	10.7%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	14.6%	12.1%	12.1%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.6%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	15.1%	13.3%	13.6%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	30.8%	33.9%	34.8%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	5.3%	4.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	11.3%	11.2%	9.9%	14.8%	12.9%

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Professional Occupations	11.1%	14.8%	18.9%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	12.9%	11.5%	11.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	11.3%	10.4%	9.2%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.4%	9.2%	8.5%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	10.1%	8.4%	9.3%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	6.0%	8.6%	8.3%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	12.1%	9.8%	10.4%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	15.7%	16.1%	14.6%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	51.2%	42.5%	42.6%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	23.5%	25.3%	27.0%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	6.6%	10.4%	10.1%	7.9%	9.1%

Measure	Community Area: Colnbrook	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
No Cars or Vans in Household	18.7%	21.8%	20.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	21.2%	15.7%	12.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	13.2%	14.5%	14.4%	13.1%	15.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	10.4%	10.1%	13.3%	13.4%	14.6%

17 Brands Hill

17.1 Brands Hill Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

17.1.1 The Brands Hill Community Area had a resident population of 2,900 people in mid-2024. Population density was 4,673 residents per km², substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and comparable with Slough Borough Council (4,873 residents per km²). This indicates a relatively densely populated urban community.

17.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 296 residents, representing growth of 11%. This was lower than growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and Slough Borough Council (19%), but aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and marginally higher than England (10%). Overall, Brands Hill has experienced moderate population growth over the period.

Age Profile

17.1.3 Brands Hill has a relatively young age profile. Children and young people aged 0-15 years accounted for 26.3% of the population, exceeding the proportion recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%) and England (18.6%). This was also slightly higher than the proportion recorded across Slough Borough Council (25.0%).

17.1.4 Residents aged 16-64 years represented 65.1% of the population, broadly aligned with comparator areas, while those aged 65 years and over accounted for 8.7% of residents, lower than the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the age structure is characterised by a relatively high proportion of children and young people and a comparatively small older population.

Ethnicity and Religion

17.1.5 The largest ethnic group in Brands Hill was people identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 44.8% of residents. This was higher than the proportion recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) and substantially higher than regional and national averages. People identifying as White represented 38.4% of the population and formed the second largest ethnic group, a proportion broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (36.1%) but notably lower than regional and national averages. People identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African accounted for 9.0% of residents, higher than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (5.7%) and England (4.2%).

17.1.6 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 39.0% of residents identifying as Christian. This was broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (41.1%) and the Regional Health Study Area (43.6%), although lower than the national average (46.3%). People identifying as Muslim represented 17.9% of residents, higher than in the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.1%) and markedly higher than regional and national averages. Sikhism was also well represented, with 15.7% of residents identifying as Sikh, exceeding proportions recorded across the Regional Health Study Area and England. Residents reporting no religion accounted for 11.2% of the population, lower than all comparator areas.

Health Characteristics

17.1.7 General health outcomes in Brands Hill were favourable. The majority of residents (86.7%) reported their health as very good or good, higher than all comparator areas, while only 2.7% reported bad or very bad health, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), Slough Borough Council (3.7%), the Regional Health Study Area (4.2%) and England (5.2%).

17.1.8 Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also comparatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 3.7% of the population, below all comparator areas. A further 5.4% reported that their activities were limited a little, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), the Regional Health Study Area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, the available data suggests that Brands Hill experiences relatively positive health outcomes, with lower levels of poor health and activity limitation than those observed across wider geographic areas.

17.1.9 For further information see Table 17.1 below.

Table 17.1: Brands Hill Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	2,900	256,775	167,359	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	4,673	2,710	4,873	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+296 (11%)	+47,086 (25%)	+26,646 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	26.3%	20.5%	25.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	65.1%	67.9%	65.4%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	8.7%	11.6%	9.7%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	48.4%	50.7%	49.5%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	51.6%	49.3%	50.5%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	38.4%	45.6%	36.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.2%	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	44.8%	38.0%	46.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	9.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	4.6%	6.0%	5.7%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	39.0%	41.1%	32.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	17.9%	14.1%	29.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Sikh	15.7%	12.4%	11.4%	1.2%	0.9%
No Religion	11.2%	17.0%	13.1%	33.7%	36.7%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	86.7%	85.1%	85.7%	84.7%	82.2%

Measure		Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Bad or Very Bad Health		2.7%	3.8%	3.7%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	3.7%	4.5%	4.5%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.4%	6.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.5%

17.2 Brands Hill Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

17.2.1 Brands Hill contains 934 households and is characterised by relatively large household sizes. Households containing three or more people account for 57.3% of all households, which is higher than across comparator areas. In particular, four-person households represent 21.7% of households, compared with 14.1% across the wider region and 12.9% nationally. Larger households of five or more people account for 14.4% of households, substantially exceeding both regional (8.5%) and national (7.3%) levels.

17.2.2 One-person households account for 20.9% of households, lower than across all comparator areas. Household composition is predominantly made up of single family households (64.4%), while other household types represent 14.8% of households, exceeding both regional (9.7%) and national (6.9%) averages. Overall, the data indicates a relatively family-oriented population with a notable proportion of larger households.

Accommodation Type

17.2.3 The housing stock in Brands Hill is dominated by terraced properties, which account for 38.3% of dwellings. This is considerably higher than across comparator areas and substantially above the national average of 23.0%. Purpose-built flats represent a further 28.4% of dwellings, broadly aligned with the wider region (28.6%) but notably higher than the national figure (17.1%). Semi-detached properties account for 21.7% of dwellings, lower than local and national comparator areas, while detached housing comprises only 9.5% of the housing stock. Other accommodation types make up a very small proportion of dwellings. Overall, the housing profile is characterised by a concentration of terraced housing and flats.

Accommodation Tenure

17.2.4 Owner-occupation is the most common tenure type in Brands Hill, accounting for 52.2% of households. This is slightly higher than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Slough Borough Council (48.4%) and the wider region (45.2%), although below the national average (61.3%). Private renting represents 33.1% of households, exceeding the

proportions recorded regionally and nationally, while social rented accommodation accounts for 13.8% of households, lower than comparator areas. The tenure profile therefore reflects a predominance of owner-occupation alongside a relatively sizeable private rented sector.

Occupancy Rating

17.2.5 The majority of households in Brands Hill have one spare bedroom, with 80.2% of households recorded as having an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1. This is broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%) and Slough Borough Council (79.2%), although slightly lower than regional and national levels. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 19.8%, which is higher than both the regional (16.4%) and national (16.6%) averages and broadly comparable with local comparator areas. This suggests slightly higher levels of under-occupancy than observed across the wider region and England.

17.2.6 For further information see Table 17.2 below.

Table 17.2: Brands Hill Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Slough	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	934	80,047	52,421	7,230,563	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	20.9%	24.6%	22.8%	28.8%	30.1%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Slough	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 People in Household	21.8%	25.4%	22.8%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	21.2%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	21.7%	17.0%	18.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	7.9%	7.9%	8.9%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	3.5%	3.6%	4..5%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.2%	1.5%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.8%	1.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	9.5%	12.7%	10.4%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	21.7%	34.0%	29.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	38.3%	21.3%	26.3%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	28.4%	27.0%	29.6%	28.6%	17.1%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Slough	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	1.7%	2.9%	2.7%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.3%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	52.2%	48.5%	48.4%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	13.8%	15.4%	19.6%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	33.1%	34.6%	30.7%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.7%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Slough	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	80.2%	78.0%	79.2%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	19.8%	22.0%	20.8%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	20.8%	24.5%	22.8%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	64.4%	59.7%	63.6%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	14.8%	15.7%	13.7%	9.7%	6.9%

17.3 Brands Hill Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

17.3.1 Brands Hill has 1,869 working-age residents and demonstrates relatively strong labour market participation. Approximately 64.4% of working-age residents are economically active, exceeding the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 4.8%, which is broadly aligned with local comparator areas but higher than regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) levels.

Qualifications

17.3.2 The qualifications profile is relatively balanced. Over one-third of residents (35.4%) hold Level 4 qualifications or above, exceeding local and national comparator areas, although remaining below the wider regional average of 41.3%. The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications (15.1%) is lower than both Slough Borough Council (20.1%) and England (18.1%), indicating comparatively favourable educational attainment. Residents with Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications account for 13.1%, slightly above comparator areas, while attainment at Levels 2 and 3 is broadly aligned with wider benchmarks.

Occupation

17.3.3 The occupational profile reflects a mix of professional, service and operational occupations. Professional occupations account for 13.8% of employment, representing the largest individual occupational group, although remaining below regional and national levels. Elementary occupations (15.8%) and process, plant and machine operative roles (11.7%) are more prevalent than across the wider region and England, indicating a relatively strong representation of operational occupations. Sales and customer service occupations account for 8.6% of employment, above the regional and national averages, while managers, directors and senior officials represent 10.1% of employment, broadly aligned with local comparator areas. Overall, the occupational profile is more weighted towards operational and service-sector roles than professional occupations.

Car or Van Availability

17.3.4 Vehicle availability is relatively high within Brands Hill. Only 12.9% of households have no access to a car or van, substantially lower than across all comparator areas. In contrast, 43.9% of households have access to one vehicle and a further 43.2% have access to two or more vehicles. The comparatively low proportion of households without access to a vehicle suggests that private transport forms an important part of local travel patterns.

Industry

17.3.5 The employment profile is characterised by a strong concentration in transport and storage, which accounts for 17.8% of employment. This is substantially higher than across comparator areas and highlights the importance of this sector to the local economy. Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, represents 14.8% of employment and is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Human health and social work activities account for 11.0% of employment, comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) but lower than regional and national averages. Overall, the data indicates a workforce with a notable dependence on transport-related employment, alongside significant employment in retail and service sectors.

17.3.6 For further information see Table 17.3 below.

Table 17.3: Brands Hill Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	1,869	160,219	103,613	11,811,043	36,605,551

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	64.4%	60.3%	60.1%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.8%	4.8%	4.4%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	15.1%	20.1%	20.1%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	13.1%	11.5%	10.7%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.6%	12.1%	12.1%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.1%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	15.1%	13.3%	13.6%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	35.4%	33.9%	34.8%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	4.7%	4.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	10.1%	11.2%	9.9%	14.8%	12.9%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Professional Occupations	13.8%	14.8%	18.9%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	11.1%	11.5%	11.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	10.0%	10.4%	9.2%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	9.8%	9.2%	8.5%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	9.1%	8.4%	9.3%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	8.6%	8.6%	8.3%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	11.7%	9.8%	10.4%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	15.8%	16.1%	14.6%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	43.9%	42.5%	42.6%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	29.1%	25.3%	27.0%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	14.1%	10.4%	10.1%	7.9%	9.1%

Measure	Community Area: Brands Hill	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
No Cars or Vans in Household	12..9%	21.8%	20.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	17.8%	15.7%	12.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	14.8%	14.5%	14.4%	13.1%	15.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	11.0%	10.1%	13.3%	13.4%	14.6%

18 Hounslow (West and Heath)

18.1 Hounslow (West and Heath) Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

18.1.1 The Hounslow West and Heath Community Area had a resident population of 41,398 people in mid-2024, making it one of the larger communities within the Site-Specific Health Study Area. Population density was 6,852 residents per km², considerably higher than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and the London Borough of Hounslow (5,150 residents per km²), indicating a densely populated urban area.

18.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 7,296 residents, representing growth of 21%. This was broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and higher than growth recorded across the London Borough of Hounslow (17%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates sustained population growth over the period.

Age Profile

18.1.3 The age profile of Hounslow West and Heath was broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and the London Borough of Hounslow. Children and young people aged 0-15 years accounted for 21.6% of the population, slightly higher than regional and national averages. Residents aged 16-64 years represented 67.8% of the population, closely aligned with comparator areas and above both the Regional Health Study Area (65.5%) and England (63.0%).

18.1.4 Residents aged 65 years and over accounted for 10.7% of the population, lower than the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the community area is characterised by a relatively large working-age population and a smaller proportion of older people compared with wider regional and national populations.

Ethnicity and Religion

18.1.5 The largest ethnic group in Hounslow West and Heath was people identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 57.1% of residents. This was substantially higher than the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%), the London Borough of Hounslow (36.7%), the Regional Health Study Area (13.9%) and England (9.6%). People identifying as White represented 25.4% of the population, considerably lower than all comparator areas. Residents identifying with Other Ethnic Groups accounted for 7.3% of the population, while people identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African represented 6.8%.

18.1.6 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 37.0% of residents identifying as Christian, broadly aligned with the London Borough of Hounslow (38.3%). People identifying as Muslim accounted for 21.6% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Hinduism was also well represented, with 14.2% of residents identifying as Hindu, while 10.9% identified as Sikh. Both proportions were notably higher than regional and national averages. Together, these data indicate a population with substantial representation of several faith groups.

Health Characteristics

18.1.7 General health outcomes in Hounslow West and Heath were broadly comparable with those observed across the wider study area and local authority. The majority of residents (84.8%) reported their health as very good or good, closely aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), the London Borough of Hounslow (85.3%) and the Regional Health Study Area (84.7%), while remaining above the national average (82.2%).

18.1.8 A total of 4.3% of residents reported bad or very bad health, comparable with regional levels but higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%). Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 5.1% of the population, while 5.4% reported that activities were limited a little. Both measures were lower than regional and national averages, although the proportion whose activities were limited a lot was slightly higher than within the Site-Specific Health Study Area and the London Borough of Hounslow. Overall, the available data suggests health outcomes are generally aligned with wider local populations, with levels of activity limitation remaining below regional and national averages.

18.1.9 For further information see Table 18.1 below.

Table 18.1: Hounslow (West and Heath) Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	41,398	256,775	299,424	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	6,852	2,710	5,150	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+7,296 (21%)	+47,086 (25%)	+44,497 (17%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	21.6%	20.5%	20.7%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	67.8%	67.9%	67.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	10.7%	11.6%	11.8%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	51.2%	50.7%	49.7%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	48.8%	49.3%	50.3%	51.3%	51.0%

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	25.4%	45.6%	44.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.4%	3.7%	4.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	57.1%	38.0%	36.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	6.8%	5.7%	7.2%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	7.3%	6.0%	7.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	37.0%	41.1%	38.3%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	21.6%	14.1%	16.7%	9.2%	6.7%
Hindu	14.2%	8.1%	9.5%	3.4%	1.8%
Sikh	10.9%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%
General Health					
Very Good or Good Health	84.8%	85.1%	85.3%	84.7%	82.2%

Measure		Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.3%	3.8%	4.1%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	5.1%	4.5%	4.8%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.4%	6.0%	6.1%	7.6%	8.5%

18.2 Hounslow (West and Heath) Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

18.2.1 Hounslow West and Heath contains 12,672 households and is characterised by relatively large household sizes. Households containing four or more people account for 37.8% of households, substantially exceeding the proportions recorded regionally (22.6%) and nationally (20.2%). In particular, households with five or more people account for 19.3% of households, compared with 8.5% across the wider region and 7.3% nationally.

18.2.2 One-person households represent 21.3% of households, lower than across all comparator areas, while two-person households are also less common than regional and national averages. Household composition is dominated by single family households (58.7%), broadly aligned with comparator areas. However, other household types account for 20.0% of households, notably higher than both the regional (9.7%) and national (6.9%) averages, indicating a relatively diverse household structure.

Accommodation Type

18.2.3 The housing stock is characterised by a mix of semi-detached housing and flats. Purpose-built flats or tenements account for 34.5% of dwellings, broadly comparable with the London Borough of Hounslow (37.4%) and significantly above the national average (17.1%). Semi-detached properties represent 32.0% of dwellings and form the largest single housing type within the community area. Detached properties account for just 5.8% of dwellings, substantially lower than regional (17.0%) and national (22.9%) levels. Converted or shared houses comprise 7.1% of housing stock, which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2.9%) and England (3.5%). Overall, the housing profile reflects a predominance of higher-density housing types.

Accommodation Tenure

18.2.4 The tenure profile indicates a strong reliance on rented accommodation. Private renting is the largest tenure category, accounting for 39.1% of households, exceeding both local authority (30.9%) and national (20.5%) levels. Social rented accommodation accounts for a further 22.7% of households, broadly aligned with the London Borough of Hounslow

(21.0%) and the wider region (23.1%). Owner-occupation represents 36.1% of households, substantially lower than comparator areas and considerably below the national average of 61.3%. Shared ownership accounts for 1.8% of households, slightly above comparator areas but remaining a relatively small component of the housing market.

Occupancy Rating

18.2.5 Occupancy ratings suggest comparatively higher levels of under-occupancy within Hounslow West and Heath. Around 71.8% of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1, lower than across all comparator areas. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 28.2%, exceeding the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%), the London Borough of Hounslow (23.0%), the wider region (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This indicates a greater prevalence of households with two or more spare bedrooms compared with comparator areas.

18.2.6 For further information see Table 18.2 below.

Table 18.2: Hounslow (West and Heath) Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	12,672	80,047	102,953	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	21.3%	24.6%	25.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	21.6%	25.4%	25.9%	32.1%	34.0%

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
3 People in Household	19.2%	18.5%	18.6%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	18.5%	17.0%	16.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	9.3%	7.9%	7.4%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	4.7%	3.6%	3.2%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	2.4%	1.5%	1.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	2.9%	1.5%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	5.8%	12.7%	4.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	32.0%	34.0%	28.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	18.4%	21.3%	20.5%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	34.5%	27.0%	37.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	7.1%	2.9%	6.4%	7.1%	3.5%

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.3%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	36.1%	48.5%	45.7%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	22.7%	15.4%	21.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	39.1%	34.6%	30.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	1.8%	1.2%	2.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	71.8%	78.0%	77.0%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	28.2%	22.0%	23.0%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	21.3%	24.5%	25.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	58.7%	59.7%	60.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	20.0%	15.7%	14.5%	9.7%	6.9%

18.3 Hounslow (West and Heath) Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

18.3.1 Hounslow West and Heath has 27,274 working-age residents. Around 56.1% of working-age residents are economically active, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (60.3%), the London Borough of Hounslow (58.8%) and the wider region (58.5%), although broadly aligned with the national figure (55.7%). Unemployment stands at 5.3%, exceeding all comparator areas and indicating a comparatively less favourable labour market position within the community area.

Qualifications

18.3.2 The qualifications profile is mixed. Over one-third of residents (35.4%) hold Level 4 qualifications or above, exceeding the national average (33.9%) and the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%). However, this remains lower than the London Borough of Hounslow (41.6%) and the wider regional average (41.3%). The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications (21.7%) is higher than across comparator areas, while Levels 2 and 3 qualifications are slightly less prevalent than wider benchmarks. Other qualifications account for 6.2% of residents, exceeding comparator areas. Overall, the data suggests a relatively polarised qualifications profile, with notable proportions of residents at both higher and lower attainment levels.

Occupation

18.3.3 The occupational profile is characterised by a relatively strong representation of elementary and customer-facing occupations. Elementary occupations account for 19.9% of employment, considerably higher than across all comparator areas. Sales and customer service occupations represent 10.1% of employment, also exceeding local, regional and national levels. Professional occupations account for 14.7% of employment, below both regional (23.5%) and national (20.3%) averages. Managers, directors and senior officials (8.9%) and associate professional and technical occupations (9.7%) are also less prevalent than comparator areas. Overall, employment is relatively concentrated in service and elementary occupations rather than higher-skilled professional roles.

Car or Van Availability

18.3.4 Vehicle availability is comparatively low within Hounslow West and Heath. More than one-third of households (37.8%) have no access to a car or van, substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), the London Borough of Hounslow (32.8%) and England (23.5%). Households with access to two or more vehicles account for 21.9%, below comparator areas, while 40.3% of households have access to a single vehicle. The data suggests a greater reliance on non-car modes of transport relative to surrounding areas.

Industry

18.3.5 The employment profile is relatively diverse, with wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, representing the largest employment sector at 15.6%. This is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Transport and storage accounts for 13.2% of employment, notably higher than the London Borough of Hounslow (10.2%), the wider region (4.8%) and England (5.0%), indicating the continued importance of transport-related activity to the local economy. Human health and social work activities account for 10.3% of employment, broadly comparable with local authority levels but below regional and national averages. Overall, the workforce reflects a combination of retail, transport and service-sector employment.

18.3.6 For further information see Table 18.3 below.

Table 18.3: Hounslow (West and Heath) Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	27,274	160,219	194,709	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	56.1%	60.3%	58.8%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	5.3%	4.8%	4.5%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	21.7%	20.1%	18.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	11.3%	11.5%	9.5%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	10.1%	12.1%	10.2%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.9%	4.5%	3.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.4%	13.3%	12.3%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	35.4%	33.9%	41.6%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	6.2%	4.7%	4.3%	2.9%	2.8%

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	8.9%	11.2%	12.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	14.7%	14.8%	20.0%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	9.7%	11.5%	12.7%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.2%	10.4%	8.8%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	10.1%	9.2%	8.7%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	8.6%	8.4%	8.2%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	10.1%	8.6%	8.0%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	8.8%	9.8%	7.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	19.9%	16.1%	13.4%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	40.3%	42.5%	44.2%	40.6%	41.3%

Measure	Community Area: Hounslow West and Heath	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hounslow	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 Cars or Vans in Household	16.1%	25.3%	17.4%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	5.8%	10.4%	5.6%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	37.8%	21.8%	32.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	15.6%	14.5%	14.3%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	13.2%	15.7%	10.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	10.3%	10.1%	10.9%	13.4%	14.6%

19 Iver and Richings Park

19.1 Iver and Richings Park Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

19.1.1 The Iver and Richings Park Community Area had a resident population of 6,150 people in mid-2024. Population density was 610 residents per km², substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and considerably higher than Buckinghamshire Council as a whole (355 residents per km²). This indicates a relatively less densely populated community compared with the wider study area.

19.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 845 residents, representing growth of 16%. This was lower than growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) but higher than Buckinghamshire Council (14%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). The area has therefore experienced moderate population growth over the period.

Age Profile

19.1.3 Iver and Richings Park has an older age profile than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area and the Regional Health Study Area. Residents aged 65 years and over accounted for 17.4% of the population, notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and broadly aligned with England (18.4%). Conversely, children and young people aged 0-15 years represented 18.2% of residents, slightly below comparator areas.

19.1.4 The working-age population (16-64 years) accounted for 64.4% of residents, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) but broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (65.5%) and slightly above England (63.0%). Overall, the age structure reflects a relatively older population, with a greater proportion of older residents and a slightly smaller proportion of children and working-age adults than across the wider study area.

Ethnicity and Religion

19.1.5 The largest ethnic group in Iver and Richings Park was people identifying as White, accounting for 61.2% of residents. This proportion was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%) but lower than Buckinghamshire Council (79.9%), the Regional Health Study Area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). People identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh represented 27.8% of the population, making this the second largest ethnic group. This proportion was substantially higher than that recorded across Buckinghamshire Council (12.3%) and the Regional Health Study Area (13.9%).

19.1.6 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 38.7% of residents identifying as Christian. This was lower than both Buckinghamshire Council (47.2%) and England (46.3%). Residents reporting no religion accounted for 26.0% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%) and Buckinghamshire Council (34.2%), while remaining below the regional and national averages. Sikhism was the second most commonly reported religion, with 16.5% of residents identifying as Sikh. This was considerably higher than across Buckinghamshire Council (1.6%), the Regional Health Study Area (1.2%) and England (0.9%). A further 7.5% of residents identified as Hindu.

Health Characteristics

19.1.7 General health outcomes in Iver and Richings Park were broadly comparable with those observed across the wider study area. The majority of residents (85.1%) reported their health as very good or good, closely aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%) and above the regional (84.7%) and national (82.2%) averages.

19.1.8 A total of 4.2% of residents reported bad or very bad health, aligned with the Regional Health Study Area and slightly higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%) and Buckinghamshire Council (3.3%). Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 4.7% of the population, broadly comparable with wider areas and below regional and national averages. A further 6.8% reported that their activities were limited a little, which was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%) but lower than Buckinghamshire Council (7.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, the data indicates health outcomes broadly in line with comparator areas, although the community's older age profile may influence future health and care needs.

19.1.9 For further information see Table 19.1 below.

Table 19.1: Iver and Richings Park Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	6,150	256,775	578,772	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	610	2,710	355	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+845 (16%)	+47,086 (25%)	+72,222 (14%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	18.2%	20.5%	19.8%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	64.4%	67.9%	61.4%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	17.4%	11.6%	18.7%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	49.3%	50.7%	48.9%	48.7%	49.0%

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Female	50.7%	49.3%	51.1%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	61.2%	45.6%	79.9%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.4%	3.7%	3.5%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	27.8%	38.0%	12.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	2.4%	5.7%	2.6%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	5.2%	6.0%	1.6%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	38.7%	41.1%	47.2%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	26.0%	17.0%	34.2%	33.7%	36.7%
Sikh	16.5%	12.4%	1.6%	1.2%	0.9%
Hindu	7.5%	8.1%	2.7%	3.4%	1.8%

Measure		Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		85.1%	85.1%	86.3%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		4.2%	3.8%	3.3%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.7%	4.5%	4.4%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.8%	6.0%	7.5%	7.6%	8.5%

19.2 Iver and Richings Park Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

19.2.1 Iver and Richings Park contains 2,162 households and is characterised by a relatively balanced household profile. Two-person households are the most common household size, accounting for 31.1% of households, broadly aligned with regional (32.1%) and Buckinghamshire-wide (34.0%) levels. One-person households represent 24.4% of households, slightly below regional and national averages.

19.2.2 Households containing four or more people account for 27.7% of households, exceeding the regional (22.6%) and national (20.2%) proportions. Larger households of five or more people comprise 10.6% of households, indicating a slightly greater presence of larger family households than across comparator areas. Household composition is dominated by single family households (64.9%), which is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (59.7%) and broadly aligned with England (63.0%). Other household types account for 10.7% of households, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area but above Buckinghamshire and national levels.

Accommodation Type

19.2.3 The housing stock is characterised by a predominance of detached and semi-detached housing. Detached properties account for 30.7% of dwellings, substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (12.7%), the wider region (17.0%) and England (22.9%). Semi-detached properties represent a further 29.7% of dwellings, meaning that around three-fifths of the housing stock comprises lower-density housing types. Terraced properties account for 18.2% of dwellings, broadly aligned with Buckinghamshire Council (17.8%), while purpose-built flats represent 15.5% of housing stock, significantly lower than regional levels (28.6%). Overall, the accommodation profile reflects a predominantly suburban housing market with a relatively limited proportion of flats.

Accommodation Tenure

19.2.4 Owner-occupation is the dominant tenure type within Iver and Richings Park, accounting for 66.6% of households. This exceeds the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), the wider region (45.2%) and England (61.3%), although it remains

slightly below the Buckinghamshire average of 70.0%. Private renting accounts for 19.4% of households, which is lower than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%) and regional levels (30.0%), while social rented accommodation represents 13.6% of households, broadly aligned with Buckinghamshire Council (13.0%) and below regional and national averages. The tenure profile therefore indicates a strong predominance of owner occupation and comparatively lower reliance on rented accommodation.

Occupancy Rating

19.2.5 The majority of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1, accounting for 83.8% of households. This is broadly aligned with the wider region (83.7%) and England (83.4%). Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 16.2% of households, consistent with regional (16.4%) and national (16.6%) levels and lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%). Overall, occupancy patterns are broadly in line with wider benchmarks.

19.2.6 For further information see Table 19.2 below.

Table 19.2: Iver and Richings Park Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	2,162	80,047	220,346	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Person in Household	24.4%	24.6%	26.3%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	31.1%	25.4%	34.0%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	16.7%	18.5%	16.7%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	17.1%	17.0%	15.6%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	6.0%	7.9%	5.0%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	2.9%	3.6%	1.5%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.1%	1.5%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.6%	1.5%	0.3%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	30.7%	12.7%	34.3%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	29.7%	34.0%	30.2%	23.5%	31.5%

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Terraced	18.2%	21.3%	17.8%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	15.5%	27.0%	14.4%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	1.4%	2.9%	1.5%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	2.5%	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.7%	1.0%	0.7%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	66.6%	48.5%	70.0%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	13.6%	15.4%	13.0%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	19.4%	34.6%	15.7%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	0.5%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	83.8%	78.0%	84.9%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	16.2%	22.0%	15.1%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	24.4%	24.5%	26.3%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	64.9%	59.7%	67.8%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	10.7%	15.7%	5.9%	9.7%	6.9%

19.3 Iver and Richings Park Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

19.3.1 Iver and Richings Park has 3,719 working-age residents and demonstrates relatively strong labour market participation. Around 62.9% of working-age residents are economically active, exceeding the proportions recorded across comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 2.8%, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%), the wider region (3.3%) and broadly aligned with Buckinghamshire Council (2.4%) and England (2.9%). This indicates comparatively favourable economic conditions within the community area.

Qualifications

19.3.2 Qualification attainment is generally strong. Nearly two-fifths of residents (39.6%) hold Level 4 qualifications or above, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%) and England (33.9%), although slightly below the Buckinghamshire and regional averages of around 41%. The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications is 16.4%, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%) and England (18.1%). Levels 1 and 3 qualifications are broadly aligned with comparator areas, while apprenticeship attainment (5.0%) is slightly above regional levels. Overall, the qualifications profile indicates relatively high levels of educational attainment.

Occupation

19.3.3 The occupational profile is characterised by a strong representation of higher-skilled occupations. Managers, directors and senior officials account for 18.7% of employment, substantially higher than regional (14.8%) and national (12.9%) levels. Professional occupations represent a further 23.9% of employment, broadly aligned with the regional average (23.5%) and above the national average (20.3%). Associate professional and technical occupations account for 14.8% of employment, while elementary occupations represent only 6.2% of employment, considerably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (16.1%), the wider region (9.0%) and England (10.5%). Overall, the occupational profile indicates a workforce concentrated in professional and managerial employment.

Car or Van Availability

19.3.4 Vehicle ownership is relatively high within Iver and Richings Park. Only 8.7% of households have no access to a car or van, substantially lower than comparator areas. More than half of households (53.7%) have access to two or more vehicles, including 20.3% with access to three or more vehicles. The data indicates a high level of private vehicle availability, exceeding regional and national levels.

Industry

19.3.5 Employment is spread across a range of sectors, with wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, representing the largest employment sector at 13.5%. This is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Human health and social work activities account for 11.1% of employment, slightly above the Site-Specific Health Study Area (10.1%) but below Buckinghamshire, regional and national levels. Education represents a further 9.4% of employment and is broadly aligned with regional and national averages. Overall, the employment profile reflects a relatively diverse mix of service-sector industries rather than a reliance on any single sector.

19.3.6 For further information see Table 19.3 below.

Table 19.3: Iver and Richings Park Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	3,719	160,219	339,712	11,811,043	36,605,551

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	62.9%	60.3%	60.3%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	2.8%	4.8%	2.4%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	16.4%	20.1%	13.8%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	9.0%	11.5%	8.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	11.7%	12.1%	13.4%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	5.0%	4.5%	4.8%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	15.7%	13.3%	15.7%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	39.6%	33.9%	41.0%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	2.5%	4.7%	2.4%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	18.7%	11.2%	18.5%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	23.9%	14.8%	22.5%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	14.8%	11.5%	15.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	10.8%	10.4%	9.4%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.5%	9.2%	9.3%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	6.0%	8.4%	7.9%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	5.4%	8.6%	6.1%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	5.7%	9.8%	4.7%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	6.2%	16.1%	6.7%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	37.6%	42.5%	37.4%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	33.4%	25.3%	36.1%	22.1%	26.1%

Measure	Community Area: Iver and Richings Park	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Buckinghamshire Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	20.3%	10.4%	15.0%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	8.7%	21.8%	11.5%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	13.5%	14.5%	13.6%	13.1%	15.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	11.1%	10.1%	12.5%	13.4%	14.6%
Education	9.4%	6.4%	10.3%	9.9%	9.9%

20 Harlington

20.1 Harlington Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

20.1.1 The Harlington Community Area had a resident population of 6,595 people in mid-2024. Population density was 2,038 residents per km², lower than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and the London Borough of Hillingdon (2,637 residents per km²), indicating a comparatively less densely populated community within the wider urban area.

20.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 1,874 residents, representing growth of 40%. This was substantially higher than growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (19%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates that Harlington has experienced significant population growth over the period.

Age Profile

20.1.3 Harlington has a relatively young age profile. Children and young people aged 0-15 years accounted for 21.5% of the population, slightly higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (20.9%), the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%) and England (18.6%).

20.1.4 Residents aged 16-64 years represented 69.8% of the population, higher than all comparator areas, while those aged 65 years and over accounted for 8.7% of residents, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (13.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the community is characterised by a comparatively large working-age population and a relatively small proportion of older residents.

20.1.5 The gender profile was balanced, with males accounting for 50.9% of the population and females 49.1%, aligning closely with the Site-Specific Health Study Area.

Ethnicity and Religion

20.1.6 The largest ethnic group in Harlington was people identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 48.0% of residents. This proportion was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) and the London Borough of Hillingdon (33.3%), and substantially exceeded regional and national averages. People identifying as White represented 34.2% of the population, considerably lower than comparator areas. Residents identifying with Other Ethnic Groups accounted for 7.9% of the population, higher than all comparator areas, while people identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African represented 5.9% of residents.

20.1.7 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 44.8% of residents identifying as Christian, broadly aligned with comparator areas. People identifying as Muslim accounted for 17.9% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.1%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (14.4%), the Regional Health Study Area (9.2%) and England (6.7%). Sikhism was also well represented, with 12.4% of residents identifying as Sikh, comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area and notably higher than regional and national averages. Residents reporting no religion accounted for 11.2% of the population, lower than all comparator areas.

Health Characteristics

20.1.8 General health outcomes in Harlington were favourable. The majority of residents (87.0%) reported their health as very good or good, higher than all comparator areas. Conversely, 3.3% of residents reported bad or very bad health, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (4.0%), the Regional Health Study Area (4.2%) and England (5.2%).

20.1.9 Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also comparatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 4.1% of the population, below all comparator areas, while 5.0% reported that their activities were limited a little, also lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (6.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (7.6%) and England (8.5%). Overall, the available data suggests comparatively positive health outcomes, with lower levels of poor health and activity limitation than those observed across the wider study area, local authority, regional and national populations.

20.1.10 For further information see Table 20.1 below.

Table 20.1: Harlington Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	6,595	256,775	329,185	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	2,038	2,710	2,637	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+1,874 (40%)	+47,086 (25%)	+53,686 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	21.5%	20.5%	20.9%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	69.8%	67.9%	65.6%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	8.7%	11.6%	13.5%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.9%	50.7%	49.4%	48.7%	49.0%

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Female	49.1%	49.3%	50.6%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	34.2%	45.6%	48.2%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.1%	3.7%	4.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	48.0%	38.0%	33.3%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	5.9%	5.7%	7.8%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	7.9%	6.0%	6.3%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	44.8%	41.1%	39.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	17.9%	14.1%	14.4%	9.2%	6.7%
No Religion	11.2%	17.0%	19.4%	33.7%	36.7%
Sikh	12.4%	12.4%	8.6%	1.2%	0.9%

Measure		Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		87.0%	85.1%	85.2%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.3%	3.8%	4.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.1%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.0%	6.0%	6.5%	7.6%	8.5%

20.2 Harlington Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

20.2.1 Harlington contains 1,979 households and is characterised by a mixed household profile with a relatively high proportion of larger households. Households comprising four or more people account for 31.2% of all households, exceeding the proportions recorded across the London Borough of Hillingdon (29.7%), the wider region (22.6%) and England (20.2%). In particular, households containing five or more people account for 15.5% of households, notably above regional and national averages.

20.2.2 One-person households represent 25.7% of households, broadly aligned with local comparator areas and slightly below regional and national levels. Single family households account for 56.0% of households, lower than comparator areas, while other household types represent 18.2% of households, considerably higher than both regional (9.7%) and national (6.9%) averages, indicating a relatively diverse household structure.

Accommodation Type

20.2.3 The housing stock is characterised by a predominance of flats. Purpose-built flats or tenements account for 50.2% of dwellings, substantially higher than the London Borough of Hillingdon (26.2%), the wider region (28.6%) and England (17.1%). This indicates a relatively high-density housing profile within the community area. Semi-detached properties account for 22.2% of dwellings, while terraced properties represent 14.1%. Detached housing is relatively uncommon at 5.8%, considerably lower than regional (17.0%) and national (22.9%) levels. Converted or shared houses account for 5.0% of dwellings, slightly above local and national averages. Overall, the accommodation profile reflects a strong concentration of higher-density housing types.

Accommodation Tenure

20.2.4 Harlington is characterised by a high proportion of rented accommodation. Private renting is the dominant tenure type, accounting for 52.3% of households, substantially exceeding the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (25.9%), the wider region (30.0%) and England (20.5%). Owner-

occupation represents 36.5% of households, considerably lower than comparator areas, while social rented accommodation accounts for 10.2% of households, also below local, regional and national averages. The tenure profile therefore indicates a strong reliance on the private rented sector.

Occupancy Rating

20.2.5 Occupancy ratings are broadly aligned with local comparator areas. Around 78.1% of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1, comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (78.0%) and slightly below regional and national levels. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 21.9% of households, broadly comparable with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) and slightly higher than the London Borough of Hillingdon (19.5%), the wider region (16.4%) and England (16.6%). This suggests somewhat higher levels of under-occupancy than observed regionally and nationally.

20.2.6 For further information see Table 20.2 below.

Table 20.2: Harlington Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	1,979	80,047	109,207	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Person in Household	25.7%	24.6%	24.4%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	24.8%	25.4%	27.1%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	18.4%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	15.7%	17.0%	17.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	9.3%	7.9%	7.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	3.2%	3.6%	3.0%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.6%	1.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.4%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	5.8%	12.7%	13.9%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	22.2%	34.0%	35.1%	23.5%	31.5%

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Terraced	14.1%	21.3%	19.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	50.2%	27.0%	26.2%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	5.0%	2.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	1.6%	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	36.5%	48.5%	56.6%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	10.2%	15.4%	16.1%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	52.3%	34.6%	25.9%	30.0%	20.5%

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Shared Ownership	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	78.1%	78.0%	80.5%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	21.9%	22.0%	19.5%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	25.8%	24.5%	24.4%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	56.0%	59.7%	64.0%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	18.2%	15.7%	11.6%	9.7%	6.9%

20.3 Harlington Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

20.3.1 Harlington has 3,762 working-age residents. Economic activity levels are broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area, with 60.2% of working-age residents recorded as economically active. This is slightly higher than the London Borough of Hillingdon (57.2%), the wider region (58.5%) and England (55.7%). Unemployment stands at 7.1%, which is notably higher than all comparator areas and indicates comparatively greater levels of labour market inactivity among those seeking employment.

Qualifications

20.3.2 The qualifications profile indicates comparatively lower levels of educational attainment. Around 31.7% of residents hold Level 4 qualifications or above, below the London Borough of Hillingdon (37.5%) and the wider regional average (41.3%), although broadly aligned with England (33.9%). The proportion of residents with no formal qualifications is 22.3%, higher than across comparator areas. Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications account for 13.3% of residents, also exceeding comparator averages. Conversely, Levels 3 and 4 qualifications are less prevalent than in surrounding areas. Overall, the data suggests a relatively greater proportion of residents with lower qualification levels.

Occupation

20.3.3 The occupational profile is characterised by a concentration of elementary, operational and service occupations. Elementary occupations account for 22.8% of employment, substantially exceeding the proportions recorded across comparator areas. Process, plant and machine operative roles represent a further 11.9% of employment, while caring, leisure and other service occupations account for 11.3%. Professional occupations comprise only 8.6% of employment, considerably lower than the London Borough of Hillingdon (21.1%), the wider region (23.5%) and England (20.3%). Managers, directors and senior officials are also less prevalent than comparator areas. Overall, the occupational structure indicates a workforce that is more strongly represented in operational and service-based roles than in higher-skilled professional employment.

Car or Van Availability

20.3.4 Vehicle availability is comparatively limited within Harlington. More than one-third of households (35.3%) have no access to a car or van, substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), the London Borough of Hillingdon (22.3%) and England (23.5%). Households with access to two or more vehicles account for 21.1%, lower than all comparator areas, while 43.6% of households have access to a single vehicle. Overall, the data suggests lower levels of private vehicle availability and a potentially greater reliance on other modes of transport.

Industry

20.3.5 The local employment profile is strongly influenced by transport-related and service-sector industries. Transport and storage is the largest employment sector, accounting for 18.9% of employment, more than double the proportion recorded across the London Borough of Hillingdon (9.2%) and substantially above regional (4.8%) and national (5.0%) levels. Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, represents 14.2% of employment and is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Accommodation and food service activities account for 14.1% of employment, significantly higher than all comparator areas and almost three times the proportion recorded across the London Borough of Hillingdon (4.9%). This indicates a local economy with a strong concentration in transport, hospitality and service-sector employment.

20.3.6 For further information see Table 20.3 below.

Table 20.3: Harlington Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	3,762	160,219	200,710	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	60.2%	60.3%	57.2%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	7.1%	4.8%	3.9%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	22.3%	20.1%	18.2%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	13.3%	11.5%	9.9%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	11.3%	12.1%	11.8%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	11.2%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	31.7%	33.9%	37.5%	41.3%	33.9%

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Other Qualifications	5.6%	4.7%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	7.7%	11.2%	13.0%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	8.6%	14.8%	21.1%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	8.6%	11.5%	12.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.2%	10.4%	10.1%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	10.1%	9.2%	9.2%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	11.3%	8.4%	8.4%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	9.9%	8.6%	7.5%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	11.9%	9.8%	7.5%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	22.8%	16.1%	10.5%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					

Measure	Community Area: Harlington	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
1 Car or Van in Household	43.6%	42.5%	44.0%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	16.8%	25.3%	24.8%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	4.3%	10.4%	8.9%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	35.3%	21.8%	22.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Transport and Storage	18.9%	15.2%	9.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	14.2%	14.3%	14.5%	13.1%	15.0%
Accommodation and Food Service Activities	14.1%	7.6%	4.9%	5.0%	4.9%

21 North Staines

21.1 North Staines Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

21.1.1 The North Staines Community Area had a resident population of 5,216 people in mid-2024. Population density was 777 residents per km², substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), Spelthorne Borough Council (2,013 residents per km²) and the Regional Health Study Area (3,041 residents per km²). This indicates a relatively less densely populated community compared with surrounding urban areas.

21.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 1,404 residents, representing growth of 37%. This was considerably higher than growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), Spelthorne Borough Council (12%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). The area has therefore experienced substantial population growth over the period.

Age Profile

21.1.3 North Staines has a distinct age profile characterised by a large working-age population. Residents aged 16-64 years accounted for 71.4% of the population, higher than all comparator areas. In contrast, children and young people aged 0-15 years represented 17.2% of residents, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), Spelthorne Borough Council (19.0%) and the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%).

21.1.4 Residents aged 65 years and over accounted for 11.4% of the population, broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) but notably lower than Spelthorne Borough Council (18.1%), the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the age structure is characterised by a comparatively high proportion of working-age residents and relatively smaller proportions of both children and older people.

Ethnicity and Religion

21.1.5 The largest ethnic group in North Staines was people identifying as White, accounting for 71.3% of residents. This proportion was broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (70.1%) but lower than England (81.0%). People identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh represented 17.3% of the population, making this the second largest ethnic group. This was higher than the proportions recorded across Spelthorne Borough Council (12.8%), the Regional Health Study Area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

21.1.6 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 44.1% of residents identifying as Christian, broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (43.6%) and slightly below Spelthorne Borough Council (50.9%) and England (46.3%). Residents reporting no religion accounted for 34.4% of the population, exceeding the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%) and Spelthorne Borough Council (31.2%), and broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (33.7%). Hinduism was the second most commonly reported religion, with 7.5% of residents identifying as Hindu, while 5.1% identified as Muslim. Both proportions were higher than those recorded across Spelthorne Borough Council and England.

Health Characteristics

21.1.7 General health outcomes in North Staines were favourable. The majority of residents (88.6%) reported their health as very good or good, higher than all comparator areas, including the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Spelthorne Borough Council (84.8%), the Regional Health Study Area (84.7%) and England (82.2%).

21.1.8 Conversely, only 2.6% of residents reported bad or very bad health, lower than all comparator areas. Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also comparatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 3.3% of the population, substantially below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.5%), Spelthorne Borough Council (4.9%), the Regional Health Study Area (5.3%) and England (6.2%). A further 6.4% reported that their activities were limited a little, broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.0%) and lower than wider comparator areas. Overall, the available data indicates comparatively positive health characteristics, with lower levels of poor health and severe activity limitation than those observed across the wider study area, local authority, regional and national populations.

21.1.9 For further information see Table 21.1 below.

Table 21.1: North Staines Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	5,216	256,775	107,074	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	777	2,710	2,013	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+1,404 (37%)	+47,086 (25%)	+11,222 (12%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	17.2%	20.5%	19.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	71.4%	67.9%	62.9%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	11.4%	11.6%	18.1%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	50.2%	50.7%	49.2%	48.7%	49.0%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Female	49.8%	49.3%	50.8%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	71.3%	45.6%	78.7%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	4.9%	3.7%	3.7%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	17.3%	38.0%	12.8%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	3.6%	5.7%	2.5%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	2.9%	6.0%	2.4%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	44.1%	41.1%	50.9%	43.6%	46.3%
No Religion	34.4%	17.0%	31.2%	33.7%	36.7%
Hindu	7.5%	8.1%	4.2%	3.4%	1.8%
Muslim	5.1%	14.1%	4.0%	9.2%	6.7%

Measure		Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		88.6%	85.1%	84.8%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		2.6%	3.8%	3.9%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	3.3%	4.5%	4.9%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.4%	6.0%	7.5%	7.6%	8.5%

21.2 North Staines Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

21.2.1 North Staines contains 1,968 households and is characterised by relatively small household sizes. Two-person households are the most common household type, accounting for 35.5% of households, which exceeds the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (24.5%), Spelthorne Borough Council (31.9%) and the wider region (32.1%). One-person households account for 28.5% of households, broadly aligned with regional and local authority levels.

21.2.2 Larger households are comparatively uncommon. Households containing five or more people account for only 4.4% of households, which is lower than across comparator areas. Household composition is dominated by single family households (61.8%), broadly comparable with wider benchmarks, while other household types account for 9.6% of households, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area and similar to the regional average.

Accommodation Type

21.2.3 The housing stock in North Staines is characterised by a relatively high proportion of flats. Purpose-built flats or tenements account for 38.6% of dwellings, considerably higher than within Spelthorne Borough Council (22.8%), the wider region (28.6%) and England (17.1%). Terraced properties represent 24.0% of dwellings, broadly aligned with regional and national averages, while semi-detached housing accounts for 20.7% of the housing stock. Detached properties comprise only 9.2% of dwellings, notably lower than the local authority (19.0%) and national (22.9%) averages. Overall, the housing profile reflects a relatively higher-density housing stock than is typical across the local authority area.

Accommodation Tenure

21.2.4 Owner-occupation is the most common tenure type in North Staines, accounting for 53.3% of households. This is higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%) and the wider region (45.2%), although lower than the Spelthorne Borough Council average of 68.1%. Private renting represents a substantial proportion of households at 39.7%, considerably higher than the local authority (17.9%), regional (30.0%) and national (20.5%) averages. In contrast, social

rented accommodation accounts for only 6.0% of households, substantially lower than comparator areas. The tenure profile therefore reflects a combination of owner-occupation and a relatively large private rented sector.

Occupancy Rating

21.2.5 Occupancy ratings indicate that the majority of households have one spare bedroom, with 82.5% of households recorded as having an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1. This is broadly aligned with regional and national levels. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 17.5% of households, which is lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%) but higher than the Spelthorne Borough Council average (12.2%). Overall, occupancy patterns are broadly comparable with wider benchmarks.

21.2.6 For further information see Table 21.2 below.

Table 21.2: North Staines Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	1,968	80,047	41,790	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	28.5%	24.6%	27.9%	28.8%	30.1%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 People in Household	35.5%	25.4%	31.9%	32.1%	34.0%
3 People in Household	19.1%	18.5%	17.9%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	12.6%	17.0%	15.7%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	2.7%	7.9%	4.7%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	1.2%	3.6%	1.3%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	0.3%	1.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	0.2%	1.5%	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	9.2%	12.7%	19.0%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	20.7%	34.0%	34.2%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	24.0%	21.3%	19.7%	21.3%	23.0%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	38.6%	27.0%	22.8%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.1%	2.9%	1.9%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	2.9%	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	2.2%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	53.3%	48.5%	68.1%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	6.0%	15.4%	12.7%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	39.7%	34.6%	17.9%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.0%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	82.5%	78.0%	87.8%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	17.5%	22.0%	12.2%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	28.6%	24.5%	27.9%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	61.8%	59.7%	64.9%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	9.6%	15.7%	7.2%	9.7%	6.9%

21.3 North Staines Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

21.3.1 North Staines has 3,236 working-age residents and demonstrates relatively strong economic participation. Around 67.1% of working-age residents are economically active, exceeding the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 4.1%, which is below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) but above the local authority (3.2%), regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) averages.

Qualifications

21.3.2 The qualifications profile is comparatively strong. Nearly half of residents (46.7%) hold Level 4 qualifications or above, substantially exceeding the proportions recorded across comparator areas. Conversely, only 11.2% of residents have no formal qualifications, notably lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%), Spelthorne Borough Council (16.8%) and England (18.1%). Levels 1, 2 and 3 qualifications are broadly aligned with comparator areas, indicating that the principal distinguishing feature of the qualifications profile is the relatively high proportion of residents with higher-level qualifications.

Occupation

21.3.3 The occupational profile is characterised by a strong concentration of higher-skilled occupations. Professional occupations account for 27.8% of employment, exceeding the proportions recorded across all comparator areas. Managers, directors and senior officials represent a further 14.7% of employment, while associate professional and technical occupations account for 17.0%. In contrast, process, plant and machine operative roles (4.2%) and elementary occupations (7.7%) are less prevalent than across comparator areas. Overall, the occupational structure reflects a workforce with a comparatively strong representation in professional and managerial employment.

Car or Van Availability

21.3.4 Vehicle availability is relatively high in North Staines. More than three-quarters of households (78.3%) have access to at least one car or van, while only 21.7% of households have no vehicle access. Although the proportion of households without a vehicle is broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area, it is notably lower than the regional average of 29.5%. The data indicates generally good access to private transport within the community area.

Industry

21.3.5 Employment is spread across a range of sectors, with information and communication representing the largest employment sector at 14.4%. This is more than double the proportion recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.4%) and substantially above regional (6.9%) and national (4.7%) levels. Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, accounts for 11.4% of employment and is broadly comparable with wider benchmarks. Transport and storage represents 10.3% of employment, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (15.7%) but above regional and national averages. Overall, the employment profile indicates a relatively strong presence of knowledge-based employment alongside established retail and transport sectors.

21.3.6 For further information see Table 21.3 below.

Table 21.3: North Staines Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	3,236	160,219	64,773	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	67.1%	60.3%	60.7%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.1%	4.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	11.2%	20.1%	16.8%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	7.7%	11.5%	11.1%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.7%	12.1%	14.4%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.2%	4.5%	5.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	14.8%	13.3%	15.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	46.7%	33.9%	33.6%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	2.8%	4.7%	3.0%	2.9%	2.8%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	14.7%	11.2%	14.5%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	27.8%	14.8%	19.5%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	17.0%	11.5%	15.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.5%	10.4%	11.7%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	7.1%	9.2%	9.8%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	6.5%	8.4%	8.6%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	5.5%	8.6%	6.6%	6.6%	7.5%
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	4.2%	9.8%	6.3%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	7.7%	16.1%	8.0%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	47.0%	42.5%	42.0%	40.6%	41.3%

Measure	Community Area: North Staines	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Spelthorne Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 Cars or Vans in Household	23.2%	25.3%	31.2%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	8.1%	10.4%	12.0%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	21.7%	21.8%	14.8%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Information and Communication	14.4%	6.4%	8.1%	6.9%	4.7%
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	11.4%	14.5%	13.1%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	10.3%	15.7%	11.9%	4.8%	5.0%

22 Horton and Wraysbury

22.1 Horton and Wraysbury Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

22.1.1 The Horton and Wraysbury Community Area had a resident population of 5,656 people in mid-2024. Population density was 476 residents per km², substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²), the Regional Health Study Area (3,041 residents per km²) and broadly comparable with the national average (433 residents per km²). This indicates a relatively sparsely populated community compared with the wider study area.

22.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 590 residents, representing growth of 12%. This was lower than growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%), but broadly aligned with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (10%), the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). Overall, the area has experienced modest population growth over the period.

Age Profile

22.1.3 Horton and Wraysbury has a comparatively older age profile than the wider study area. Residents aged 65 years and over accounted for 20.6% of the population, substantially higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%), the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Conversely, children and young people aged 0-15 years represented 16.1% of the population, lower than all comparator areas.

22.1.4 The working-age population (16-64 years) accounted for 63.2% of residents, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (67.9%) and the Regional Health Study Area (65.5%), but broadly aligned with England (63.0%). Overall, the age structure is characterised by a relatively high proportion of older residents and a lower proportion of children and working-age people compared with the wider study area.

Ethnicity and Religion

22.1.5 The largest ethnic group in Horton and Wraysbury was people identifying as White, accounting for 66.6% of residents. This proportion was higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (45.6%), although lower than the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (79.9%) and England (81.0%). People identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh represented 25.0% of the population, making this the second largest ethnic group. This proportion was notably higher than that recorded across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (13.1%), the Regional Health Study Area (13.9%) and England (9.6%).

22.1.6 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 44.5% of residents identifying as Christian, broadly aligned with the Regional Health Study Area (43.6%) and England (46.3%). Residents reporting no religion accounted for 22.9% of the population, higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (17.0%) but lower than the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (31.0%), the Regional Health Study Area (33.7%) and England (36.7%). Sikhism was the second most commonly reported religion, with 14.2% of residents identifying as Sikh. This was substantially higher than the proportions recorded across the local authority (2.9%), the Regional Health Study Area (1.2%) and England (0.9%). A further 5.8% of residents identified as Hindu.

Health Characteristics

22.1.7 General health outcomes in Horton and Wraysbury were favourable overall. The majority of residents (86.2%) reported their health as very good or good, higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), the Regional Health Study Area (84.7%) and England (82.2%), although slightly below the proportion recorded across the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (87.6%).

22.1.8 Only 3.2% of residents reported bad or very bad health, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), the Regional Health Study Area (4.2%) and England (5.2%). Levels of disability and long-term health problems were broadly comparable with comparator areas. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 4.6% of the population, while 6.8% reported that activities were limited a little. Both measures remained below regional and national averages, although they were higher than the equivalent proportions recorded across the Royal Borough of

Windsor and Maidenhead. Overall, the data indicates generally positive health outcomes, despite the community area's comparatively older population profile.

22.1.9 For further information see Table 22.1 below.

Table 22.1: Horton and Wraysbury Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	5,656	256,775	158,943	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	476	2,710	776	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+590 (12%)	+47,086 (25%)	+13,845 (10%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	16.1%	20.5%	19.4%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	63.2%	67.9%	62.1%	65.5%	63.0%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
65+	20.6%	11.6%	18.4%	15.7%	18.4%
Gender					
Male	49.7%	50.7%	49.1%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	50.3%	49.3%	50.9%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	66.6%	45.6%	79.9%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.4%	3.7%	3.4%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	25.0%	38.0%	13.1%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	1.1%	5.7%	1.5%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	3.9%	6.0%	2.1%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	44.5%	41.1%	49.9%	43.6%	46.3%

Measure		Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
No Religion		22.9%	17.0%	31.0%	33.7%	36.7%
Sikh		14.2%	12.4%	2.9%	1.2%	0.9%
Hindu		5.8%	8.1%	3.1%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		86.2%	85.1%	87.6%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.2%	3.8%	3.0%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.6%	4.5%	4.2%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	6.8%	6.0%	6.8%	7.6%	8.5%

22.2 Horton and Wraysbury Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

22.2.1 Horton and Wraysbury contains 2,074 households and is characterised by a relatively balanced household profile, with a notable concentration of two-person households. Around 32.4% of households comprise two people, broadly aligned with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (33.3%) and the wider region (32.1%). One-person households account for 23.8% of households, below both regional and national averages.

22.2.2 Households containing four or more people account for 27.1% of households, exceeding regional (22.6%) and national (20.2%) levels. Larger households of five or more people represent 11.6% of all households, indicating a greater prevalence of larger family households than is typical across comparator areas. Household composition is dominated by single family households (62.7%), broadly aligned with regional and national averages, while other household types account for 13.2% of households.

Accommodation Type

22.2.3 The housing stock is characterised by a strong predominance of detached housing. Detached properties account for 59.5% of dwellings, substantially higher than the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (30.7%), the wider region (17.0%) and England (22.9%). Semi-detached properties represent a further 17.1% of dwellings. Terraced housing (10.2%) and purpose-built flats (8.2%) account for relatively small proportions of the housing stock compared with comparator areas. A small proportion of households occupy caravans or other mobile or temporary structures (1.8%), which is higher than comparator averages but remains a minor component of local housing provision. Overall, the accommodation profile reflects a predominantly low-density residential area.

Accommodation Tenure

22.2.4 Owner-occupation is the dominant tenure type, accounting for 76.9% of households. This is substantially higher than all comparator areas and notably above the national average of 61.3%. Private renting accounts for 15.3% of households and social rented accommodation represents 7.5%, both considerably lower than comparator areas.

Occupancy Rating

22.2.5 Occupancy patterns are broadly aligned with regional and national averages. Around 83.1% of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1, comparable with the wider region (83.7%) and England (83.4%). Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 16.9% of households, broadly consistent with regional and national levels and lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (22.0%). Overall, occupancy patterns do not differ markedly from wider benchmarks.

22.2.6 For further information see Table 23.2 below.

Table 22.2: Horton and Wraysbury Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	2,074	80,047	60,905	7,230,536	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	23.8%	24.6%	27.5%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	32.4%	25.4%	33.3%	32.1%	34.0%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
3 People in Household	16.7%	18.5%	16.9%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	15.5%	17.0%	15.6%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	6.6%	7.9%	4.5%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	2.7%	3.6%	1.4%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.0%	1.5%	0.4%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.3%	1.5%	0.4%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	59.5%	12.7%	30.7%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	17.1%	34.0%	26.1%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	10.2%	21.3%	17.9%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	8.2%	27.0%	20.0%	28.6%	17.1%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	2.2%	2.9%	2.5%	7.1%	3.5%
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.7%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	1.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	76.9%	48.5%	66.2%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	7.5%	15.4%	12.6%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	15.3%	34.6%	20.6%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	0.3%	1.2%	0.7%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	83.1%	78.0%	82.6%	83.7%	83.4%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	16.9%	22.0%	17.4%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	24.1%	24.5%	65.8%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	62.7%	59.7%	29.9%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	13.2%	15.7%	15.9%	9.7%	6.9%

22.3 Horton and Wraysbury Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

22.3.1 Horton and Wraysbury has 3,435 working-age residents. Economic activity levels are broadly aligned with comparator areas, with 59.8% of working-age residents recorded as economically active. Unemployment stands at 3.1%, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and broadly comparable with regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) levels, suggesting relatively favourable labour market conditions.

Qualifications

22.3.2 The qualifications profile indicates relatively high attainment levels. Around 38.3% of residents hold Level 4 qualifications or above, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%) and England (33.9%), although remaining below the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (45.0%) and the wider regional average (41.3%). Residents with no formal qualifications account for 15.4% of the population, lower than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.1%) and England (18.1%). Qualification levels across Levels 2 and 3 are broadly aligned with comparator areas. Overall, the data indicates a relatively well-qualified resident population.

Occupation

22.3.3 The occupational profile is characterised by a strong representation of managerial and professional occupations. Managers, directors and senior officials account for 22.7% of employment, substantially exceeding comparator areas and representing the largest occupational group within the community area. Professional occupations account for a further 20.2% of employment, broadly aligned with the national average. Associate professional and technical occupations represent 14.5% of employment, while elementary occupations account for only 6.0%, considerably lower than regional and national levels. Overall, the occupational profile reflects a workforce concentrated in higher-skilled occupations.

Car or Van Availability

22.3.4 Vehicle ownership is particularly high within Horton and Wraysbury. Only 7.5% of households have no access to a car or van, substantially lower than all comparator areas. More than three-fifths of households (62.0%) have access to two or more vehicles, including 25.6% with access to three or more vehicles. This is considerably higher than regional and national levels and indicates very high levels of private vehicle availability.

Industry

22.3.5 Employment is spread across a range of sectors, with wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, representing the largest sector at 13.0% of employment. This is broadly aligned with comparator areas. Transport and storage accounts for 10.4% of employment, substantially higher than within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (5.1%) and more than double the regional and national proportions. Human health and social work activities account for 9.4% of employment, broadly comparable with local authority levels but below regional and national averages. Overall, the employment profile reflects a diverse economy with a notable concentration in transport-related activities.

22.3.6 For further information see Table 22.3 below.

Table 22.3: Horton and Wraysbury Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	3,435	160,219	95,341	11,811,043	36,605,551
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	59.8%	60.3%	60.7%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	3.1%	4.8%	2.7%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	15.4%	20.1%	12.6%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	10.9%	11.5%	8.2%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	12.9%	12.1%	12.9%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	4.6%	4.5%	4.1%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	15.5%	13.3%	14.8%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	38.3%	33.9%	45.0%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	2.5%	4.7%	2.5%	2.9%	2.8%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	22.7%	11.2%	20.9%	14.8%	12.9%
Professional Occupations	20.2%	14.8%	24.5%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	14.5%	11.5%	16.6%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	11.1%	10.4%	8.6%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	8.4%	9.2%	7.6%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	6.2%	8.4%	7.1%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	5.9%	8.6%	5.0%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	4.9%	9.8%	3.7%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	6.0%	16.1%	6.0%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	30.6%	42.5%	39.9%	40.6%	41.3%

Measure	Community Area: Horton and Wraysbury	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
2 Cars or Vans in Household	36.4%	25.3%	33.9%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	25.6%	10.4%	13.4%	7.9%	9.1%
No Cars or Vans in Household	7.5%	21.8%	12.7%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	13.0%	14.5%	11.8%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	10.4%	15.7%	5.1%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	9.4%	10.1%	9.9%	13.4%	14.6%

23 Langley

23.1 Langley Demographic Baseline Data

Population and Growth

23.1.1 The Langley Community Area had a resident population of 35,457 people in mid-2024, making it one of the largest communities within the Site-Specific Health Study Area. Population density was 5,332 residents per km², exceeding both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (2,710 residents per km²) and Slough Borough Council (4,873 residents per km²), indicating a densely populated urban community.

23.1.2 Between 2011 and mid-2024, the population increased by 5,393 residents, representing growth of 18%. This was lower than the growth recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (25%) and broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (19%), but notably higher than growth across the Regional Health Study Area (11%) and England (10%). This indicates sustained population growth within the community over the period.

Age Profile

23.1.3 Langley has a relatively young age profile. Children and young people aged 0-15 years accounted for 24.7% of the population, notably higher than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (20.5%), the Regional Health Study Area (19.0%) and England (18.6%), and broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (25.0%).

23.1.4 Residents aged 16-64 years represented 64.1% of the population, broadly comparable with wider areas, while those aged 65 years and over accounted for 11.2% of residents. This proportion was slightly below the Site-Specific Health Study Area (11.6%) and substantially lower than the Regional Health Study Area (15.7%) and England (18.4%). Overall, the age structure is characterised by a relatively large proportion of children and young people and a comparatively smaller older population than observed regionally and nationally.

23.1.5 The gender profile was balanced, with females accounting for 50.9% of residents and males 49.1%, closely aligned with comparator areas.

Ethnicity and Religion

23.1.6 The largest ethnic group in Langley was people identifying as Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh, accounting for 49.3% of residents. This proportion was higher than both the Site-Specific Health Study Area (38.0%) and Slough Borough Council (46.7%), and substantially exceeded regional and national averages. People identifying as White represented 33.7% of the population, a proportion slightly lower than Slough Borough Council (36.1%) and considerably below the Regional Health Study Area (70.1%) and England (81.0%). Residents identifying as Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African accounted for 7.2% of the population, broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (7.6%) and higher than the national average.

23.1.7 Christianity was the most commonly reported religion, with 29.7% of residents identifying as Christian. However, this proportion was lower than all comparator areas. People identifying as Muslim accounted for 20.8% of residents, while 16.0% identified as Sikh and 14.3% identified as Hindu. All three proportions were substantially higher than regional and national averages, with Hinduism and Sikhism also exceeding the proportions recorded across Slough Borough Council. These data indicate substantial representation of multiple faith groups within the community.

Health Characteristics

23.1.8 General health outcomes in Langley were favourable overall. The majority of residents (86.2%) reported their health as very good or good, exceeding the proportions recorded across the Site-Specific Health Study Area (85.1%), Slough Borough Council (85.7%), the Regional Health Study Area (84.7%) and England (82.2%).

23.1.9 Only 3.5% of residents reported bad or very bad health, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (3.8%), the Regional Health Study Area (4.2%) and England (5.2%), and broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (3.7%). Levels of disability and long-term health problems were also comparatively low. Residents reporting that their day-to-day activities were limited a lot accounted for 4.2% of the population, below all comparator areas, while 5.9% reported that their activities were limited a little, broadly aligned with the Site-Specific Health Study Area (6.1%) and Slough Borough Council

(5.7%), and lower than regional and national averages. Overall, the available data suggests generally positive health outcomes, with lower levels of poor health and activity limitation than those observed across wider comparator populations.

23.1.10 For further information see Table 24.1 below.

Table 24.1: Langley Demographic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Population					
Total Population (Mid-2024 Estimates)	35,457	256,775	167,359	18,732,629	58,619,998
Population Density (Usual residents per km^2)	5,332	2,710	4,873	3,041	433
Population Growth (2011-Mid-2024 Estimates)	+5,393 (18%)	+47,086 (25%)	+26,646 (19%)	+1,876,146 (11%)	+5,513,724 (10%)
Age Profile					
0-15	24.7%	20.5%	25.0%	19.0%	18.6%
16-64	64.1%	67.9%	65.4%	65.5%	63.0%
65+	11.2%	11.6%	9.7%	15.7%	18.4%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Gender					
Male	49.1%	50.7%	49.5%	48.7%	49.0%
Female	50.9%	49.3%	50.5%	51.3%	51.0%
Self-Identified Ethnicity					
White	33.7%	45.6%	36.1%	70.1%	81.0%
Mixed or Multiple ethnic groups	3.6%	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	3.0%
Asian, Asian British or Asian Welsh	49.3%	38.0%	46.7%	13.9%	9.6%
Black, Black British, Black Welsh, Caribbean or African	7.2%	5.7%	7.6%	8.0%	4.2%
Other Ethnic Group	6.2%	6.0%	5.7%	3.9%	2.2%
Religion (top 4)					
Christian	29.7%	41.1%	32.0%	43.6%	46.3%
Muslim	20.8%	14.1%	29.4%	9.2%	6.7%
Sikh	16.0%	12.4%	11.4%	1.2%	0.9%

Measure		Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Hindu		14.3%	8.1%	7.8%	3.4%	1.8%
General Health						
Very Good or Good Health		86.2%	85.1%	85.7%	84.7%	82.2%
Bad or Very Bad Health		3.5%	3.8%	3.7%	4.2%	5.2%
Disability and Long-Term Health Problems						
Disabled under the Equality Act	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Lot	4.2%	4.5%	4.5%	5.3%	6.2%
	Day-to-day Activities Limited a Little	5.9%	6.0%	5.7%	7.6%	8.5%

23.2 Langley Housing Baseline Data

Household Size and Composition

23.2.1 Langley contains 11,315 households and is characterised by a relatively family-oriented population with a greater prevalence of larger households than is observed across many comparator areas. Households comprising four or more people account for 37.7% of all households, substantially higher than the regional (22.6%) and national (20.2%) averages. In particular, households containing five or more people represent 15.8% of households, indicating a notable concentration of larger family households.

23.2.2 One-person and two-person households account for 21.0% and 21.9% of households respectively, both lower than regional and national levels. Household composition is dominated by single family households, which account for 66.0% of households, exceeding comparator areas. Other household types represent 13.1% of households, higher than regional (9.7%) and national (6.9%) averages.

Accommodation Type

23.2.3 The housing stock comprises a mix of housing types, with semi-detached properties forming the largest category at 29.8% of dwellings. Terraced properties account for 24.8% and purpose-built flats represent 25.7% of dwellings, both broadly aligned with local comparator areas. Detached properties account for 17.6% of dwellings, comparable with the wider region (17.0%) but lower than the national average (22.9%). The proportion of converted or shared accommodation is relatively low, indicating that the housing stock is primarily made up of conventional residential properties.

Accommodation Tenure

23.2.4 Owner-occupation is the dominant tenure type in Langley, accounting for 56.5% of households. This exceeds the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (48.5%), Slough Borough Council (48.4%) and the wider region (45.2%), although it remains below the national average of 61.3%. Social rented accommodation accounts for 20.3% of households, slightly above local and national averages, while private renting represents 22.1% of households,

lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (34.6%), Slough Borough Council (30.7%) and the wider region (30.0%). Overall, the tenure profile reflects a relatively stable housing market characterised by a strong level of owner occupation.

Occupancy Rating

23.2.5 The majority of households have an occupancy rating for bedrooms of -1, accounting for 80.4% of households. This is broadly comparable with local comparator areas, although slightly below regional (83.7%) and national (83.4%) levels. Households with an occupancy rating of -2 or less account for 19.6% of households, higher than regional (16.4%) and national (16.6%) averages and broadly aligned with Slough Borough Council (20.8%). This suggests slightly greater levels of under-occupancy than are evident across the wider region.

23.2.6 For further information see Table 24.2 below.

Table 24.2: Langley Housing Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Number of Households					
Total Number of Households	11,315	80,047	52,421	7,230,563	23,434,230
Household Size					
1 Person in Household	21.0%	24.6%	22.8%	28.8%	30.1%
2 People in Household	21.9%	25.4%	22.8%	32.1%	34.0%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
3 People in Household	19.3%	18.5%	18.8%	16.7%	16.0%
4 People in Household	21.9%	17.0%	18.2%	14.1%	12.9%
5 People in Household	8.7%	7.9%	8.9%	5.2%	4.5%
6 People in Household	4.1%	3.6%	4..5%	1.8%	1.5%
7 People in Household	1.5%	1.5%	1.9%	0.7%	0.5%
8 or More People in Household	1.5%	1.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%
Accommodation Type					
Detached	17.6%	12.7%	10.4%	17.0%	22.9%
Semi-detached	29.8%	34.0%	29.6%	23.5%	31.5%
Terraced	24.8%	21.3%	26.3%	21.3%	23.0%
In a purpose-built block of flats or tenement	25.7%	27.0%	29.6%	28.6%	17.1%
Part of a converted or shared house, including bedsits	0.9%	2.9%	2.7%	7.1%	3.5%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Part of another converted building, for example, former school, church or warehouse	0.2%	0.8%	0.4%	1.0%	0.8%
In a commercial building, for example, in an office building, hotel or over a shop	0.5%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	0.8%
A caravan or other mobile or temporary structure	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Accommodation Tenure					
Owner-Occupied	56.5%	48.5%	48.4%	45.2%	61.3%
Social Rented	20.3%	15.4%	19.6%	23.1%	17.1%
Privately Rented	22.1%	34.6%	30.7%	30.0%	20.5%
Shared Ownership	1.0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	1.0%
Living Rent Free	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms (Total)					
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -1	80.4%	78.0%	79.2%	83.7%	83.4%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Occupancy Rating for Bedrooms: -2 or less	19.6%	22.0%	20.8%	16.4%	16.6%
Household Composition					
One-person Household	20.9%	24.5%	22.8%	28.9%	30.1%
Single Family Household	66.0%	59.7%	63.6%	61.5%	63.0%
Other Household Types	13.1%	15.7%	13.7%	9.7%	6.9%

23.3 Langley Economic Baseline Data

Economic Activity

23.3.1 Langley has 22,450 working-age residents and demonstrates relatively strong economic participation. Around 60.9% of working-age residents are economically active, slightly exceeding the proportions recorded across comparator areas. Unemployment stands at 4.1%, lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (4.8%) and Slough Borough Council (4.4%), although above regional (3.3%) and national (2.9%) levels.

Qualifications

23.3.2 The qualifications profile is comparatively strong. Around 41.6% of residents hold Level 4 qualifications or above, exceeding the Site-Specific Health Study Area (33.9%), Slough Borough Council (34.8%) and England (33.9%), and broadly aligned with the regional average (41.3%). Residents with no formal qualifications account for 16.3% of the population, lower than local and national comparator areas. Qualification levels at Levels 1 to 3 are broadly comparable with wider benchmarks. Overall, the data indicates relatively high levels of educational attainment.

Occupation

23.3.3 The occupational structure reflects a relatively strong representation of professional occupations. Professional occupations account for 23.6% of employment, exceeding the proportions recorded within the Site-Specific Health Study Area (14.8%), Slough Borough Council (18.9%) and England (20.3%), and broadly aligned with the regional average. Managers, directors and senior officials account for 12.5% of employment, while associate professional and technical occupations represent 11.9%. Operational occupations, including process, plant and machine operatives (8.1%) and elementary occupations (11.8%), are less prevalent than within the wider Site-Specific Health Study Area. Overall, the occupational profile suggests a workforce with a relatively strong professional component.

Car or Van Availability

23.3.4 Vehicle availability is relatively high within Langley. Only 15.5% of households have no access to a car or van, substantially lower than the Site-Specific Health Study Area (21.8%), Slough Borough Council (20.3%), the wider region (29.5%) and England (23.5%). More than two-fifths of households (43.2%) have access to two or more vehicles, including 12.3% with access to three or more vehicles. This indicates comparatively high levels of private vehicle ownership.

Industry

23.3.5 Employment is distributed across a range of sectors. Wholesale and retail trade, including repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, represents the largest employment sector, accounting for 13.2% of employment and broadly aligning with comparator areas. Transport and storage accounts for 12.6% of employment, substantially exceeding regional (4.8%) and national (5.0%) levels, highlighting the importance of this sector to the local economy. Human health and social work activities represent 12.2% of employment, broadly comparable with local comparator areas. Overall, the employment profile reflects a diverse economy with a notable concentration in transport-related industries alongside retail and health-related employment.

23.3.6 For further information see Table 24.3 below.

Table 24.3: Langley Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Working Age Residents					
Total Number of Working Age Residents (aged 16-64)	22,450	160,219	103,613	11,811,043	36,605,551

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Economic Activity					
Economically Active	60.9%	60.3%	60.1%	58.5%	55.7%
Unemployed	4.1%	4.8%	4.4%	3.3%	2.9%
Highest Level of Qualification					
No Formal Qualifications	16.3%	20.1%	20.1%	15.8%	18.1%
Level 1 and Entry Level Qualifications	9.7%	11.5%	10.7%	8.8%	9.7%
Level 2 Qualifications	11.5%	12.1%	12.1%	12.0%	13.3%
Apprenticeship	3.9%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	5.3%
Level 3 Qualifications	13.6%	13.3%	13.6%	15.3%	16.9%
Level 4 Qualifications or Above	41.6%	33.9%	34.8%	41.3%	33.9%
Other Qualifications	3.5%	4.7%	4.4%	2.9%	2.8%
Occupation					
Managers, Directors and Senior Officials	12.5%	11.2%	9.9%	14.8%	12.9%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
Professional Occupations	23.6%	14.8%	18.9%	23.5%	20.3%
Associate Professional and Technical Occupations	11.9%	11.5%	11.0%	14.8%	13.3%
Administrative and Secretarial Occupations	9.9%	10.4%	9.2%	8.9%	9.3%
Skilled Trades Occupations	6.9%	9.2%	8.5%	8.8%	10.2%
Caring, Leisure and Other Service Occupations	8.3%	8.4%	9.3%	8.4%	9.3%
Sales and Customer Service Occupations	7.1%	8.6%	8.3%	6.6%	7.5$
Process, Plant and Machine Operatives	8.1%	9.8%	10.4%	5.3%	6.9%
Elementary Occupations	11.8%	16.1%	14.6%	9.0%	10.5%
Car or Van Availability					
1 Car or Van in Household	41.3%	42.5%	42.6%	40.6%	41.3%
2 Cars or Vans in Household	30.9%	25.3%	27.0%	22.1%	26.1%
3 or More Cars or Vans in Household	12.3%	10.4%	10.1%	7.9%	9.1%

Measure	Community Area: Langley	Site-Specific Health Study Area	Local Authority: Slough Borough Council	Regional Health Study Area: London and South East	National Health Study Area: England
No Cars or Vans in Household	15.5%	21.8%	20.3%	29.5%	23.5%
Industry (top 3)					
Wholesale and Retail Trade; Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles	13.2%	14.5%	14.4%	13.1%	15.0%
Transport and Storage	12.6%	15.7%	12.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Human Health and Social Work Activities	12.2%	10.1%	13.3%	13.4%	14.6%

24 Local Health Study Area

24.1 Health and Wellbeing Baseline Data

Life Expectancy

24.1.1 Life expectancy across the Local Health Study Area is generally higher than the England average of 80.0 years for males and 83.8 years for females. Richmond upon Thames and Elmbridge record the highest life expectancy, while Buckinghamshire also performs favourably. In contrast, Slough records lower life expectancy than both regional and national comparators, at 78.5 years for males and 82.9 years for females.

Mortality

24.1.2 Mortality outcomes broadly reflect life expectancy patterns. Under-75 mortality from all causes is lowest in Elmbridge (200.8 per 100,000 population) and Richmond upon Thames (212.4), and generally below the England average (321.0) across the Local Health Study Area. Slough records notably higher mortality rates, including for cancer, cardiovascular disease and respiratory disease. Preventable mortality is also comparatively low in Richmond upon Thames (82.7 per 100,000 population) and Elmbridge (93.0), compared with England (145.8). Infant mortality is generally aligned with or below national levels, although higher rates are evident in Slough (6.9 per 1,000 live births) and Hounslow (4.8). Suicide rates are typically lower than regional and national averages.

Disease and Poor Health

24.1.3 Health conditions vary across the Local Health Study Area. Estimated diabetes diagnosis rates are higher than the England average (78.0%) in Slough (88.4%), Hounslow (84.1%), Spelthorne (83.2%) and Hillingdon (82.6%). Asthma prevalence is generally lower than regional and national averages. Alcohol-related hospital admissions are elevated in Ealing, Hounslow and Spelthorne, while tuberculosis incidence is notably higher in Ealing, Slough and Hounslow compared with England. Rates of new STI diagnoses are also higher in several London boroughs, particularly Wandsworth and Ealing.

Child Development, Education and Key Risk Factors

24.1.4 Child health and educational outcomes are generally favourable. Attainment 8 scores exceed the England average across all authorities, with the highest scores recorded in Richmond upon Thames (59.1) and Elmbridge (55.8). Rates of children living in low-income families are generally lower than the England average, particularly in Richmond upon Thames, Elmbridge and Windsor and Maidenhead, although higher levels are evident in Slough and Hounslow. Childhood obesity exceeds the England average in Slough, Ealing and Hounslow, while substantially lower rates are recorded in Richmond upon Thames and Elmbridge. Under-18 conception rates and smoking at the time of delivery are consistently below national averages across the Local Health Study Area.

Adult Health and Wellbeing

24.1.5 Adult health and wellbeing indicators are generally positive. Smoking prevalence is lower than the England average across all authorities, while levels of physical activity are generally high, particularly in Richmond upon Thames, Elmbridge and Wandsworth. The prevalence of adults who are overweight (including obesity) is lower than the England average in most authorities, although higher rates are recorded in Spelthorne and Slough. Depression prevalence is also generally lower than regional and national averages.

Older People Risk Factors

24.1.6 Outcomes for older people are generally favourable. Hip fracture rates among people aged 65 and over are lower than the England average across most of the Local Health Study Area, particularly in Wandsworth, Runnymede and Richmond upon Thames. Slough records a notably higher rate. Estimated dementia diagnosis rates vary across the Local Health Study Area but are broadly comparable with regional and national benchmarks overall.

Table 25.1: Health and Wellbeing Baseline Data

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Life Expectancy (1 year range)															
Male		81.6	81.2	81.2	83.6	78.5	81.2	81.0	81.3	83.1	80.8	82.2	81.1	80.9	80.0
Female		85.8	84.8	85.1	87.2	82.9	85.3	85.2	85.3	86.8	85.2	85.4	85.1	84.7	83.8
Mortality															
Infant Mortality (per 1,000 live births)		2.5	3.6	4.8	1.5	6.9	1.2	4.2	2.9	2.3	2.9	3.2	3.3	3.2	4.2
Under 75 Mortality Rate (1 year range) (per 100,000 population)	All causes	274.6	281.4	273.1	212.4	391.7	270.9	280.5	262.6	200.8	284.6	248.9	282.1	287.0	321.0
	Cancer	96.6	104.9	101.9	74.4	133.5	104.3	109.1	102.4	81.8	96.7	101.6	100.8	109.6	114.6
	Cardiovascular	60.7	73.5	64.5	48.8	91.2	51.1	50.1	46.8	34.1	66.3	52.0	69.4	59.1	71.5
	Liver Disease	17.1	17.1	17.2	14.1	26.0	13.1	27.5	-	12.0	16.6	11.9	15.7	16.4	19.4

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
	Respiratory Disease	23.1	25.4	20.3	21.3	39.3	22.9	38.7	33.8	9.7	26.6	15.4	25.8	25.2	31.5
	Causes Considered Preventable	119.8	122.1	120.8	82.7	161.7	97.7	120.7	122.3	93.0	120.0	107.5	126.1	122.1	145.8
Mortality Rate (1 year range) (per 100,00 populatio n)	All causes	772	834	808	665	1,017	795	808	831	716	856	773	828	845	913
	Cancer	193.4	208.0	230.3	171.9	237.6	205.3	214.5	204.0	188.4	213.5	212.1	216.8	227.4	238.4
	Cardiovascu lar	206.4	209.4	181.3	151.7	253.8	179.5	182.5	167.2	151.9	203.0	172.3	204.2	190.8	211.9
	Dementia and Alzheimer's Disease	102.5	106.1	99.3	84.4	103.6	118.4	95.5	117.4	115.7	108.7	101.7	105.1	109.7	115.8
	Liver Disease	26.3	22.3	30.0	18.1	35.7	17.4	34.8	17.9	20.5	26.5	16.2	22.5	22.7	25.7
	Respiratory Disease	81.3	107.4	98.5	75.1	137.7	96.1	107.7	130.4	76.2	90.0.	79.1	96.8	97.7	110.8
	Causes Considered Preventable (under 75)	119.8	122.1	120.8	82.7	161.7	97.7	120.7	122.3	93.0	120.0	107.5	126.1	122.1	145.8

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Mortality Rate from Cancer (1 year range) (per 100,000 population)	All Cancer	193.4	208.0	230.3	171.9	237.6	205.3	214.5	204.0	188.4	213.5	212.1	216.8	227.4	238.4
	Lung	35.9	41.4	41.4	32.0	47.7	33.4	39.9	39.6	31.1	38.6	35.0	41.1	39.5	46.4
	Breast (Females)	24.7	32.5	30.9	27.5	20.9	25.2	35.8	35.6	26.5	27.1	32.8	28.8	30.8	30.3
	Prostrate (Males)	39.8	47.7	39.7	40.2	42.5	33.5	34.8	44.9	31.3	42.4	40.4	39.3	40.8	43.0
	Colorectal	21.1	25.2	21.6	21.9	28.8	22.9	21.1	24.1	20.3	24.8	23.1	22.9	25.2	25.5
	Leukaemia and Lymphoma	20.2	16.7	20.9	16.8	22.2	17.1	20.9	17.0	17.8	21.1	20.0	20.0	20.2	20.3
	Pancreatic	13.9	13.1	12.4	16.3	14.2	12.6	17.9	19.0	13.0	13.9	14.2	14.7	15.4	15.2
	Oesophageal	6.8	8.7	10.4	7.6	10.0	7.4	9.1	12.0	9.9	5.9	9.2	8.1	10.3	11.4
	Liver	9.7	11.4	10.7	6.4	11.6	7.9	7.0	8.4	5.5	9.8	8.6	9.6	8.3	9.2
	Bladder	6.6	4.7	7.2	5.9	5.4	8.3	6.9	7.1	10.4	7.4	8.3	6.7	8.0	8.6
	Stomach	5.4	3.8	4.7	5.5	5.2	4.4	5.3	8.2	5.7	5.2	4.2	5.5	4.2	5.2
Winter Mortality Index (%)		4.6%	12.3 %	1.6%	3.5%	9.5%	14.3 %	10.2 %	15.1 %	10.0 %	17.0 %	10.4 %	10.3 %	8.6%	8.1%

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Suicide Rate (per 100,000 population)		8.4	7.8	7.2	9.6	9.4	10.2	10.2	10.3	9.3	5.7	9.7	7.5	10.4	10.9
Disease and Poor Health															
Estimated Diabetes Diagnosis Rate (%)		79.0 %	82.6 %	84.1 %	55.5 %	88.4 %	66.1 %	83.2 %	76.1 %	60.7 %	60.9 %	-	71.4 %	75.2 %	78.0 %
Asthma QOF Prevalence (6+ years) (%)		5.2%	5.2%	4.5%	4.9%	5.2%	5.9%	5.6%	5.5%	5.4%	4.5%	6.5%	4.7%	6.5%	6.6%
Admission Episodes (per 100,000 population)	Alcohol-Specific Conditions (under 18 years)	13.6	17.4	7.5	10.6	-	-	22.6	-	-	10.2	-	13.6	24.5	22.6
	Alcohol Related Conditions (Narrow)	628	525	590	367	459	389	571	478	378	371	432	403	429	504

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Emergency Hospital Admissions for Intentional Self-Harm	49.0	61.4	67.6	80.9	65.1	82.3	94.1	58.6	74.7	46.6	113.9	51.7	125.4	117.0
TB Incidence (three year average) (per 100,000 population)	33.6	24.4	31.5	4.6	32.8	5.9	9.8	3.3	4.3	11.2	6.6	18.9	5.9	8.5
New STI Diagnoses (excluding chlamydia aged 24 years and under) (per 100,000 population)	862	483	588	501	539	337	358	297	289	1,383	314	1,050	317	441
Child Development, Education and Key Risk Factors														
Under 18s Conception Rate (per 1,000 population)	6.7	10.2	7.7	5.1	9.2	6.9	11.4	9.7	7.3	8.9	6.7	10.0	11.3	13.9
Low Birth Weight of Term Babies	4.2%	3.9%	4.1%	2.6%	4.9%	2.9%	2.9%	2.2%	1.8%	2.2%	2.6%	3.5%	2.6%	3.0%
Smoking Status at Time of Delivery (%)	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	3.9%	4.9%	4.9%	4.5%	4.5%	4.5%	3.9%	4.5%	3.3%	5.7%	6.1%

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Average Attainment 8 Score		52.5	50.1	50.6	59.1	49.4	51.6	48.1	48.4	55.8	52.7	51.2	50.7	47.0	46.0
Child in Absolute Low Income Families (Under 16s)		15.7 %	15.1 %	16.5 %	5.2%	19.3 %	7.7%	11.2 %	10.5 %	5.6%	12.6 %	11.0 %	15.6 %	13.0 %	19.8 %
Child in Relative Low Income Families (Under 16s)		15.7 %	15.1 %	16.5 %	5.2%	19.3 %	7.7%	11.2 %	10.5 %	5.6%	12.6 %	11.0 %	15.6 %	13.0 %	19.8 %
Physical Activity in Children – one hour+ per day (5-16 years)		-	44.6 %	46.8 %	50.4 %	35.8 %	55.1 %	-	58.1 %	59.3 %	56.6 %	48.1 %	47.1 %	49.5 %	49.1 %
Year 6 Prevalence of Obesity (10-11 years) (%)		23.9 %	21.3 %	23.6 %	12.1 %	25.4 %	15.4 %	18.2 %	58.4 %	13.1 %	19.0 %	17.3 %	23.2 %	19.2 %	22.2 %
16-17 year old NEETS		1.1%	3.4%	1.4%	1.3%	3.4%	1.7%	-	-	-	2.8%	2.4%	2.0%	3.6%	3.4%
Hospital admissions (per	Asthma (under 19 years)	149.4	194.6	140.3	129.8	61.3	40.8	123.4	50.9	112.8	105.7	102.0	164.2	99.4	138.8

Measure		Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
100,000 population)	Mental Health Conditions (under 18 years)	43.1	67.4	29.5	68.3	22.3	43.8	66.7	84.9	59.4	68.6	62.7	63.4	80.9	80.2
	A Result of Self-Harm (10-24 years)	124.7	138.6	142.9	194.7	152.4	215.4	-	-	-	125.8	314.1	125.6	307.7	266.6
	Substance Misuse (15-24 years)	30.3	47.3	33.0	58.3	-	-	34.5	-	34.4	27.5	-	43.5	46.6	47.4
	Dental Caries (0-5 years)	335.8	362.6	282.8	117.8	-	-	206.5	203.5	113.5	230.5	-	290.5	94.5	207.2
Adults Health and Wellbeing															
Smoking Prevalence in Adults (aged 18+) (%)		7.4%	10.6 %	8.1%	9.3%	6.8%	6.7%	10.8 %	7.1%	9.0%	8.5%	8.3%	10.2 %	9.4%	10.4 %
Physical Activity in Adults – Active: At Least 150 Minutes a Week		67.5 %	57.9 %	60.5 %	75.3 %	53.5 %	70.9 %	67.6 %	71.6 %	75.1 %	76.3 %	70.4 %	65.9 %	67.4 %	64.6 %

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Overweight (Including Obesity) Prevalence in Adults (18+ years) (%)	59.0 %	62.7 %	61.0 %	43.1 %	65.3 %	59.3 %	68.3 %	58.4 %	55.6 %	51.3 %	63.1 %	57.4 %	63.0 %	64.6 %
Depression: QOF Prevalence	7.4%	10.6 %	7.4%	11.6 %	10.3 %	12.7 %	-	-	-	10.4 %	13.5 %	10.3 %	14.9 %	14.3 %
Older People Risk Factors														
Hip Fractures in People Aged 65+ (per 100,000 population)	461	494	434	434	656	481	481	404	568	384	495	468	518	563
Estimated Dementia Diagnosis Rate (aged 65+) (per 100 population)	67.2	68.1	63.0	66.6	61.6	67.8	67.2	57.4	67.0	77.9	59.3	68.3	64.2	66.3
OHID Classification														
	The local authority performs significantly better than the England average. The difference is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.													
	The local authority performs similarly to the England average. There is no statistically significant difference between the local authority and the benchmark.													
	The local authority performs significantly worse than the England average. The difference is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.													

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
	No comparison has been undertaken, for example where data are unavailable or a comparison is not considered appropriate.													

24.2 Demographic and Economic Baseline Data

Population

24.2.1 The Local Health Study Area comprises a mix of large London boroughs and smaller South East authorities. Buckinghamshire has the largest projected population in 2047 (641,480), followed by Ealing (399,143), Wandsworth (377,779) and Hillingdon (351,032). Population growth is forecast across all authorities, ranging from 5.8% in Slough to 14.7% in Wandsworth. Growth projections are broadly aligned with regional and national trends, with particularly strong increases forecast in Wandsworth (14.7%), Buckinghamshire (14.4%), Hillingdon (12.9%) and Runnymede (12.5%), indicating continued population growth across the Local Health Study Area over the assessment period.

Main Language

24.2.2 The Local Health Study Area exhibits notable variation in linguistic diversity. The London boroughs, particularly Ealing, Hounslow and Slough, have lower proportions of residents reporting English as their main language (69.7%, 72.2% and 72.9% respectively) than London (79.5%), South East (93.1%) and England (91.0%). These authorities also record relatively high proportions of residents reporting Asian languages as their main language, ranging from 15.2% in Ealing and Hounslow to 15.9% in Slough. In contrast, Richmond upon Thames (89.5%), Windsor and Maidenhead (91.9%), Elmbridge (93.6%) and Buckinghamshire (92.9%) have language profiles more closely aligned with regional and national patterns, with English reported as the main language by the majority of residents.

Average Income

24.2.3 Average income varies considerably across the Local Health Study Area. The highest annual gross pay is recorded in Wandsworth (£81,801), Elmbridge (£79,026) and Richmond upon Thames (£75,590), substantially exceeding the London (£55,033), South East (£44,556) and England (£41,038) averages. Windsor and Maidenhead (£57,666) also records earnings above regional and national benchmarks. In contrast, lower average incomes are reported in Slough (£39,266) and Hounslow (£42,735), although most authorities exceed the England average. Overall, the Local Health Study Area includes several areas of comparatively high income, particularly within south-west London and Surrey.

Claimant Count

24.2.4 Claimant count levels generally reflect the relative size of each authority, with the largest claimant populations recorded in Ealing (17,435), Hillingdon (10,880), Buckinghamshire (10,665), Hounslow (10,335) and Wandsworth (10,115). Lower claimant counts are evident in the smaller authorities of Runnymede (1,520), Elmbridge (2,060), Spelthorne (2,425) and Windsor and Maidenhead (2,530). Overall, claimant counts are concentrated within the larger urban authorities, particularly across west London, reflecting their larger working-age populations.

Table 25.2: Demographic and Economic Baseline Data

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Population														
Population Projections 2047 (2022-based)	399,143 (+7.8%)	351,032 (+12.9%)	314,426 (+8.0%)	208,428 (+6.8%)	168,692 (+5.8%)	164,804 (+6.4%)	113,117 (+9.1%)	100,215 (+12.5%)	155,824 (+11.1%)	377,779 (+14.7%)	641,480 (+14.4%)	9,974,679 (+12.5%)	10,636,045 (+13.3%)	64,388,886 (+12.7%)
Main Language														
English	69.7%	78.2%	72.2%	89.5%	72.9%	91.9%	90.2%	92.3%	93.6%	84.5%	92.9%	79.5%	93.1%	91.0%
Other UK Language	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
French	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	1.3%	0.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Portuguese	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	1.4%	0.3%	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%
Other European Language (EU, non-EU, non-national)	9.3%	5.4%	8.4%	4.6%	8.6%	3.2%	4.0%	3.5%	2.9%	5.9%	2.9%	7.1%	3.0%	3.5%
Russian	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Turkish	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.2%
Arabic	2.5%	0.8%	1.1%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.9%	0.2%	0.4%
Asian Language	15.2 %	13.3 %	15.2 %	3.0%	15.9 %	3.3%	4.2%	2.4%	1.9%	4.6%	3.3%	8.2%	2.6%	3.7%
African Language	1.3%	1.0%	1.0%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	0.1%	1.1%	0.2%	0.4%
Sign Language	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Other Language	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Average Income (Mean)														
Annual Pay – Gross (£), 2025	£45,109	£47,268	£42,735	£75,590	£39,266	£57,666	£45,983	£48,025	£79,026	£81,801	£47,678	£55,033	£44,556	£41,038
Claimant Count														

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Claimant Count as a Proportion of Residents Aged 16-64 (July 2026)	17,435	10,880	10,335	3,285	6,610	2,530	2,425	1,520	2,060	10,115	10,665	353,355	185,725	1,489,570

24.3 Crime Baseline Data

24.3.1 The 11 Local Planning Authorities that make up the Local Health Study Area are situated within following three Police Force Areas:

- Metropolitan Police Force Area: Ealing, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Richmon upon Thames and Wandsworth.
- Thames Valley Police Force: Slough, Windsor and Maidenhead and Buckinghamshire.
- Surrey Police Force: Spelthorne, Runnymede and Elmbridge.

24.3.2 Crime patterns vary across the Local Health Study Area, reflecting differences between the London boroughs and surrounding South East authorities. Theft offences represent the largest crime category in most areas, accounting for between 26.8% of recorded offences in Spelthorne and 44.9% in Richmond upon Thames. The proportion of theft offences is generally higher in the London boroughs, particularly Richmond upon Thames (44.9%), Wandsworth (44.2%), Hillingdon (40.1%) and Ealing (38.8%), compared with the England average (31.5%).

24.3.3 Violence against the person is also a major offence category, accounting for over one-third of recorded crime in Buckinghamshire (40.6%), Slough (38.7%), Runnymede (38.1%) and Elmbridge (37.7%). Robbery offences are more prevalent in the London boroughs, particularly Wandsworth (3.0%) and Ealing (2.8%), while surrounding authorities generally record lower proportions. Public order offences account for a greater proportion of recorded crime in Spelthorne (11.8%), Runnymede (11.0%) and Elmbridge (10.5%) than in London (6.2%).

24.3.4 In absolute terms, the highest volumes of recorded crime occur within the larger London boroughs, including Ealing (31,075 offences), Hillingdon (30,158), Hounslow (26,167) and Wandsworth (25,804). Lower crime totals are recorded within the smaller district authorities, including Runnymede (6,600), Elmbridge (7,310) and Spelthorne (8,066). Overall, crime within the London boroughs is characterised by a higher proportion of theft and robbery offences, while surrounding South East authorities record relatively higher proportions of violence against the person and public order offences.

Table 25.3: Crime Baseline Data

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Crime														
Violence Against the Person	32.6%	28.9%	33.5%	26.4%	38.7%	36.1%	37.3%	38.1%	37.7%	28.9%	40.6%	27.1%	38.9%	37.6%
Sexual Offences	3.3%	3.2%	3.0%	3.1%	3.5%	3.6%	3.8%	3.7%	3.6%	3.4%	4.9%	3.0%	4.4%	4.2%
Robbery	2.8%	2.4%	2.4%	2.3%	1.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	0.9%	3.0%	1.1%	3.5%	1.2%	1.7%
Theft Offences	38.8%	40.1%	38.5%	44.9%	32.3%	32.0%	26.8%	27.7%	29.4%	44.2%	28.2%	46.0%	29.%	31.5%
Criminal Damage and Arson	6.8%	6.5%	7.2%	9.3%	7.9%	8.7%	9.2%	8.1%	8.7%	6.0%	8.2%	6.0%	9.1%	8.6%
Drug Offences	6.9%	5.3%	5.6%	5.0%	4.5%	6.1%	5.2%	6.3%	5.1%	5.5%	4.5%	5.9%	4.3%	4.5%
Possession of Weapons Offences	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.5%	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%	1.2%	1.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	1.3%	1.2%
Public Order Offences	6.8%	6.6%	7.5%	7.2%	8.6%	9.9%	11.8%	11.0%	10.5%	6.8%	8.9%	6.2%	8.6%	8.2%
Miscellaneous Crimes Against Society	1.2%	6.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.7%	1.9%	3.5%	2.9%	2.7%	1.4%	2.9%	1.4%	2.7%	2.5%
Total Recorded Crime	**31,075**	**30,158**	**26,167**	**11,267**	**14,784**	**9,081**	**8,066**	**6,600**	**7,310**	**25,804**	**11,478**	**925,694**	**679,621**	**4,891,754**

Measure	Ealing	Hillingdon	Hounslow	Richmond upon Thames	Slough	Windsor and Maidenhead	Spelthorne	Runnymede	Elmbridge	Wandsworth	Buckinghamshire	London	South East	England
Key														
	Lower than national average (>5% below)													
	Similar to national average (within ±5%)													
	Higher than national average (>5% above)													

Appendix 15.1

Landscape, Townscape, and Visual Methodology

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 15.1 Landscape, Townscape and Visual Methodology

Contents

1.	**Introduction**		**1**
	1.1	Definition of Landscape	1
	1.2	Professional Standards and Guidance	1
	1.3	The Context of Townscape and Visual Effects in the Urban Environment	3
	1.4	Approach to the Assessment	3
2.	**Methodology**		**5**
	2.1	Baseline Data Collection and Review	5
	2.2	Assessment Stages	6
	2.3	Methodology for the Assessment of Landscape, and Townscape Effects	7
	2.4	Assessment of Effects on Views and Visual Amenity	19
	2.5	Landscape and Visual Mitigation Measures	28
	2.6	Assessment of Level of Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects	28
	2.7	Assessment of Night-time Landscape, Townscape and Visual Effects	29
	2.8	Assessment of Effects on Tranquillity	31
	2.9	Methodology for the Assessment of Cumulative Landscape and Visual Effects	32
3.	**Technical Methodologies**		**36**
	3.1	Zone of Visual Influence and Zone of Theoretical Visibility	36
	3.2	Baseline Views Photography	37
4.	**Standard LTVIA Glossary and Abbreviations**		**38**
	4.1	LTVIA Glossary	38
	4.2	Standard Abbreviations	41

Tables

Table 15.1.1: Landscape Designations 8
Table 15.1.2: Factors which Influence Landscape, Townscape Value 9
Table 15.1.3: Defining Value 11
Table 15.1.4: Receptor Susceptibility to Change 12

Table 15.1.5: Indicative Landscape Receptor Sensitivity 13
Table 15.1.6: Indicative Size/Scale Criteria 15
Table 15.1.7: Geographical Extent Criteria 16
Table 15.1.8: Reversibility Criteria 16
Table 15.1.9: Indicative Criteria for Magnitude of Landscape Effect with Direction of Effect 17
Table 15.1.10: Value of Views Criteria 20
Table 15.1.11: Criteria for Visual Receptor Susceptibility to Change 21
Table 15.1.12: Indicative Criteria for Visual Receptor Sensitivity 23
Table 15.1.13: Indicative Size/Scale of Change 24
Table 15.1.14: Indicative Geographic Extent Criteria 26
Table 15.1.15: Indicative Criteria for Magnitude and Type of Visual Effect 27
Table 15.1.16: Levels of Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects 28
Table 15.1.17: Lighting Zones 30
Table 15.1. 18: LTVIA Glossary 38

1. Introduction

1.1 Definition of Landscape

1.1.1 **Landscape** was defined at the European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000): "The landscape is part of the land, as perceived by local people or visitors, which evolves through time as a result of being acted upon by natural forces and human beings." (***The European Landscape Convention - Council of Europe Landscape Convention (coe.int)***)

1.1.2 Landscape was also defined by Swanwick and Land Use Consultants, 2002, as follows:

"Landscape is about the relationship between people and place. It provides the setting for our day-to-day lives. The term does not mean just special or designated landscapes and it does not only apply to the countryside. Landscape can mean a small patch of urban wasteland as much as a mountain range, and an urban park as much as an expanse of lowland plain. It results from the way that different components of our environment – both natural (the influences of geology, soils, climate, flora and fauna) and cultural (the historical and current impact of land use, settlement, enclosure and other human interventions) – interact together and are perceived by us. People's perceptions turn land into the concept of landscape."

1.2 Professional Standards and Guidance

1.2.1 The Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LTVIA) will be undertaken and led by a chartered landscape architect at Stantec UK Limited (Stantec), a Registered Practice of the Landscape Institute (LI) and a corporate member of the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA).

1.2.2 Stantec's methodology for LTVIA is based on professional experience of landscape and visual appraisals and impact assessments, the **Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** (Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 3rd Edition, 2013) and its associated clarifications. In addition, the LTVIA methodology considers the principles set out in the following Landscape Institute technical notes and guidance:

- LI Technical Information Note 08/2015: **Landscape Character Assessmen**t (LI, February 2016)[1];

[1] Landscape Institute (2016) Landscape Character Assessment. Technical Information Note 08/2015. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Landscape Character Assessment TIN 08/2015 (Accessed: 27 August 2026)

- LI Technical Guidance Note 01/17 **Tranquillity – An Overview**, (LI, January 2017)[2];
- LI Technical Information Note 05/2017: Townscape Character Assessment (LI, revised April 2018)[3];
- LI Technical Guidance Note 06/19 **Visual Representation of Development Proposals** (LI, September 2019)[4] and the supporting Technical Information Notes: TIN 07/19 Visual Representation Glossary[5], TIN 08/19 Camera Auto Settings[6], and TIN 09/19 Earth Curvature[7].
- LI Technical Guidance Note 02/21: **Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations** (LI, February 2021)[8];
- CAP 1616: Airspace Design (Civil Aviation Authority, 2021)[9];
- CAP 1616i **Environmental Assessment Requirements and Guidance for Airspace Change Proposals** (Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), 2023)[10]; and
- LI Technical Guidance Note (LITGN-2024-01) **Notes on Clarifications on aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines on Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** (LI, 2024)[11];

[2] Landscape Institute (2017) Tranquillity: An Overview. Technical Guidance Note 01/17. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Tranquillity – An Overview (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[3] Landscape Institute (2018) Townscape Character Assessment. Technical Information Note 05/2017 (revised April 2018). London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Townscape Character Assessment (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[4] Landscape Institute (2019) Visual Representation of Development Proposals. Technical Guidance Note 06/19. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[5] Landscape Institute (2019) Visual Representation Glossary. Technical Information Note 07/19. London: Landscape Institute.

[6] Landscape Institute (2019) Camera Auto Settings. Technical Information Note 08/19. London: Landscape Institute.

[7] Landscape Institute (2019) Earth Curvature. Technical Information Note 09/19. London: Landscape Institute.

[8] Landscape Institute (2021) Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations. Technical Guidance Note 02/21. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[9] Civil Aviation Authority (2021) CAP 1616: Airspace Change Process (formerly Airspace Design). Gatwick: Civil Aviation Authority. Available at: CAP 1616 (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[10] Civil Aviation Authority (2023) CAP 1616i: Environmental Assessment Requirements and Guidance for Airspace Change Proposals. Gatwick: Civil Aviation Authority. Available at: CAP 1616i (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[11] Landscape Institute (2024) Notes and Clarifications on Aspects of the 3rd Edition Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3). LITGN-2024-01. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: LITGN-2024-01 (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

1.3 The Context of Townscape and Visual Effects in the Urban Environment

1.3.1 Within urban locations, there is a general level of expectation for regeneration, redevelopment and renewal; the efficient use of land to adapt and change; and the anticipation of change to views within the townscape taking place over time. In other words, an urban environment is not static; change and renewal is an integral part of that urban environment. Accordingly, the expected changing nature of the urban environment is taken into account within the LTVIA.

1.3.2 New buildings may create either beneficial or adverse effects upon the urban environment. However, the evaluation of the quality of architectural design and appearance of buildings is a subjective issue, and one which does not form part of the LTVIA process. Instead, it is assumed that the quality of the design of the proposals would be appropriate to the existing urban context, as set out in a separate Design and Access Statement for the proposed development. The LTVIA is therefore based on assessing the key design principles of the Proposed Development and the consequential effects upon townscape elements and townscape character.

1.3.3 Whether new development located within a townscape leads to a positive or adverse visual change may be largely subjective. The assessment of visual effects in the LTVIA has regard to the level of anticipated change and renewal of the urban environment, for example through the planned regeneration and development for an area, as set out in adopted local planning policies.

1.4 Approach to the Assessment

1.4.1 The **Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment**, (Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 3rd Edition, 2013) (**GLVIA3**) notes in paragraph 1.17, page 9, in reference to the European Union Directive 2011/92/EU (now as amended by 2014/52/EU):

"The Directive is clear that the emphasis is on the identification of likely significant environmental effects. This should embrace all types of effect and includes, for example, those that are positive/beneficial and negative/adverse, direct and indirect, and long and short term, as well as cumulative effects. Identifying significant effects stresses the need for an approach that is in proportion to the scale of the project that is being assessed and the nature of its likely effects. Judgement needs to be exercised at all stages in terms of the scale of investigation that is appropriate and proportional. This does not mean that effects should be ignored, or their importance minimised but that the assessment should be tailored to the particular circumstances in each case.'

1.4.2 On the 31st of December 2020, the UK left the European Union. The European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 provides the new constitutional framework for continuity of retained EU law in the UK. European Union Directive 2011/92/EU (now as amended by 2014/52/EU) is retained and, in UK law, is achieved through the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

1.4.3 The assessment of landscape and visual effects aims to be as objective as possible; however, professional judgements are required to be made, as **GLVIA3** explains in paragraph 2.23, page 21:

'Professional judgement is a very important part of LVIA. Whilst there is some scope for quantitative measurement of some relatively objective matters, for example the number of trees lost to construction… much of the assessment must rely on qualitative judgements, for example about what effect the introduction of a new development of land use change may have on visual amenity, or about the significance of change in the character in the landscape and whether it is positive or negative.'

1.4.4 In accordance with guidance, the LTVIA will consider the effects on landscape as an environmental resource, including landscape character and landscape features (landscape receptors), townscape character and townscape features (townscape receptors) and people's views / visual amenity (visual receptors), as separate assessment components. The LTVIA will also identify and assess the negative and positive effects (type of effects) and significance of change arising from the Proposed Development on landscape and visual receptors.

1.4.5 The assessment of landscape and visual effects makes comparison with the **baseline year of 2026**, and the assessment periods comprise: i) during the construction; ii) during operation (i.e. on completion of the development); and iii) 15 years after completion of the development, when the mitigation planting is assumed to have successfully established and grown to provide effective mitigation. The assessment of visual effects in a winter period is considered to represent the worst-case visibility scenario, due to deciduous vegetation not being in leaf and therefore the Site or Proposed Development would be most visible.

1.4.6 The LTVIA will assess the maximum parameters which are being sought to be secured as part of the planning application, and which will be set out on the emerging Parameter Plans.

1.4.7 In addition to the parameter, effects on landscape and visual receptors from overflight under 7,000ft resulting from the Proposed Development will be assessed during operation of the development.

1.4.8 The LTVIA will be prepared as part of an Environmental Statement (ES) and is submitted to accompany the planning application.

2. Methodology

2.1 Baseline Data Collection and Review

Desktop Study

2.1.1 The initial step in LTVIA is to establish the baseline landscape and visual conditions. Background data is collected and reviewed to establish the baseline landscape and landscape character receptors and potential visual receptors. The data includes the nature of topography, landscape planning designations and published sources of landscape character or, where relevant, townscape character.

2.1.2 Typical information sources include:

- Ordnance Survey OpenData for mapping
- 1:25,000 OS Explorer, for example via Bing Maps, for a general map overview of the Site and surrounding area, as well as to review the Public Rights of Way network (bridleways, footpaths, byways, other routes), including names and locations of Long-Distance Route or National Trails, and for Open Access Land area locations and boundaries
- Google Earth Pro for aerial photography and Google Street View
- www.magic.defra.gov.uk for an initial review of statutory and non-statutory designations
- National Cycle Network https://www.sustrans.org.uk/
- Historic England
- National Planning Policy Framework (2026)[12]
- Local authority websites for Local Plans and Development Frameworks, including Area Action Plans if relevant
- National Character Area Profiles (Natural England, 2014)[13]

[12] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2026) National Planning Policy Framework. London: Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. Available at: National Planning Policy Framework (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

[13] Natural England (2024) *National Character Area Profiles*. Available at: National Character Area Profiles (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

- Regional, borough, district or local landscape character assessments and relevant supplementary design or planning guidance (SPD or SPG), and
- Relevant Conservation Area appraisals.

Landscape and Visual Survey and Photographic Record

2.1.3 The Site and surrounding area will be visited in 2026 and 2027 to undertake the landscape and visual survey in a winter, summer and night-time scenario, and to collect the photographic record of the visual baseline, to represent people's views from the selected assessment view locations. This exercise also enables the LTVIA assessor to:

- Determine the extent of visibility of the Site and any existing built form or structures;
- Determine the visibility of the Proposed Development, utilising the results from the ZTV plan to guide the field work;
- Gain further understanding of the landscape components which create the landscape character; and to
- Carry out the assessment of landscape and visual effects.

2.2 Assessment Stages

2.2.1 A three-stage assessment process will be adopted for the LTVIA, in accordance with the **Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** (Landscape Institute / Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 3rd Edition, 2013). Firstly, the sensitivity of receptors will be assessed. Secondly the magnitude of effects likely to result from the Proposed Development will be assessed. Lastly, the level of significance of the identified landscape or visual effect on the receptor will be assessed. The type of effect is also determined.

Type of Effects

2.2.2 The principal sources of change to landscape and townscape character / features and people's views and visual amenity, arise from the introduction of new built form and/or structures, and new, or changes to elements and character.

2.2.3 The changes that occur can be identified as **temporary** (e.g. those which occur during the construction period) or **permanent** changes (i.e. those which occur on and after the completion of construction works and those associated with the final development form).

2.2.4 Changes will be **direct**, or i**ndirect**. Direct effects are those which result directly from the development; whereas indirect, or secondary, effects may arise as a consequential change resulting from the development, for example: changes to offsite and downstream vegetation, because of alterations to a drainage regime.

Direction of Effects

2.2.5 Changes may be **beneficial** or **adverse**; and some changes may initially be adverse, but over time gradually improve. Beneficial effects have a **positive influence** on the receptor (enhancement); alternatively, adverse effects have a **negative influence** on the receptor (degradation).

2.2.6 It is possible that the type of effect may be judged to be **neutral**. Where a neutral type of effect is judged to occur for landscape receptors, there would be a change to the landscape features and/or characteristics, but the change would be entirely consistent or in keeping with the existing landscape character or landscape features, such that the existing character or features are maintained, and the change would not cause deterioration or enhancement of the character or features. Where a neutral type of effect is judged to occur for visual receptors, there would be a change to the composition of the view, but that change would be consistent or entirely in keeping with the existing elements of the baseline view, maintain the composition and quality of the existing baseline view, and would not enhance or deteriorate the baseline view.

2.3 Methodology for the Assessment of Landscape, and Townscape Effects

2.3.1 The assessment of landscape effects considers how the Proposed Development would affect the landscape / townscape features or components of the Site (the 'fabric', for example: landform; land use, scale and massing, urban grain, legibility, appearance, open spaces, amenity spaces, public realm, and green infrastructure features including trees, woodland and hedgerows; watercourses, ponds or other waterbodies), and the key characteristics which contribute to its distinctive character (the 'landscape or townscape character'). Additionally, the assessment considers effects upon the Long-Distance Walking Routes / Public Rights of Way / National Cycle Network Routes.

2.3.2 A methodical consideration of each effect upon each identified landscape receptor is undertaken, in order to determine the significance of effects, in terms of:

i. Value and susceptibility to change (**sensitivity** of the receptor); and

ii. Size / scale, geographical influence, duration and reversibility (**magnitude** of the landscape / townscape effect).

Sensitivity of Landscape, Townscape Receptors

2.3.3 The assessment of receptor sensitivity combines judgements on the value attributed to the receptor and the 'susceptibility to change' of the receptor to the specific type of development proposed.

Value of Landscape, Townscape Receptors

2.3.4 The value of landscape, townscape receptors is assessed, including landscape / townscape character and the individual features which contribute to that character. Landscapes, townscape may be valued at community, local, national, or international levels. Existing designations are taken as an indicator for value, and the value of undesignated landscapes / townscape is also considered. At the more detailed scale of the LTVIA study area, it may be found that the landscape value of a specific area may be different to that suggested by the broader formal designation.

2.3.5 Table 15.1.1 sets out the relative importance and value of landscape, townscape designations and provides generic descriptions.

Table 15.1.1: Landscape Designations

Typical Designation and Importance (Value)	Description
World Heritage Site *International (Very High)*	Unique sites, features or areas of international importance with settings of very high quality, and Outstanding Universal Values according to UNESCO criteria.
National Park, AONB, Conservation Area, curtilage of Grade I, II and II* Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest, Scheduled Monuments *National (High)*	Sites, features or areas of national importance with settings of high quality.
Non- statutory regional landscape designations, such as Special Landscape Areas or Areas of Great Landscape Value; Long Distance Routes / Paths / Trails, National Cycle Network (NCN) Routes *Regional (High or Medium)*	Sites, features or areas of regional importance with intact character. Areas of landscape identified as having importance at the regional level.

Typical Designation and Importance (Value)	Description
Non-statutory district or local landscape designations, such as Areas of Local Landscape Importance; Designated Public Open Space, Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) *District (Medium)*	Sites, features, or areas of importance at the district / local authority level.
Areas with no designation, local Public Right of Way *Local (Medium or Low)*	General countryside area valued at the local level.

2.3.6 Other factors which may influence value are set out in Table 15.1.2. This list is with reference to Table 1 within the Landscape Institutes **TGN 02/21: Assessing landscape value outside national designations**[14].

2.3.7 Where landscapes / townscapes are not designated, and where no other local authority guidance on value is available, an assessment is made by reference to the criteria in Table 15.1.2, reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Landscapes / townscapes may be judged to be of local authority or local community value on the basis of one or more of these factors and informed by the professional experience of the assessor. There may be circumstances where an undesignated landscape / townscape is judged to be of national value or equivalent to national value; conversely, there may be areas within designated landscapes / townscape which do not meet the designation criteria nor demonstrate the key characteristics or special qualities of the rest of the designated area. In such instances, the reasoning for value judgements is clearly set out.

Table 15.1.2: Factors which Influence Landscape, Townscape Value

Attribute	Criteria
Landscape Quality / Condition	Intactness or physical condition of the landscape of both the individual features and overall landscape structure.
Distinctiveness / Sense of Place	Sense of identify related to aesthetic and perceptual qualities which create distinctiveness.
Rarity	Rarity of landscape character areas, types or features.

[14] Landscape Institute (2021) Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations. Technical Guidance Note 02/21. London: Landscape Institute. Available at: Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations (Accessed: 27 August 2026).

Attribute	Criteria
Representativeness	Particular characteristic/feature/element considered an important example.
Cultural Interest	The presence of archaeological, historic or cultural heritage interest which contributes positively to the landscape.
Natural Heritage	Landscape with clear evidence of ecological, geological, geomorphological or physiographic interest which contributes positively to the landscape
Recreation	Evidence that the landscape experience forms an important part of recreational activity, e.g. as established in guidebooks.
Function	Landscape which performs a clearly identifiable and valuable function, particularly in the healthy functioning of the landscape
Perceptual (scenic quality)	General appeal of the landscape to the senses (primarily visual).
Perceptual (wildness and tranquillity)	Landscape with a strong perceptual value notable wildness, remoteness, tranquillity and/or dark sky
Associations	Relevant associations with notable figures, such as writers or artists, or events in history that contribute to landscape value.

2.3.8 An assessment of value for each receptor is made, informed by designations and based on an overview of the value criteria in Table 15.1.3. Where appropriate, key individual components of the landscape, townscape, including particular features, notable aesthetic and perceptual qualities, are considered in terms of importance in their own right, including whether or not they can realistically be replaced. They may also be judged on their contribution to the overall character and value of the wider landscape.

2.3.9 For example, an intact landscape, townscape in good condition, where scenic quality, tranquillity, and/or cultural heritage features make a particular contribution, or where there are important historical associations, is likely to be highly valued. Conversely, a degraded landscape, townscape in poor condition, with no scenic qualities or cultural interest is likely to be considered as low landscape value. Also, a Georgian terrace may have high value in its own right, but also be important because it forms part of a vista which contributes significantly to the townscape character.

2.3.10 Example criteria descriptions for the continuum from low value to very high value are provided in Table 15.1.3 **Defining Value**. These are not exhaustive and are provided as a guide to the assessor

Table 15.1.3: Defining Value

Level of value	Typical criteria descriptors
Very High	Designations and/or conservation interests: of international importance, i.e. UNESCO World Heritage Sites (WHS) which have been designated internationally due to their Outstanding Universal Importance, or a designated WHS Buffer.
High	An area possessing a notably distinctive sense of place and character, and / or attributes which make a fundamental contribution to the receptor or character. Indicators: • Designations and/or conservation interests: of national/regional importance. Valued for its contribution to a national landscape designation and / or a designated cultural heritage asset. Important characteristics and features recognised as forming intrinsic part of nationally designated landscape or regionally designated non-statutory landscape, townscape, or which form a fundamental part of the national or regional green infrastructure network. • Key characteristics and features: features which are prevalent within the landscape, townscape and are fundamental to defining the distinct landscape, townscape character of an area. Highly valued for its landscape, townscape character or high value assigned in published character assessment. • Distinctive individual or rare features and which contribute to a landscape, townscape character that has a notably strong sense of place. • Highly valued for its scenic quality. • Highly valued for its landscape or townscape character. • Character that has a clear sense of place • Landscape in good condition: a distinct landscape, townscape structure with strong pattern and intact features. • Few detractors or uncharacteristic features present. • Valued for contribution to recreational activity and / or part of a long-distance walking route / path / trail. • An area with high-quality materials in the public realm • Important cultural or historic associations. • Irreplaceable features or character.
Medium	An area with a moderately defined sense of place and character, and / or attributes which contribute to the receptor or character. Indicators:

Level of value	Typical criteria descriptors
	• Designations and/or conservation interests: local, district, or regional importance (e.g. Special Landscape Areas, Long Distance Walking Routes), designated Public Open Spaces. May be undesignated • Key characteristics and features: features that are mostly intact and contribute to the overall character of an area and / or provide some scenic quality and cultural interest. • Landscape features protected by local policy such as Tree Protection Orders. • Moderate condition: exhibits recognisable structure and characteristic patterns.. • Some detracting features present.
Low	An area with a weak sense of place or poorly defined character, and / or attributes which make some contribution to the receptor or character. Indicators: • Undesignated. • Key characteristics and features: features that are uncharacteristic, disjointed or weak character and / or which detract from the character of an area. • Condition: degraded structure with fragmented pattern and poor legibility of character. Typically, in poor condition. • Absence of distinctive individual or rare features. Character that has a poor sense of place, few scenic qualities and / or little cultural interest. • Contains a high level of discordant or detracting features which are notable and have a strong influence on the perception and quality of the landscape. Strongly influenced by detracting land uses and buildings

Susceptibility to Change of Landscape, Townscape Receptors

2.3.11 The assessment of susceptibility of landscape or townscape receptors to the type of change arising from the Proposed Development, is based upon the typical factors and criteria set out in Table 15.1.4.

Table 15.1.4: Receptor Susceptibility to Change

Susceptibility	Criteria
High	Little ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the

Susceptibility	Criteria
	baseline landscape or townscape and/or the achievement of landscape or townscape planning policies and strategies.
Medium	Some ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline landscape or townscape and/or the achievement of landscape or townscape planning policies and strategies.
Low	Substantial ability to accommodate the proposed development without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline landscape or townscape and/or the achievement of landscape or townscape planning policies and strategies.

Overall Judgement of Sensitivity of Landscape, Townscape Receptors

2.3.12 An overall assessment of sensitivity was made for each landscape receptor, based on a combined judgement of the above criteria, using the typical scales set out in Table 15.1.5.

Table 15.1.5: Indicative Landscape Receptor Sensitivity

Landscape Sensitivity	Description
Very High	Landscapes / townscape of very high international importance and rarity with no, or very limited, ability to accommodate the Proposed Development and / or which contains irreplaceable landscape features or character.
High	An area possessing a particularly distinctive sense of place and high-quality character, and / or attributes that contribute greatly to the good condition and quality of the landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character or the key characteristics of the published character, and with little ability to accommodate the proposed development and / or with irreplaceable features or character.
Medium	An area with a clearly defined sense of place and character, and / or attributes which provide some contribution to the moderate condition and quality of the landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character or the key characteristics of the published character, and with partial tolerance to change of the type proposed.

Landscape Sensitivity	Description
Low	An area with a weak sense of place, and/or in poor condition / quality and/or with a poorly defined character, and / or attributes which provide little contribution to the positive aspects of the landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character or the key characteristics of the published character, and with the ability to tolerate substantial change of the type proposed.

Magnitude of Landscape, Townscape Effects

2.3.13 Development proposals can create beneficial and/or adverse effects upon the landscape or townscape. However, the evaluation of the architectural design and appearance of buildings is a subjective issue, and one which does not form part of the LTVIA. The assessment of landscape, townscape and visual effects is based upon the scale, form and massing of Proposed Development as set out in the parameter plans, and the consequential effects upon landscape, landscape character, townscape, townscape character and people's views and visual amenity.

2.3.14 The magnitude of an effect is assessed in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and degree of reversibility.

Size/Scale of Landscape, Townscape Change

2.3.15 The size or scale of change upon a landscape or townscape receptor that is likely to be experienced as a result of the Proposed Development considers:

- The extent of elements that will be lost or added, the proportion of the total extent that the loss or addition represents and the contribution of that element to the character of the landscape, townscape, or for designated areas the contribution of that element to the special qualities and/or purpose of the designation.
- The degree to which aesthetic or perceptual aspects of the landscape or townscape are altered either by removal of existing components of the landscape, townscape or by the addition of new ones.
- Whether the effect changes the key characteristics of the landscape or townscape, which are critical to its distinctive character.

2.3.16 The size / scale of the landscape, townscape effect is based upon professional judgement and is described as a scaled range, from Very

Large, Large, Medium, Small, Very Small or No Change. For example, a large size / scale change may result from the complete removal or removal of a large proportion of a feature which is considered a key characteristic and is critical to the landscape's or townscapes distinctive character. An example of a small size / scale change may result from the removal of a small or limited proportion of a feature.

2.3.17 The criteria set out in Table 15.1.6 were used to assess the size and scale of landscape, townscape effects, based on the degree of change that will occur as a result of the proposed development.

Table 15.1.6: Indicative Size/Scale Criteria

Criteria Level	Size or Scale of Change to Landscape Receptor
Very Large	Fundamental change to the baseline feature or key characteristics; total loss or permanent alteration, with integrity of the landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character compromised or greatly enhanced; and/or forming a dominant new feature in the landscape or townscape.
Large	Substantial change to the baseline feature or key characteristics; all, or a large proportion, of the feature is lost or permanently altered, with its integrity compromised or greatly enhanced; and/or forming a prominent new feature in the landscape or townscape.
Medium	Partial change to the baseline feature or key characteristics, which may diminish or enhance its overall integrity; and/or result in a conspicuous loss or alteration to the existing landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character; and/or form a noticeable new feature in the landscape or townscape.
Small	Limited change to the baseline feature or key characteristics, such that a small proportion of the feature is affected, with little effect on its integrity; and/or limited loss or alteration to the existing landscape / landscape character or townscape / townscape character; and/or forming a new feature in the landscape or townscape.
Very Small	Very little discernible change to the baseline feature or key characteristics, resulting in very little loss or permanent alteration, with very little to no effect on its integrity; and/or forming a barely discernible new feature in the landscape or townscape.
No Change	The proposed development will not cause any change to the baseline feature or key characteristics.

Geographical Influence of Landscape Effect

2.3.18 The geographical extent over which a landscape effect would be experienced is considered separately as a slight modifier to the size / scale of effect.

2.3.19 The geographical extent is determined by the indicative criteria set out in Table 15.1.7.

Table 15.1.7: Geographical Extent Criteria

Criteria Level	Description of Geographical Influence
Wider landscape / townscape level	The effect extends across the wider landscape or townscape, across several landscape or townscape character areas / types, beyond the Site.
Landscape / townscape character type/ area level	The change would affect the entire a landscape or townscape type/character area as well as the Site itself.
Adjacent landscape / townscape level	The effect would be experienced within the Site and within the immediate setting or adjacent surroundings of the Site only, these being within only part of a landscape or townscape type / character area.
Site level	The effect would be experienced only within the Site itself.

Duration of Effect

2.3.20 The duration of a change is considered as a slight modifier to the size / scale of effect and is determined by the criteria set out in Chapter 4 Approach, section 4.3.3.

Reversibility of Effect

2.3.21 Reversibility is a judgement about the prospects and practicality of the effect being reversed, typically, in the lifetime of a generation. The typical categories of reversibility are set out in Table 15.1.8 below:

Table 15.1.8: Reversibility Criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Permanent	Change cannot be realistically reversed. e.g. change of land use

Criteria Level	Description
/ **irreversible**	from agricultural fields to urban housing development. Change that lasts for 15 years+ is deemed permanent / irreversible.
Partially reversible	Change is partially reversible, or moderately difficult to reverse but not impossible e.g. the restoration of a quarry to something similar to the pre-quarry landscape baseline, or introduction of elements which are representative of baseline features / characteristics.
Reversible	Change which will endure for a finite period of time and can be fully or largely reversed. e.g. wind turbines or solar panels, with a limited operational life and permission, and which have high potential for removal and reinstatement of the landscape at decommissioning; or construction activities which would be reversed once construction is complete e.g. installation of temporary hoardings around a construction site.

Overall Magnitude of Effect

2.3.22 Consideration of the size/scale, geographical influence, duration, and reversibility, as described above, is then combined with professional judgement to determine the likely magnitude of change that will occur to landscape or townscape receptors as a result of the Proposed Development. Indicative criteria descriptions are set out in Table 15.1.9.

Table 15.1.9: Indicative Criteria for Magnitude of Landscape Effect with Direction of Effect

Criteria Level	Description for Type of Effect	
Major	**Major Adverse** The proposals would result in a total change in the key characteristics of landscape or townscape character; would introduce elements totally uncharacteristic to the attributes of the receiving landscape or townscape such as its massing, scale, pattern and features; and/or would destroy or permanently degrade the integrity of landscape character; or is in total conflict with established planning objectives for	**Major Beneficial** The proposals would totally accord with the landscape or townscape features / characteristics, including scale, pattern, massing; or would restore, recreate or permanently enhance the condition or character of the landscape or townscape and enhance characteristic features through the use of local materials or planting; and/or deliver established

Criteria Level	Description for Type of Effect	
	landscape and visual elements of enhancement of the landscape or townscape; and/or result in a substantial or total loss, or alteration of key features / characteristics.	planning objectives for landscape and visual elements of enhancement of the landscape or townscape.
Moderate	**Moderate Adverse** The proposals would result in a partial change in the key characteristics of landscape or townscape character; would introduce elements uncharacteristic to, out of scale or at odds with the attributes of the receiving landscape or townscape, such as its massing, scale, pattern and features; and/or would result in partial loss, or alteration of key features / characteristics; or be in conflict with established planning objectives for landscape or townscape and visual elements of enhancement of the landscape or townscape.	**Moderate Beneficial** The proposals would achieve a good fit with the landscape or townscape features / characteristics, such as massing, scale, and pattern; or would noticeably improve the condition or character of the landscape or townscape and enhance characteristic features through the use of local materials; and/or support established planning objectives for landscape and visual elements of enhancement of the landscape or townscape.
Slight	**Slight Adverse** The proposals would result in little change in the key characteristics of landscape or townscape character and would introduce elements that do not quite fit with the attributes of the receiving landscape such as its massing, scale, pattern and features; and/or would result in a minor loss or alteration of features / characteristics; and/or contribute to degrading the landscape character; or would not fit with established planning objectives for landscape and visual elements of maintaining the landscape.	**Slight Beneficial** The proposals would achieve a degree of fit with the landscape or townscape features / characteristics and provide some enhancement to the condition or character of the landscape.
Negligible	**Negligible Adverse** The proposals would result in a just	**Negligible Beneficial** The proposals would result

Criteria Level	Description for Type of Effect	
	discernible change to landscape or townscape features / characteristics, which would not be quite in keeping with the existing landscape and landscape or townscape character.	in a just discernible improvement to the landscape or townscape features / characteristics.
Indistinct	As a result of the proposals, there would be a change to the landscape or townscape features / characteristics, but the change would be entirely in keeping with the existing landscape or townscape character or features such that the existing character and/or features are maintained, and that change does not cause deterioration or enhancement of the character.	
No Change	The proposals would not cause any change to the landscape or townscape features / characteristics.	

2.4 Assessment of Effects on Views and Visual Amenity

2.4.1 This assesses how the Proposed Development will affect the views available to people and their visual amenity.

2.4.2 Visual receptors always comprise people; and include users of public rights of way, public open spaces, public realm or other outdoor recreational facilities, and also travellers in vehicles who may be visiting, living or working within the study area, and their views at particular places.

2.4.3 The following terminology is used to describe the approximate distance between the representative viewpoint and the proposed development:

- Local or short distance or close-range view: under 0.5km;
- Medium distance or mid-range view: 0.5km – 2km;
- Long-range or long-distance view: beyond 2km.

2.4.4 The type of view, and the number of viewers likely to experience the view, is described in the following terms:

- Glimpsed (i.e. seen in passing) / Filtered / Oblique / Framed / Open Views; and
- Few / Moderate / Many Viewers.

2.4.5 A methodical consideration of each visual effect upon each identified visual receptor is undertaken, in order to determine the significance of effects, in terms of:

- Value and susceptibility to change (sensitivity of the visual receptor, or viewer); and
- Size / scale, geographical influence, composition, duration and reversibility (magnitude of the visual effect).

2.4.6 LTVIA relates to public amenity and therefore the value of views to the public. Therefore, no private viewpoints are assessed. However, where appropriate, representative views have been selected from publicly accessible locations within or on the edge of main settlements, or to represent views that would be experienced from property groupings or other buildings likely to be significantly affected by the Proposed Development.

Sensitivity of Visual Receptors

2.4.7 The assessment of visual receptor sensitivity combines judgements on the value attributed to the visual receptor and the 'susceptibility to change' of the receptor to the specific type of development proposed.

2.4.8 The value assigned to views has regard to several factors, including:

- Recognition through planning or heritage assets; and
- The popularity of the viewpoint, its appearance in guidebooks, literature or art, on tourist maps, and the facilities provided to enable enjoyment of the view.

2.4.9 The criteria for the assessment of the value of views is summarised Table 15.1.10; note that these are provided for guidance and are not intended to be absolute.

Table 15.1.10: Value of Views Criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Very High	Views with very high scenic value or where the view forms an important part of the experience within landscapes of international importance i.e. UNESCO World Heritage Sites, or for people's views from within a designated WHS Buffer.
High	Views with high scenic value within landscapes of national or regional importance and statutory landscape designations including, but not limited to, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty etc; and/or highly popular visitor

Criteria Level	Description
	attractions where the view forms an important part of the experience and could be expected to be regularly experienced; and/or views from landscapes with important cultural associations / historic estates with specific views or designed focussed views; and/or the view is identified as a published Key View / vista / view cone in statutory documents, planning policies or supplementary planning documents.
Medium	Views with moderate scenic value within undesignated landscapes or those from landscapes of regional or district importance or moderately popular visitor attractions or well-used open spaces where the view forms part of the experience, or with local cultural associations, and / or a local key view / vista / view cone identified by the LPA through the scoping process, and which is not defined within published guidance.
Low	Views with unremarkable scenic value within undesignated landscape; or with partly degraded visual quality and/or containing visual detractors; or views that are not particularly popular; and with minimal or no cultural associations.

2.4.10 The susceptibility of people to changes in views is a function of:

- The occupation or activity of the viewer at a given location; and
- The extent, therefore, to which a person's attention or interest may be focussed on a particular view and the visual amenity experienced.

2.4.11 For the purposes of the visual impact assessment, visual receptors' susceptibility to change is based upon the criteria in Table 15.1.11.

Table 15.1.11: Criteria for Visual Receptor Susceptibility to Change

Criteria Level	Description
High	• Residents at home; • People engaged in outdoor recreation, including visitors to areas of open space (e.g. country parks) or users of Long-Distance Trails / Routes or Public Rights of Way, whose attention is likely to be focussed on the visual experience of the landscape and on particular views; • Visitors to heritage assets, landmarks or other attractions where views of the surroundings are an important part of the experience;

Criteria Level	Description
	• Communities where the quality of the views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents; and • Travellers on scenic or tourist routes, including cyclists on national cycle routes designed to provide an attractive experience.
Medium	• Travellers on general road, rail or other transport routes, where the view is moderately important to the quality of the journey and/or the speed of travel is moderate or low speed; • Visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where views of the surroundings are a minor contribution to experience and enjoyment; • People using local parks, open spaces, public realm, or walking on streets or local public rights of way, with moderate interest in their visual environment.
Low	• People engaged in active outdoor sport or recreation, which does not involve appreciation of, or focus upon views; • People at their place of work or shopping, where the landscape setting is not important to the experience or quality of working life and/or the surroundings are irrelevant to the enjoyment of the activity; and • Travellers, where the view is fleeting and incidental to the journey, e.g. high-speed roads / trains.

2.4.12 An overall assessment of sensitivity is made for each visual receptor, based on professional judgement and informed by the combination of the identified value and susceptibility criteria. Typically, a worst-case approach is taken, i.e. a value of High combined with a susceptibility of Medium would result in an overall sensitivity of High. Professional judgments may adjust this approach, when there are reasons associated with the value of the view that lead to a reduction or increase in overall sensitivity. In such instances, the rational for the professional judgment which has been made is provided in the baseline description.

2.4.13 The indicative criteria used for the overall assessment of sensitivity are set out in Table 15.1.12. Note that these are provided for guidance and are not intended to be absolute.

Table 15.1.12: Indicative Criteria for Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Criteria Level	Description
Very High	Views with a very high scenic value, within landscapes of international importance i.e. UNESCO World Heritage Sites or designated WHS buffers and experienced by people whose attention is highly focused on the visual experience of the landscape.
High	Typically views with a high scenic value within landscapes of national or regional importance; and/or people using scenic routes or national trails / walking routes, or using national cycle routes designed to be an attractive experience; and/or highly popular visitor attractions where the view forms an important part of the experience; and/or views from landscapes with important cultural associations / historic estates with specific views or designed focussed views; and/or the view is identified as a published Key View / vista / view cone in statutory documents, planning policies or supplementary planning documents; and/or forms part of the landscape setting to communities. The view is experienced by people whose attention is focused on the landscape and/or on particular views.
Medium	Typically views of a moderate scenic value within landscapes of regional / district importance, or views from moderately popular visitor attractions or well-used open spaces; the view forms part of the experience to a moderate extent; or has been identified by the local authority as a locally important view through the scoping process but otherwise is not defined within publications. The view is experienced by travellers on general roads / railways or other transport routes, visitors to heritage assets or other attractions where views of the surroundings are a minor contribution to experience and enjoyment, people using local parks, open spaces, public realm areas or streets or local Public Rights of Way and other people with moderate interest in their surrounding visual environment.
Low	Typically views of unremarkable scenic value, with partly degraded visual quality and presence of visual detractors. Views experienced by people with limited appreciation of, or focus upon, views of their surroundings, and/or where the visual setting is not important to the experience or quality of activity, and/or where the view is fleeting and incidental.

Magnitude of Visual Effects

2.4.14 The magnitude of a visual effect is assessed in terms of its size or scale, the geographical extent of the area influenced and its duration and degree of reversibility. These criteria are combined with professional judgement to determine the likely magnitude of change that will occur to visual receptors as a result of the Proposed Development.

Size/Scale of Visual Change

2.4.15 The size or scale of change in the view relates to the degree of contrast to, or integration with, the visual composition, which is likely to result from the proposed development; and is influenced by the relative time over which a view is experienced and whether it is a full, partial, or glimpsed view.

2.4.16 The judgement of size or scale of visual change in the view considers:

- The scale of the change in the view with respect to the loss or addition of features in the view and changes in the view composition and depth of the view, including the proportion of the view occupied by the Proposed Development.
- The degree of contrast or integration of any new elements or changes in the landscape with the existing or remaining landscape features and characteristics in terms of form, scale and mass, line, hight, colour and texture seen in the view.
- The nature of the view of the Proposed Development, including the relative amount of time over which it will be experienced and whether views will be full, partial, glimpsed, or screened.

2.4.17 The size / scale of the visual effect is based upon professional judgement and is described as a scaled range, from Very Large, Large, Medium, Small, Very Small, to No Change.

2.4.18 The indicative criteria set out in Table 15.1.13 is used to inform the judgement of the size / scale of visual effects, based on the degree of change to the view or composition.

Table 15.1.13: Indicative Size/Scale of Change

Criteria Level	Description
Very Large	Fundamental to complete change to the view. The proposals would be seen as the most dominant feature(s) in the view, and completely change the composition of the view, be seen across the entire view and/or create a high level of visual contrast with

Criteria Level	Description
	other features in the view, and/or cause fundamental change that degrades or enhances the view. The proposals would form the primary focus of the view. Typically, the view would be experienced from within the Site or very close to the Site, and the Proposed Development would occupy the foreground view
Large	Substantial change to the view. The proposals would cause a dominant or complete change or contrast to most of the view / view composition, which would affect a large proportion or portion of the view, resulting from the loss of features or addition of new elements in the view; and will substantially alter (degrade or enhance) the appreciation or composition of the view. The Proposed Development would typically lie at the centre of the view, forming the focus of the view. Typically, the view would be experienced from close to the Site.
Medium	The proposals would cause clearly noticeable change or contrast to the composition of the view; and/or change to only a proportion of the view / view composition, being a conspicuous new feature or features in the view, that would partially contrast or be in harmony with other features in the view. Typically, the Proposed Development would be subordinate to existing features in the view composition, it would likely be seen in the centre of the view or as part of an oblique view and would occupy the middle ground of the view or form only part of the foreground of the view.
Small	Limited change to the view. The proposals would occupy a small portion of the view and cause a perceptible change or contrast to the view, but the balance and composition of the view would only slightly alter from baseline view. The visual change would partially integrate with the surroundings in the view, and/or form a minor new feature in the view. Typically, the visual change would be experienced as little change to the baseline view, and/or as a filtered view or glimpsed view / in a narrow angle of view within the overall view composition; and/or be seen at an oblique angle. Typically, the Proposed Development would be seen at some distance, occupying the mid-ground to background of the view.
Very Small	Very little change to the view. The proposals would cause a barely perceptible visual change or contrast to the view, which would not affect the baseline view composition. Typically, the Proposed Development would be experienced as a very filtered view through vegetation or at a considerable distance, occupying the background / long- or far-distance in the view. would affect a very small part of the overall view, and/or lie at a very oblique angle.

Criteria Level	Description
No Change	The proposals would fully maintain the existing view composition and would not cause any changes in the view.

Geographical Influence of Change to Views and Orientation/Length of Views

2.4.19 The geographical influence of change to views determines how far the visual effect would be experienced; this is distinct to the size/scale of visual effect. The geographical extent of the visual effect arising from the Proposed Development varies depending on the location of the visual receptor. Consideration is given to the orientation of the view, in relation to the main activity of the visual receptor and the focus of the view; the distance between the visual receptor and the Proposed Development; and the extent of the area over which visual change would be experienced. Geographical extent is a slight modifier to the size/scale of effect and is determined according to the indicative criteria set out in Table 15.1.14.

Table 15.1.14: Indicative Geographic Extent Criteria

Criteria Level	Description
Widespread	The visual change would occur to visual receptors over a widespread area or lengths of routes.
Large	The visual change would occur to visual receptors over a large area or large lengths of routes.
Medium	Visual change would occur to a moderate geographical area or lengths of routes.
Small	Visual change would be evident over a small geographical area or short lengths of routes.
Very Small	Visual change would occur to visual receptors over a very small area or very short lengths of routes.

Duration and Reversibility

2.4.20 Duration and reversibility are assessed using the same criteria as were used for landscape effects – see **Table 15.1.8** above.

Overall Magnitude of Effect

2.4.21 Consideration of the size/scale, geographical influence, duration and reversibility, as described above, is combined with professional judgement to determine the likely magnitude of change that will occur to visual receptors. Indicative criteria descriptions are set out in **Table 15.1.15**.

Table 15.1.15: Indicative Criteria for Magnitude and Type of Visual Effect

Criteria Level	Description for Type of Effect
Major	The proposals would cause a **dominant or complete change or contrast** to the view, resulting from the **loss or addition** of features in the view and **substantially alter** (**degrade or enhance**) the appreciation of the view or composition of the view.
Moderate	The proposals would cause a **clearly noticeable change or contrast** to the view, which would have **some effect** on the composition, resulting from the **loss or addition** of features in the view and would **moderately alter** (**degrade or enhance**) the appreciation of the view or the composition of the view.
Slight	The proposals would cause a **perceptible change or contrast** to the view, but which would only **partially change** the composition of the view or the appreciation of the view. There may only be a partial view of the Proposed Development in the view.
Negligible	The proposals would cause a **barely perceptible change or contrast** to the view, which would **barely alter** the appreciation of the view or the composition of the view.
Indistinct	There would be very limited **change** to the composition of the view, but that change would be **entirely in keeping** with the existing elements of the view and would **maintain the composition and quality** of the existing baseline view and **does not enhance or degrade** the baseline view.
No Change	The proposals would **maintain** the existing view entirely and cause **no change** to that view.

Visual receptor groups

2.4.22 Due to the extensive scale of the Study Area, the complexity of its land uses and number of likely visual receptors due to the urban fabric, the visual receptors have been grouped according to their location, sensitivity, and characteristics of its visual amenity. The representative locations within each receptor group will reflect typical views experienced by that group and are used to establish the visual baseline.

2.5 Landscape and Visual Mitigation Measures

2.5.1 Primary mitigation measures are defined as those which have been developed through the iterative design process, and which have become integrated or embedded into the Proposed Development.

2.5.2 Standard construction and operational management practices are defined as those which would be required to be adopted for the avoidance of, and reduction of, adverse environmental effects as part of the standard construction process, such as the implementation of tree protection fencing around retained trees. These standard practices for construction are therefore not considered to form part of the embedded mitigation; and instead, are expected to be detailed in a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), to be prepared at a relevant time.

2.5.3 Secondary, or further mitigation and enhancement measures are those which would be proposed in order to address adverse effects which remain after the embedded (primary) mitigation has been incorporated into the Proposed Development.

2.6 Assessment of Level of Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects

2.6.1 The level of significance of landscape and visual effects vary with the location, landscape context and type of proposed development.

2.6.2 The level of significance of landscape and visual effects is a matter of professional judgement, which is informed by the combination of the receptor sensitivity and the magnitude of effects, as set out in Table 15.1.16. Substantial, Major to Substantial and Major levels of significance of effect are considered to be 'significant'. Minor and Negligible levels of significance of effect are identified as 'not significant'. 'Moderate' levels of significance of effect can be either significant or not significant, with the final judgement based on professional opinion. Where a moderate effect is considered not significant full reasoning for the decision will be identified.

Table 15.1.16: Levels of Significance of Landscape and Visual Effects

Magnitude of Effect						
	Major Effect	Moderate Effect	Slight Effect	Negligible Effect	Indistinct Effect	No Change
Very High Sensitivity*	***Substantial***	***Major to Substantial***	***Major***	***Moderate***	Minor	No Change
High Sensitivity	***Major to Substantial***	***Major***	***Moderate***	Minor	Negligible	No Change

Magnitude of Effect						
	Major Effect	Moderate Effect	Slight Effect	Negligible Effect	Indistinct Effect	No Change
Medium Sensitivity	***Major***	***Moderate***	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Low Sensitivity	***Moderate***	Minor	Minor	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

**A 'Very High' level of Sensitivity is only applicable to international designated landscapes or views from those international designated landscapes, i.e. World Heritage Sites that meet UNESCO criteria.*

2.6.3 The above table has regard to guidance in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, (3rd Edition, 2013), at paragraph 5.56, page 92 (significance of landscape effects) and paragraph 6.44, page 116 (significance of visual effects).

2.6.4 A substantial level of significance of effect is assigned where a landscape or visual effect is considered to represent a key factor in the decision-making process. Such effects are generally, but not exclusively, associated with altering the integrity of sites and features of international, national, or regional importance. However, a change at a district scale of site or feature may also enter this category, though that is subject to professional judgement and will be proportional to the type and extent of development that is being assessed. Where there is a combination of a receptor's high sensitivity and a major effect, professional judgement may be applied to determine a 'major to substantial level of significance of effect, where it is considered that either the effect would not represent a key factor in the decision-making process, or where the development would have limited effects such that it would not alter the integrity of sites and features of international, national or regional importance.

2.6.5 The judgements of significance are not judgements of acceptability, because they do not consider the policy context, which is a matter for decision-makers.

2.7 Assessment of Night-time Landscape, Townscape and Visual Effects

2.7.1 The Night-time assessment will be undertaken using the same methodology, principles and significance criteria as the LTVIA but will consider effects occurring during hours of darkness. The assessment will identify the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development on night-

time landscape, and townscape character and visual amenity, including effects arising from artificial lighting, illuminated infrastructure, changes in traffic movements and any aviation lighting requirements. The assessment will consider both direct and indirect changes to the perception and experience of the landscape at night.

2.7.2 Baseline night-time landscape and visual conditions will be established through desk-based review and site surveys undertaken during hours of darkness. CPRE's (2016) England's Light Pollution and Dark Skies mapping illustrates a national map of England's light pollution. For the purposes of this assessment, night-time is defined as the period between sunset and sunrise. Night-time field surveys will be undertaken during periods of established darkness, following the end of evening twilight, to enable the assessment of existing lighting conditions, Environmental Lighting Zones and the visibility of the Proposed Development.

2.7.3 The baseline assessment will identify existing night-time character, sources of artificial light, dark areas and sensitive receptors. In addition to the landscape character baseline, Environmental Lighting Zones (ELZs) will be defined within the Study Area using professional judgement and site survey in accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Note 01/21: The Reduction of Obtrusive Light. The ELZ classification (E0–E4) defined below will be used to define the sensitivity of the receiving environment and existing levels of night-time brightness.

Table 15.1.17: Lighting Zones

Zone	Surrounding	Lighting environment	Example
E0	Protected	Dark	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Starlight Reserves, International Dark-Sky Association Dark Sky Parks
E1	Natural	Intrinsically dark	National Parks, AONB
E2	Rural	Low district brightness	Village or relatively dark outer suburban locations
E3	Suburban	Medium district brightness	Small town centres or suburban locations
E4	Urban	High district brightness	Town/city centres with high levels of night time activity

2.7.4 The assessment will identify and evaluate changes to the night-time baseline arising from the Proposed Development. In order to determine the night-time effects on landscape character and views, a qualitative assessment will be undertaken. This will include the assessment of obtrusive light effects, including light spill, light intrusion, glare and sky glow, together with changes to the visibility and appreciation of the landscape during hours of darkness. The magnitude of change and sensitivity of receptors will be assessed to determine the significance of night-time landscape and visual effects, using the same approach adopted for the LTVIA.

2.8 Assessment of Effects on Tranquillity

2.8.1 'Tranquillity' is considered to be a state of calm and quietude and an important asset of landscape, appearing as an objective attribute in a range of strategies, policies and plans. In 2004, the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) commissioned a pilot study to develop a methodology to map tranquillity. This resulted in the report Mapping Tranquillity: Defining and assessing a valuable resource (CPRE, 2005). The report developed thinking of what tranquillity is and is not and why it is important. In 2006, CPRE commissioned a project to map tranquillity on a national scale (published in 2007). This was followed by the technical report Tranquillity Mapping: Developing a Robust Methodology for Planning Support (Jackson et al., 2008). This report highlights that tranquillity is a vital element of the countryside experience, one that can be used as a workable indicator, and that it has a meaning and significance that has resonance across different places, times and groups of people.

2.8.2 Section 5.313 of Proposed draft revision to the Airports National Policy Statement - to be known as the Heathrow Expansion National Policy Statement (2026)[15] state that

2.8.3 "*The assessment should include the visibility and conspicuousness of the scheme during construction and the presence and operation of the scheme and potential impacts on views and visual amenity. This should include any noise and light pollution effects, including on local amenity, tranquillity and nature conservation.*"

2.8.4 In order to facilitate better outcome of the protected landscape in line with their statutory purposes, impacts upon tranquillity shall be considered. CAP 1616i[16] states that "*Change sponsors must show how they have considered*

[15] Department for Transport (2018). Airports National Policy Statement. Available at: Airports National Policy Statement - GOV.UK

[16] Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) (2023) Environmental Assessment Requirements and Guidance for Airspace Change Proposals (CAP 1616i). Crawley: Civil Aviation Authority. Available at: https://www.caa.co.uk/publication/download/20867 (Accessed: 3 July 2026).

and taken account of these impacts by using operational diagrams or overflight contours to identify any tranquillity receptors overflown below 7,000 feet. An assessment is also required for the opening year and across the forecast period (normally 10 years)."

2.8.5 The Landscape Institute Technical Information Note 'Tranquillity – An Overview' (Landscape Institute, 2017) discusses what is understood by tranquillity in the landscape profession. The note concludes that 'there is no objective guidance on the subject or a consistent application of approach'.

2.8.6 Based on the above policies and guidance, the LTVIA will consider effects on tranquillity as a perceptual quality of landscape and townscape character arising from changes in overflight activity below 7,000 feet. The assessment will examine changes in perceptual tranquillity within landscape and townscape character areas, as well as effects on the experience of tranquillity by visual receptors and within nationally designated landscapes. The assessment will take account of the contribution of aircraft visibility and overflight activity to perceptions of tranquillity.

2.8.7 The following information will be used to establish the tranquillity baseline and potential effect on the tranquillity:

- The current CPRE tranquillity map covering the study area;
- Baseline overflight assessment below 7,000ft;
- Proposed overflight assessment below 7,000ft;
- Observation from Site visit;
- Baseline noise survey; and

2.8.8 Operational phase noise survey.

2.9 Methodology for the Assessment of Cumulative Landscape and Visual Effects

2.9.1 Definition of cumulative landscape and visual effects was first set out in the 2002 edition of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and since then has been further refined, in terms of windfarm development, by guidance produced in Scotland, which is used more widely than windfarms, and not only in Scotland. The current definitions, as set out in 'Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments', Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), 2012, are referred to in paragraph 7.3 of **GLVIA3** and for the purpose of the LVIA are interpreted and defined as follows:

- **Cumulative effects** - 'the additional changes caused by a Proposed Development in conjunction with other similar developments or as the combined effect of a set of developments, taken together';
- **Cumulative landscape effects** - effects that 'can impact on either the physical fabric or character of the landscape, or any special values attached to it'
- **Cumulative visual effects** - effects caused by combined visibility, which 'occurs where the observer is able to see two or more developments from one viewpoint' and/or sequential effects which 'occur when the observer has to move to another viewpoint to see different developments'.

2.9.2 In accordance with the emphasis in EIA, the cumulative assessment is required to focus on cumulative landscape, townscape and visual effects which are **likely to be significant**, rather than providing a comprehensive listing of every conceivable cumulative landscape and visual effect that might occur. The approach must be reasonable and proportional to the proposed development.

2.9.3 Paragraph 7.18 of GLVIA3 refers to different focuses of a cumulative effects assessment: *'…the **additional** effects of the main project under consideration, or on the **combined** effects of all the past, present and future proposals together with the new project*.' GLVIA3 recognises some of the limitations of assessing combined cumulative effects, noting that *'…the assessor will not have assessed the other schemes and cannot make a fully informed judgement*.'

2.9.4 The cumulative landscape, Townscape and visual effects assessment (CLTVEA) in the LTVIA is informed by reference to the baseline photographs and any verified views which will be prepared for the Proposed Development, as well as the LTVIA assessor's knowledge from the visual survey. Where cumulative verified views are available, these would also be used to inform the CLTVEA.

2.9.5 The CLTVEA considers the effects of the Proposed Development in terms of:

- an extension or intensification of the landscape and/or visual effects of other similar developments;
- 'filling' an area over time with similar development, such that the landscape resource, views and visual amenity are judged to be substantially altered; and
- incremental change arising from the proposal, because of successive individual developments.

2.9.6 The CLTVEA also seeks to provide understanding of cumulative landscape and visual effects in terms of how the Proposed Development would both **interact** and **combine** with effects of the committed developments which the ES considers. Accordingly, the CLTVEA is formed by assessment of **incremental cumulative effects** and **combined cumulative effects**. These are defined as follows.

Incremental Cumulative Effects

2.9.7 Incremental cumulative effects are the **additional** effects of the Proposed Development in the context of all the committed developments being taken into account. So, the assessment essentially looks at the contribution of the Proposed Development to the overall effect of the committed developments. For example, Project X results in 0.25ha of new woodland, and Project Y results in 9ha of new woodland – whilst the combined cumulative effects (see below) would be 9.25ha of new woodland and therefore potentially quite significant, the incremental cumulative effect of Project X is 0.25ha of new woodland which is likely to be an effect which is not significant.

Combined Cumulative Effects

2.9.8 Combined cumulative effects are those which result from the **combination** of the Proposed Development and committed developments. Where appropriate, these may be further identified as **additive effects** (a total effect produced by the Proposed Development and committed developments in combination; being the sum of the parts or the overall consequence. For example, in simplest terms, Project X results in 1ha of woodland removed, Project Y results in 2ha of woodland removed, resulting in a combined additive cumulative effect of 3ha of woodland removed); or **synergistic effects** (where the combined effect is greater than the sum of the separate effects of the cumulative developments, and which would not have occurred from the Proposed Development or any of the committed developments in isolation. For example, the losses of woodland from Project X and Project Y combine to have a new effect on a species that is not affected by the loss of woodland from either Project X or Project Y in isolation). Where combined effects are assessed, the assessment is made against the baseline year (i.e. all developments, combined, assessed against baseline).

Limitations to the Cumulative Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment

2.9.9 It is acknowledged that there will be limitations to the assessment of combined cumulative effects in the CLTVEA. Typical limitations include:

- Limited information that is available in the public domain and/or to the assessor. In some cases, committed development proposals or

permissions may not be accompanied by a LTVIA due to their scale of development or local authority requirements.

- Stantec did not prepare the LTVIAs for the committed developments. A different assessor will have a different professional judgement of landscape and visual effects, and use different assessment methodologies in LTVIAs.
- Different baseline dates between the LTVIAs for the Proposed Development and the committed developments.
- Assessments of different landscape and visual receptors, that are not comparable; and
- The absence of verified views for the committed developments.

3. Technical Methodologies

3.1 Zone of Visual Influence and Zone of Theoretical Visibility

3.1.1 Since the Proposed Development's height parameters are still being developed, a Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) has been used for visibility mapping and Scoping purposes.

3.1.2 The ZVI defines the area within which the Proposed Development may be visible and where significant visual effects could potentially occur, taking account of landform, distance, and other screening features, including woodland blocks and the urban fabric. The area outside of the ZVI may still have view of the proposed development, but such views are likely to be limited, filtered, or distant in nature and are therefore unlikely to result in significant visual effects.

3.1.3 The ZVI is derived through map interpretation and involves a degree of professional judgement by the Landscape Architect. As the maximum height of the Proposed Development has not yet been determined, the ZVI is used to illustrate the likely extent of the visual envelope and to inform the initial scoping process.

3.1.4 A Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis will be carried out as part of the LTVIA, this based upon the development parameters. A ZTV analysis is a computer-generated tool to identify the 'theoretical' extent of visibility for the Scheme.

3.1.5 The ZTV shows theoretical visibility only and so it is important to fully understand that its accuracy is limited to the digital information that it has been based upon and the algorithm used in its calculation. It is stressed that the ZTV remains only as a tool in the landscape and visual impact assessment of the Scheme. A ZTV alone cannot indicate the potential visual impacts, nor show the likely significance of impacts that the Scheme will have.

3.1.6 However, it does guide an appreciation of the potential and maximum visibility of the Scheme, that can then be used to focus the visual assessment process on those areas affected and avoids those areas which will not be affected.

3.1.7 The ZTV calculation will be performed using ESRI ArcGIS Pro 3.0.2, under the Viewshed Spatial Analyst tool. The ZTV computer software processes landform data and other selected features influencing the extent of visibility, for example, woodland and settlements, in order to identify the theoretical extent of the area from which the Scheme is likely to be visible. This will analyse both a Digital Terrain Model (DTM), and Digital Surface Model (DSM).

3.1.8 A DTM ZTV illustrates the worst-case scenario, in that it will only take into account of the landform, i.e., it is solely the terrain surface, or bare earth model.

3.1.9 A DSM ZTV, includes heights of objects, such as principal areas of woodland and settlements as well as the terrain surface. Both a DTM and DSM analysis have been prepared, but the use of a DSM analysis allows for a more pragmatic approach to identify where the potential visibility of the Scheme will occur, due to the screening effect from both the buildings and vegetation contained within the DSM. This ZTV is considered a realistic, worst case, however it is important to note that features, such as hedgerows or street trees, which are generally not included are likely to provide additional filtering of views.

3.1.10 The viewer height of the ZTV will be set at 1.6m above ground level. This is higher than the camera height recommended for photograph visualisations and compensates for potential inaccuracies in digital terrain data and to ensure that the 'worst case' is represented.

3.2 Baseline Views Photography

3.2.1 The requirements for the collection of baseline views photography and presentation of photography are described within the Landscape Institute Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note 06/19 (TGN 06/19) (Landscape Institute, 2019), and this has been considered.

3.2.2 Photography included at Scoping was captured during July 2026. Further technical photography will be collected in Summer 2026 and Winter 2026/2027 to support the LTVIA.

3.2.3 Further detail on the technical methodology for View Location photography will be included in the LTVIA.

4. Standard LTVIA Glossary and Abbreviations

4.1 LTVIA Glossary

4.1.1 Standard terms used in the LTVIA are set out in Table 15.1.18.

Table 15.1. 18: LTVIA Glossary

Term	Explanation
Baseline Conditions	The environment as it appears (or would appear) immediately prior to the implementation of the Scheme together with any known or foreseeable future changes that will take place before completion of the project
Baseline Information	Collection of background information on the environmental, social and economic setting of a Scheme, to be sued to predict changes and compare and evaluate them in terms of importance
Characteristics	Features, or combinations of, which make a contribution to distinctive landscape or townscape character
Committed Development	Development projects that are either under construction or which have valid planning permission/consents
Conservation Area	Land awarded protection status to prevent change to the natural features, cultural heritage and biodiversity of the area
Cumulative effects	Additional changes caused by the Scheme in conjunction with other developments (associated with or separate to it), or actions that occurred in the past, present or are likely to occur in the foreseeable future. And: The summation of effects that result from changes caused by a development in conjunction with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions
Designated Landscape or Townscape	Areas of landscape or townscape identified as being of importance at international, national or local levels, either defined by statute or identified in development plans or other documents
Desktop Studies	The gathering and analysis of existing data from the public domain, scientific and commercial databases, and available project sources, in order to identify environmental constraints and opportunities
Direct Effect	An effect that is directly attributable to the Scheme

Term	Explanation
Development	Any proposal that results in a change to the landscape and/or visual environment
Enhancement	Proposals that seek to improve the landscape resource and the visual amenity of the site and its wider setting, over and above its baseline condition
Features	Particularly prominent, "eye-catching" elements or characteristic components (i.e. Tree clumps, church towers, or wooded skylines).
Heritage	The historic environment and especially valued assets and qualities such as historic buildings and cultural traditions
Key Characteristics	Those combinations of features which are particularly important to the current character of the landscape or townscape, and which help to give an area its particularly distinctive sense of place
Landscape	An area, as perceived by people, the character of which is the result of action and interaction of natural and/or human factors
Landscape or Townscape Character	A distinct and recognisable pattern of features that occurs consistently in a particular type of landscape or townscape and which makes one landscape or townscape different from another. It reflects particular combinations of geology, landform, soils, vegetation, land use and human settlement, built form and layout, scale, mass and legibility. It creates the particular sense of place of different areas of the landscape or townscape
Landscape or Townscape Effects	Effects on the landscape or townscape as a resource in its own right
Landscape or Townscape Quality (condition)	A measure of the physical state of the landscape or townscape. It may include the extent to which typical character is represented in the individual areas, the intactness of the landscape or townscape and the condition of individual features
Landscape or Townscape Receptors	Defined aspects of the landscape or townscape resource that have the potential to be affected by a proposal.
Landscape or Townscape Value	The relative value that is attached to different landscapes or townscapes by society. A landscape or townscape may be valued by different stakeholders for a variety of reasons.
Listed Buildings	A building with historic, artistic or architectural interest, which has been listed on the statutory list of buildings

Term	Explanation
Magnitude	A term that combines judgements about the size and scale of the effect, the extent of the area over which it occurs, whether it is reversible or irreversible and the length of its duration. Includes consideration of whether the effect is reversible or irreversible. Magnitude is presented in terms of being major, moderate, slight or negligible. Magnitude is defined for LTVIA in the LTVIA Methodology Appendix.
Mitigation Measures	Action taken to avoid reduce or offset adverse environmental, social and economic impacts of a Scheme
Indirect Effects	Effects that result indirectly from the proposed Scheme as a consequence of the direct effects, often occurring away from the site, or as a result of a sequence of interrelationships or a complex pathway. They may be separated by distance or in time from the source of the effects.
Photomontage	The superimposing of an image onto a photograph for the purpose of creating a realistic representation of proposed or potential changes to a view
Receptor	Physical resource or user group that would experience an effect, either negative or positive from the Scheme
Residual Effects	Impacts that would remain following the implementation of the mitigation measures
Sensitivity	A term applied to specific receptors, combining judgements of the susceptibility of the receptor to the specific type of change of development proposed and the value related to that receptor
Scoping	Scoping is the process of determining what issues are to be addressed and setting out a methodology in which to address them in a structured manner appropriate to the plan or programme. Scoping is carried out in consultation with the appropriate bodies.
Significance	A measure of the importance of gravity of the environmental effect, defined by significance criteria specific to the environmental topic. This assessment considers the sensitivity or importance of the receptor (high, medium, low and negligible) and the magnitude/scale of change (large, medium, small and negligible) which is likely to occur in the receiving environment after mitigation.
Study Area	Areas surrounding and including the Scheme, where there is reasonable potential for environmental, economic and

Term	Explanation
	social impacts arising from the Scheme. Study areas are defined for each topic of the EIA
Susceptibility	The ability of a defined landscape or townscape or visual receptor to accommodate the specific Scheme without undue negative consequences
Townscape	The character and composition of the built environment including the buildings and the relationships between them, the different types of urban open space, including green spaces, and the relationship between buildings and open spaces
Visual Amenity	The overall pleasantness of the views people enjoy of their surroundings, which provides an attractive visual setting or backdrop for the enjoyment of activities of the people living, working, recreating, visiting, or travelling through an area.
Visual Effects	Effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people
Visual Receptor	Individuals and/or defined groups of people who have the potential to be affected by a proposal. Typically represented by a selected viewpoint location.
Visualisation	A computer simulation, photomontage or other technique illustrating the predicted appearance of a development. Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) are produced in accordance with specific methodology.
Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV)	A map, digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible, typically using a Digital Terrain Model or bare earth base.
ZTV with visual barriers	A map, digitally produced, showing areas of land within which a development is theoretically visible, typically using a Digital Surface Model which accounts for built form and vegetation features.

4.2 Standard Abbreviations

4.2.1 Standard abbreviations used in the LTVIA are set out below:

- AOD – Above Ordnance Datum
- BS – British Standard
- CA – Conservation Area

- CEMP - Construction Environmental Management Plan
- CROW Act – The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- CRTN - Control of Road Traffic Noise
- DAS – Design and Access Statement
- DEFRA - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- EU - European Union
- GI – Green Infrastructure
- GIS – Geographical Information Systems
- GLVIA3 – Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Landscape Institute (Third edition)
- IEMA - Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment
- LCA – Landscape Character Area
- LCT – Landscape Character Type
- LDP – Local Development Plan
- LI – Landscape Institute
- LPA – Local Planning Authority
- LVIA – Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- LTVIA – Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
- MAGIC – English Government's online mapping tool
- NCA – National Character Area
- NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework
- PPG – Planning Practice Guidance
- PRoW - Public Rights of Way
- RHPG – Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest
- RSA – Regional Scenic Area
- SAC – Special Area of Conservation

- SAM – Scheduled Ancient Monument
- SLA – Special Landscape Area
- SPG – Supplementary Planning Guidance
- SUDS - Sustainable urban drainage systems
- TPO – Tree Preservation Order
- WHS – World Heritage Site
- ZTV – Zone of Theoretical Visibility
- ZVI – Zone of Visual Influence

Appendix 15.2

Published Landscape Character

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 15.2 Published Landscape Character

Contents

1.	**Introduction**		**1**
	1.2	National Landscape Character (2014)	1
	1.3	Colne Valley Regional Park (2017)	5
	1.4	Hillingdon (2012)	9
	1.5	Spelthorpe (2015)	18
	1.6	Runnymede (2015)	20
	1.7	Windsor and Maidenhead (2004)	21
	1.8	Hounslow (2014)	22
	1.9	Slough (HAL PEIR / HWL 2020)	25

1. Introduction

1.1.1.1 This Appendix provides an overview of the published landscape character relevant to the assessment, i.e. those areas that are proposed to be scoped into the ES Chapter. It covers national character and local character areas as published by Natural England (national) and the relevant local planning authorities.

1.2 National Landscape Character (2014)

1.2.2.1 Natural England's (NE) Landscape Character Map of England identifies broad overarching character at the national level. GLVIA 3 notes the purpose of national character area profiles in LVIA is to 'set the scene' with assessment of specific impacts to character undertaken using local character assessments.

1.2.3 NCA 111: Northern Thames Basin

1.2.3.1 This NCA lies within the north-eastern extents of the study area. It *"extends from Hertfordshire in the west to the Essex coast in the east. It is separated from the North Sea and the Thames Estuary by the narrow Greater Thames Estuary (NCA 81). This NCA contains the suburbs of north London and historic towns and cities including St Albans and Colchester. It also includes new and planned towns such as Welwyn Garden city, Hatfield and Basildon."*

1.2.3.2 Relevant key characteristics associated with the NCA include the following:

- "The landform is varied with a wide plateaux divided by river valleys. The prominent hills and ridges of the 'Bagshot Hills' are notable to the northwest and extensive tracts of flat land are found in the south.
- A diverse landscape with a series of broad valleys containing the major rivers Ver, Colne and Lea, and slightly steeper valleys of the rivers Stour, Colne and Roman. Numerous springs rise at the base of the Bagshot Beds and several reservoirs are dotted throughout the area.
- The pattern of woodlands is varied across the area and includes considerable ancient semi-natural woodland. Hertfordshire is heavily wooded in some areas as are parts of Essex, while other areas within Essex are more open in character. Significant areas of wood pasture and pollarded veteran trees are also present.
- The field pattern is very varied across the basin reflecting historical activity.
- The diverse range of semi-natural habitats include ancient woodland, lowland heath and floodplain grazing marsh and provide important habitats for a wide range of species including great-crested newt, water vole, dormouse and otter.
- The medieval pattern of small villages and dispersed farming settlements remain central to the character of parts of Hertfordshire and Essex.

Market towns have expanded over time as have the London suburbs and commuter settlements, with the creation of new settlements such as the pioneering garden city at Welwyn and the planned town at Basildon."

1.2.3.3 In relation to tranquillity, the NCA is described as follows:

"Based on the CPRE map of tranquillity (2006) it appears that the least tranquil areas are associated with urban centres such as the north London suburbs of Watford, Chelmsford and Basildon together with Colchester towards the north and the coastal towns of Southend-on-Sea, Clacton-on-Sea and Harwich. Other areas of disturbance are associated with the main transport routes linking these centres including the M25, M11, A1(M), A12 and A127 roads. The most tranquil areas tend to be the lowland areas to the east of the NCA towards the coast. These more rural areas are more sparsely inhabited, such as around the Maldon District and to the south of Colchester around the Abberton Reservoir, and less disturbed. In the west of the NCA the area around Broxbourne Woods to the east of Hatfield provides some tranquillity from the surrounding disturbed areas."

1.2.3.4 In relation to intrusion, the NCA is described as follows:

"The 2007 Intrusion Map (CPRE) shows the extent to which rural landscapes are 'intruded on' from urban development, noise (primarily traffic noise), and other sources of visual and auditory intrusion. This shows a similar pattern to the tranquillity mapping, with areas of disturbed land associated with urban areas, for example Watford and Chelmsford, and towns, such as Colchester and Harwich, and the main road and rail transport corridors linking these centres. Light pollution resulting from intensive agriculture, growth of settlements and road infrastructure improvements (A1M) is particularly apparent in the flat terrain." The map indicates that between 1960 and 2007 there has been an almost 15% increase in disturbed or intruded land, and an 8% increase in urban development.

1.2.4 NCA 115: Thames Valley

1.2.4.1 The Site lies within National Character Area (NCA) profile 115: Thames Valley the key characteristics of which are noted as:

- "Flat and low-lying land, rising to low, river-terraced hills, which include the prominent local outcrop of chalk on which Windsor Castle sits.
- The underlying geology is dominated by the London Clay which, over much of the area, is overlain by river-lain sands and gravels.
- The numerous hydrological features provide unity to an area which otherwise lacks homogeny; these features include the River Thames and its tributaries, streams, lakes, canals and open waterbodies (the result of restored gravel workings).
- Woodlands characterise the north-western area, with the wooded character extending up to the southern edge of the Chiltern Hills.

- Farming is limited. Where it survives, grazed pasture is the major land use within a generally open, flat and featureless landscape. The field pattern is medium-scale and irregular, with smaller fields to the west. Localised areas of species-rich hay meadows provide a splash of colour in summer.
- Although densely populated and developed, pockets of woodland, open grassland, parkland, wetlands and intimate meadows provide escape and tranquillity, and include a variety of habitats supporting important populations of many species, notably stag beetle, shoveler, gadwall and other invertebrates and wildfowl.
- Towards London in the east, 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.
- There are small but biologically important areas of lowland heathland – especially on higher sandy ground in the north – and a small area to the south falls within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) buffer zone.
- To the south, the open Thames flood plain dominates, with its associated flat grazing land, becoming characterised by a number of formal historic landscapes on higher ground. Between Hampton and Kew, the River Thames forms the focus of a series of designed landscapes.
- The area has an urban character, and there are very few villages of more traditional character, although almost half of the area is Green Belt land and development has been restricted in areas like Crown Estate land and Eton College grounds.
- The river is closely associated with numerous historic places and cultural events, such as the signing of Magna Carta at Runnymede. Tourists from all over the world are drawn to the rich heritage of the area, flocking to attractions like Hampton Court Palace and Windsor Castle.
- The area is important for recreation, both for residents and visitors.
- Historic parkland and commons provide access to green space, the Thames Path National Trail runs the length of the NCA, and a variety of activities are enjoyed on the river and other waterbodies."

1.2.4.2 In relation to tranquillity NCA 115 records at paragraph 11.1:

"Based on the CPRE [Campaign to Protect Rural England] map of Tranquillity (2006) none of this NCA can be officially considered as tranquil. The lowest scores for tranquillity are around the urban areas and Heathrow Airport. Expanses of parkland such as Windsor Great Park score medium tranquillity...The 2007 Intrusion Map (CPRE) shows the extent to which rural landscapes are 'intruded on' from urban development, noise (primarily traffic noise), and other sources of visual and auditory intrusion. This shows that almost the entire NCA is disturbed by visual and auditory intrusion."

1.2.4.3 The text adds in relation to intrusion at paragraph 11.2:

"*The 2007 Intrusion Map (CPRE) shows the extent to which rural landscapes are 'intruded on' from urban development, noise (primarily traffic noise), and other sources of visual and auditory intrusion. This shows that almost the entire NCA is disturbed by visual and auditory intrusion."*

1.2.5 NCA 129: Thames Basin Heaths

1.2.5.1 This NCA lies to the southwest of the study area. The Thames Basin Heath NCA "*stretches westwards from Weybridge in Surrey to the countryside around Newbury in Berkshire"*. Key characteristics of relevance in relation to NCA 129 are as follows:

- "High woodland cover, offering an array of colour in the autumn. Conifers and large plantations on former heathland are dominant features in the east, while the west is scattered with small, semi-natural woodlands on ancient sites.
- Acid, leached soils mean that farming on the plateaux is limited to rough pasture, and that alternative land uses (such as forestry, golf courses and horse paddocks) have emerged. Heather, gorse, oak and birch all thrive here. Arable land and improved pasture are found in the valleys, on alluvium.
- Beyond the large areas of heathland and woodland, there is a patchwork of small to medium-sized fields with woods. The legacy of historic hunting forests includes veteran trees, ancient woods, ancient hedgerows and parklands. Historic meadows remain as fragments along watercourses.
- Historic commons offer tranquillity and unenclosed views, while other rights of access are enjoyed across farmland, canals and downland. Ministry of Defence ownership restricts (but does not entirely prevent) public enjoyment.
- Valley floors are wet with ditches, numerous watercourses, ponds, waterfilled gravel pits, reedbeds and carr. Historic features include mills, relict water meadows, and canals such as the River Wey Navigations.
- 20th-century conurbations, including Camberley, sprawl along the Blackwater Valley, with associated roads (including the M3) dissecting heathland and woodland into blocks. Elsewhere, there are winding lanes and historic dispersed villages and farmsteads of traditional, locally-made brick and tile."

1.2.5.2 In relation to tranquillity, the NCA is described as follows:

"Based on the CPRE map of tranquillity (2006) the Thames Basin Heaths become progressively more tranquil to the west; poor tranquillity scores are found in the east."

1.2.5.3 In relation to intrusion, the NCA is described as follows:

"The 2007 Intrusion Map (CPRE) shows the extent to which rural landscapes are 'intruded on' from urban development, noise (primarily traffic noise), and other sources of visual and auditory intrusion. This shows that the only areas of undisturbed land now lie to the very west of the area." The table within the NCA Profile (from CPRE Intrusion Map, 2007) shows a 31% decrease in undisturbed land between 1960 and 2007, and a 10% increase in urban areas.

1.3 Colne Valley Regional Park (2017)

1.3.1 LCA 3: Cowley to West Drayton

1.3.1.1 This LCA is defined by Yiewsly and West Drayton to the east and the M4 to the south and forms the lower reaches of the River Colne. *"It comprises the valley floor of the River Colne which contains a complex network of different water channels including the River Colne, Grand Union Canal and Fray's River. There are numerous naturalistic lakes, post gravel extraction, which have a strong recreation focus. The area is well wooded giving rise to an enclosed and intimate character."* Key characteristics associated with this LCA include:

- "Low lying, flat, floodplain with little topographic variation.
- Frequent presence of water – including River Colne, Grand Union Canal, and Fray's River and the chain of waterbodies associated with former gravel extraction sites.
- Dense tree cover associated with the restored lakes and along watercourses, gives rise to a small scale and intimate landscape with limited views out.
- Occasional fields of pasture and grazing with scattered trees.
- Valuable wetland and riparian habitats which support a diverse flora and fauna.
- Settlement density is low comprising isolated properties, clusters of housing, occasional light industrial development and mobile home parks.
- Access into the area is by small rural east/west lanes and public rights of way.
- Area is traversed by mainline railway between West Drayton and Iver (part of Crossrail) and a line connecting West Drayton to Poyle.
- Pockets of tranquillity and intimacy created by vegetation and water.
- Extensive areas used for recreation often associated with waterways and lakes such as canal barging, angling and bird watching."

1.3.1.2 The character assessment also provides an overview of potential landscape strategies which would aim to **Protect**, **Manage** and **Plan** within the LCA. Examples of these are listed below:

- **Protect:** the strong sense of tranquillity, the attractive setting formed by the river valley floor, and the narrow lanes from urban fringe pressures.
- **Manage:** the water quality in the various waterbodies, conserve and enhance existing habitats, existing open views across expanses of water, recreation within the landscape, and improve the quality of 'gateways' from urban areas into the green corridor.
- **Plan:** extend and connect habitats and enhance biodiversity, increased access and connection of existing footpaths and routes, further screening of roads, industry and abrupt urban edges through tree planting, creation of local landmarks, and manage lanes which provide access into the area.

1.3.2 LCA 4: Harmondsworth to Stanwell Moor

1.3.2.1 This LCA includes the Colne Valley and the historic villages adjacent to Heathrow Airport. *"It is a lowland landscape with limited variations in topography and is significantly affected by infrastructure serving the airport and/or visual/audible intrusion of aircraft manoeuvres."* Key characteristics associated with this LCA include:

- "Low lying floodplain associated with the lower reaches of the River Colne.
- Area dissected by numerous roads servicing the airport – M25, A3044, A4 and A3113.
- Large scale industrial/commercial development west of the M25 and around the airport perimeter – including pavilion style commercial properties and distribution centres.
- Former areas of gravel extraction resulting in some small lakes and rough grazing.
- Historic villages of Stanwell Moor, Longford and Harmondsworth associated with the fringes of the River Colne.
- Area affected by aircraft flight paths and landing/take off manoeuvres with significant noise and visual intrusion.
- Heathrow air traffic control tower (beyond character area to the east) and a chimney of Grundon Lakeside Road Incarcerator are local landmarks."

1.3.2.2 The character assessment also provides an overview of potential landscape strategies which would aim to **Protect**, **Manage** and **Plan** within the LCA. Examples of these are listed below:

- **Protect:** small lanes resisting unsympathetic highways improvement or signage, historic features within the valley, the pattern of villages and their relationship with the River Colne, ecological networks provided by watercourses.
- **Manage:** recreation in the landscape ensuring development is in keeping with the rural character, extend areas of wet grassland and meadow with appropriate grazing and livestock.
- **Plan:** for the planting of new woodland within the valley floor to improve structure and mitigate the effects of urban development, for creation of new habitats and enhance existing, increased informal recreational use including improved PRoW, for the potential of Heathrow expansion ensuring appropriate mitigation which would strengthen the positive characteristics of the area and contribute to placemaking, and for the creation of local landmarks to assist with orientation and increased awareness of the River Colne.

1.3.3 LCA 8: Horton and Wraysbury Lowlands

1.3.3.1 This LCA comprises part of the Thames floodplain and River Colne alluvial fan and is characterised by a flat, low-lying landscape. *"Much of the area has been altered by gravel extraction and the construction of reservoirs resulting*

in a repetitive pattern of large lakes and steep reservoir embankments. Between these waterbodies are braided channels of the Colne Brook, and Colne and Wraysbury Rivers, remnant meadows and historic villages." Key characteristics associated with this LCA include:

- "Flat, low-lying alluvial fan/floodplain.
- Area significantly altered by large reservoirs and lakes in former gravel pits.
- Course of Colne Brook, Colne and Wraysbury Rivers obscured by artificial lakes.
- Artificial reservoir embankments rise to 20m and contrast starkly with otherwise flat topography of the area and dominate adjoining settlements and road corridors.
- Land use is predominantly lakes with remnant areas of pasture (including reservoir embankments) and some medium scaled arable fields in the north.
- Expansive naturalised and restored man-made wetland landscape of ecological importance particularly for over wintering birds.
- Dissected by M25, railway and affected by flight paths to/from Heathrow.
- Some views across open expanses of water but most views are contained by vegetation around the lakes, resulting in contrasting areas of openness and enclosure.
- Historic villages of Colnbrook, Horton, and Wraysbury each with notable listed structures such as churches, windmill, mill buildings and coach houses.
- Significant water based activity and passive recreation although there is a relative lack of footpaths around Colnbrook, Horton, and Wraysbury."

1.3.3.2 The character assessment also provides an overview of potential landscape strategies which would aim to **Protect**, **Manage** and **Plan** within the LCA. Examples of these are listed below:

- **Protect:** historic features along waterways, historic character of individual villages and key views to church towers, areas of ancient pasture/common such as Staines Moor and Common, the ecological value of the various reservoirs and lakes.
- **Manage:** woodland and scrub areas fringing lakes and seek opportunities to open up views across the water from the surrounding landscape, recreation in the landscape, small scale hedgerow pattern and mature hedgerow trees close to villages.
- **Plan:** for improved interpretation of the historic character and features, to improve the footpath network in order to improve access to the wider landscape, to enhance the landscape context of the route of the Colne Valley Trail/Way and plan alternative routes where development causes severance, for the creation of local landmarks.

1.3.4 LCA 11: Richings Lowland

1.3.4.1 This LCA comprises *"low-lying and gently sloping land between Langley Park and the Thamas/Colne* floodplain *between 40-25m AOD. It is a predominantly agricultural landscape, used for arable, orchards/market gardening and golf courses. There is a notable east/west grain to the landscape due to the Grand Union Canal and railway line, pylons, M4 and A4."* Key characteristics associated with this LCA include:

- "Lowland topography, gently sloping southwards between 40-25m AOD.
- Watercourses or waterbodies are scarce in this landscape except for the east/west arm of the Grand Union Canal and Horton Brook which feeds lakes in former Richings Parkland.
- Varied land use including paddocks close to settlement, large arable fields and horse grazing pastures (former landfill south of M4).
- Area of former orchards at the turn of the 20th century – still evident in land use today.
- Tree cover is sparse, scattered along field boundaries or roads or within former parkland areas giving rise to an open, expansive character.
- Strong east/west grain to this landscape reflected in transport routes e.g. railway, Grand Union Canal, pylons, M4 and A4.
- Encroachment of urban edge of Langley and Brands Hill with abrupt hard urban edge to east.
- Several golf courses including the Iver, Richings Park and Thorney Park.
- Pylons are visually prominent in this open landscape.
- Long extensive views across open fields or former landfill sites."

1.3.4.2 The character assessment also provides an overview of potential landscape strategies which would aim to **Protect**, **Manage** and **Plan** within the LCA. Examples of these are listed below:

- **Protect**: hedgerow boundaries through good management, open views to ensure visual interest, and protect distinctive Victorian architecture.
- **Manage**: arable/pasture land with the aim of generating a wildlife rich habitat and visually attractive landscape, recreational land use sensitively, and watercourse corridors through the creation of wider riparian buffers, vegetation and riverbank enhancement.
- **Plan**: to plant trees and woodland to contain and reduce visual impacts of development, for appropriate mitigation for major development which may harm the existing character, to re-introduce small scale orchards, restore areas of former landfill with small tree copses and hedgerows, to enhance landscape character and condition along the route of the Colne Valley Way/Trail, and for the creation of local landmarks through environmental art and sculpture.

1.3.5 LCA 13: River Ash Corridor – Staines

1.3.5.1 This LCA "*focuses around the River Ash between the M25 and HMP Bronzefield, although the river course is not often apparent in the landscape.*

It is a disjointed area dissected by major roads and railways. There is a matrix of different urban fringe land uses from playing fields and allotments to wider areas of grazed common land." Key characteristics associated with this LCA include:

- "Flat, low-lying landscape associated with the River Ash and contained by settlement.
- The course of the river is often not apparent and, in a few places, culverted.
- Trees are associated with water bodies and the road/rail network.
- Notable areas of common land grazed by cattle and some remnant pasture fields.
- Other urban fringe land uses including school playing fields, pocket parks, lakes and earth works from past and current gravel extraction.
- Many open areas are fenced and there are strong perceptions of restricted access.
- Staines Aqueduct, roads, railways and pylons cut through the area creating a disjointed and disorientating character.
- Distant views are largely contained by roadside embankments/vegetation and settlement although some long views to the control tower at Heathrow.
- Tranquillity and sense of remoteness are limited."

1.3.5.2 The character assessment also provides an overview of potential landscape strategies which would aim to **Protect**, **Manage** and **Plan** within the LCA. Examples of these are listed below:

- **Protect**: areas where the watercourse is evident in the landscape, the sense of open space created by the linking of parcels of land along the watercourse/floodplain despite urban context.
- **Manage**: increase the normal flow in the river and alleviate low flow problems, the water channel through de-silting and removal of rubbish and non-native species.
- **Plan:** to enhance the margins of the watercourse through tree planting and shelves of emergent vegetation, for a River Ash footpath connecting parcels of land, to enhance people's perception of the river and enjoyment of its qualities and rationalise and remove unnecessary fencing which restrict views and physical access.

1.4 Hillingdon (2012)

1.4.1 LCA 16: Cranford Open Gravel Terrace

1.4.1.1 Hillingdon Landscape and Townscape Character Assessment, London Borough of Hillingdon Council (2012) summarises the landscape character of Cranford Open Gravel Terrace (K3) LCA as follows:

"*The character area lies in the south of Hillingdon Borough within the Hounslow Gravel Natural Landscape Area (London's Natural Signatures).*

The borough administrative boundary defines the eastern edge of the character area, with the landscape extending into Hounslow Borough. The settlement edge of Hayes Town and the M25 delineate the northern margin. Harlington is located to the west, and Heathrow Airport and associated commercial infrastructure delineate the southern edge.

A low lying flat landscape on the gravel terrace with large scale arable cultivation, and the historic parkland of Cranford Country Park in the east of the area. Varying degrees of enclosure are experienced with greater tree cover at Cranford Country Park, creating an intimate and enclosed landscape, contrasting with the greater sense of openness within farmland. A range of habitats are associated largely with Cranford Country Park, including woodland, scrub, meadow and wetlands. The River Crane and Frog's Ditch pass through the park and a number of manmade ponds provide recreational and biodiversity opportunities. An area of sand and gravel extraction is present, and busy surrounding roads impart local and visual intrusions, however, pockets of tranquillity exist throughout, particularly within Cranford Country Park."

1.4.1.2 The high levels of enclosure within Cranford Country Park, primarily due to the presence of trees and woodlands, limit the influence of buildings, infrastructure and industry, and result in a sense of relative tranquillity. Further south, the auditory and visual influences of the A4 road, development and Heathrow airport are more apparent giving relatively low levels of tranquillity in these areas.

1.4.1.3 Key characteristics associated with this LCA include the following:

- "A flat landscape, predominantly underlain by Taplow Gravel Formation with a small area of Langley Silt Formation in the north. A large area of infilled ground in the west of the character area.
- Arable farmland predominates in the west of the area, occupying large scale fields, with smaller scale fields of paddock interspersed close to Harlington.
- The historic parkland of Cranford Country Park is in the east of the area, with a number of Grade II listed structures, representing the remains of Cranford House.
- Hydrological features are largely associated with Cranford Country Park, with the exception of a large pond in the north, which occupies former gravel works. The River Crane flows along the eastern boundary, with Frogs Ditch passing across the north and west, and a number of ponds scattered throughout.
- An operational sand and gravel extraction occurs in the north adjacent to Cranford Country Park.
- Significant biodiversity value and wildlife habitats associated with Cranford Country Park, recognised as a Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation, and comprising woodland, scrub, meadow and wetlands.

- Hedgerows provide an important linear corridor connecting fragmented habitats throughout the character area, particularly within farmland.
- Modern edge settlement filters in from Harlington, however, settlement is limited elsewhere. Heathrow Airport and associated infrastructure feature prominently along the southern boundary.
- The M4 runs along the north boundary, however, elsewhere roads are limited to Cranford Lane, and a small section of the A4.
- A network of footpath, bridleways and numerous informal footpaths cut though Cranford Country Park, however public rights of way are limited elsewhere.
- Open, long views south across farmland and with Heathrow notable in many vistas.
- Varying degrees of enclosure, with open farmland contrasting with dense woodland enclosure at Cranford Country Park.
- Pockets of tranquillity, particularly within Cranford Country Park, which has a strong seminatural character."

1.4.2 LCA 17: Harlington Open Gravel Terrace

1.4.2.1 Hillingdon Landscape and Townscape Character Assessment, London Borough of Hillingdon Council (2012) summarises the landscape character of Harlington Open Gravel Terrace LCA as follows:

"*The character area lies in the south of Hillingdon Borough within the Hayes Gravel Natural Landscape Area (London's Natural Signatures). The boundaries of the character area are largely defined by settlement and roads, with Hayes Town bordering the northern boundary, Harlington located to the east, and the A408 and edge of Sipson defining the west. Commercial infrastructure associated with Heathrow Airport delineates the southern extent of the character area.*

A flat and open landscape, with a mix of land uses. Large fields of arable cultivation predominate, interspersed with amenity grass playing fields, Heathpark golf course, a large cemetery and industrial sand and gravel works. Limited tree cover emphasises the openness of the character area, with long views across the landscape, particularly south, towards Heathrow Airport, which features prominently in many views. A network of hedgerows provides some visual unity and wildlife corridors within this landscape and generate a strong geometric form."

1.4.2.2 The auditory and visual influences of industrial areas, M4 motorway and Heathrow airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general, however pockets of more tranquil open space exist in places – particularly those furthest from the M4 motorway.

1.4.2.3 Key characteristics associated with the LCA are noted below:

- "A flat open landscape underlain with London Clay Formation.

- 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 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."

1.4.3 LCA 18: Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace

1.4.3.1 Hillingdon Landscape and Townscape Character Assessment, London Borough of Hillingdon Council (2012) summarises the landscape character of Harmondsworth Open Gravel Terrace (K1) LCA as follows:

"*The character area lies in the south of Hillingdon Borough within the Hayes Gravel Natural Landscape Area (London's Natural Signatures). The boundaries of the character area are largely defined by settlement edge and roads, with the M4 north, Sipson and the*

A408 delineating the eastern edge, and commercial infrastructure associated with Heathrow Airport bounding the south. The west is contained by the settlement of Harmondsworth and the A3044 and defined by the Colne Valley floodplain.

A flat and open landscape dominated by large scale arable farmland with fields delineated by a strong network of hedgerows with scattered trees. These together with scrubby and grassed road side verges provide important visual unity and wildlife corridors within the arable landscape. Small blocks of trees and tree belts provide occasional screening to industrial activity and commercial buildings. A number of ponds occupy former gravel pits in the north. The arable land cover, land use and flat topography, generate a simple and uniform character. Open, long views are afforded, particularly south across farmland, with buildings and infrastructure associated with Heathrow Airport prominent in many vistas."

1.4.3.2 The auditory and visual influences of the M4 motorway, industrial activity and nearby Heathrow airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity within this landscape.

1.4.3.3 Key characteristics associated with the LCA are noted below:

- "Flat open landscape, predominantly underlain by Langley Silt Formation with pockets of Taplow Gravel Formation. Areas of worked and infilled ground evident.
- Predominantly 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 add biodiversity interest and additionally screen industrial and commercial activity in places.
- Modern edge settlement filters in the 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 flat topography.
- Retains a farmland landscape character, despite being surrounded by settlement and urban development."

1.4.4 TCT 20: Heathrow Commercial Airport

1.4.4.1 This townscape character type (TCT) lies at the northern edge of Heathrow Airport, predominantly comprising the commercial and industrial development that lies along the A4 Bath Road. The auditory and visual influences of the A4 road corridor and Heathrow airport are such that the tranquillity level within this townscape is relatively low.

1.4.4.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCT include the following:

- "Commercial development situated largely along a straight, tree lined main road (A4) including hotels, restaurants, business parks, offices and car parking, associated with Heathrow Airport.
- Development is within large plots, accessed by roads terminating in dead ends.

- Built form is large scale and simple, with materials often comprising plate glass and stainless/painted steel construction, concrete, and red brick.
- Buildings frontages often with ornamental planting. Other boundaries include wire fencing, low brick walls and hedgerows.
- Open space includes car parking with ornamental landscape schemes in communal areas.
- Surfaces are mainly tarmacked, with concrete kerbs. Use of 'designed' hard materials including concrete flags and block paving.
- Views are kept short by large buildings with longer views linearly along roads. Heathrow Airport features predominantly in the backdrop to many views.
- Busy roads and airport traffic creates a busy character with strong sense of movement."

1.4.5 LCA 21: Heathrow Gravel Terrace Infrastructure

1.4.5.1 Hillingdon Landscape and Townscape Character Assessment, London Borough of Hillingdon Council (2012) summarises the landscape character of Heathrow Gravel Terrace Infrastructure (L1) LCA as follows:

"*The character area lies in the south of Hillingdon Borough within the Hounslow Gravels Natural Landscape Area (London's Natural Signatures). The boundaries of the character area are largely defined by the extent of Heathrow Airport with the borough administrative boundary and the perimeter roads defining its edges.*

A flat landform, underlain by London Clay with superficial gravel deposits (Taplow Gravel Formation), dominated by Heathrow Airport. Large extents of hardstanding (runways, access roads etc), buildings and associated infrastructure. There is little vegetation, limited to strips of grass alongside runways and shrub/climber planting on the exterior of perimeter walls and fencing. However, the Airport Reservoir and Burrows a Site of Grade II Borough importance. The diverted artificial watercourse of the Longford and Duke of Northumberland Rivers run along the southern and eastern edge and there is a rain water collection pond north of Terminal 5. Formerly a moorland and heath landscape then agricultural land with the village of Heath Row. A private aerodrome was built on this site in the 1930s. The airport has expanded with increasing demand for air travel and is a prominent feature in the south of the borough creating visual and audible impacts."

1.4.5.2 The auditory and visual influences of Heathrow airport are such that there are relatively low levels of tranquillity within this landscape.

1.4.5.3 Key characteristics associated with this LCA include the following:

- "Flat landform, underlain by London Clay with superficial gravel deposits 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.
- The artificial watercourses of the Longford and Duke of Northumberland occur along the western and southern boundaries of the airport, diverted a number of time most recently to accommodate Terminal 5.
- There is little ecological interest in this built landscape.
- Formerly heath and moorland then an agricultural landscape. The Fairey's Great West Aerodrome, a private aerodrome with a single runway was built here in the 1930s.
- Expansion of the airport has occurred with increasing demand for air travel. Terminal 5 was completed in 2008.
- Surrounded on all sides by perimeter road, security fencing and blast walls.
- The airport extends more than 12km^2 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."

1.4.6 TCT 22: Historic Core

1.4.6.1 The Historic Core TCT includes areas within Sipson, Harmondsworth, Harlington, West Drayton, Hayes, Cowley, Hillingdon, Yeading, Uxbridge, and Ickenham, which contain a variety of land uses (such as retail, commercial and residential). These areas are generally at or near local centres of activity, mostly located on or near local transport routes, which results in relatively low levels of tranquillity.

1.4.6.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCT include the following:

- "This type forms the historic core of settlement, usually associated with a church, green or common. The archaeology of these areas is particularly important.
- A considerable time depth is apparent with built development having evolved from the medieval period to the present day, often along historic routes.
- A tight urban grain is created by relatively high density development with buildings often drawn close to street frontages.
- Built vernacular is varied, including timber framed buildings, red brick with some white render. A concentration of listed buildings and 'historic assets'.
- Materials include red brick, purple brick, white render and slate roofing.
- A variety of land uses (ecclesiastical, retail, commercial and residential) creates an active and vibrant townscape.
- Greens and commons provide important open spaces providing focal points at the heart of settlement.

- Variety and rhythm created by varying building lines and roof heights, and texture created by the varied materials palette and facade 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."

1.4.7 TCT 23: Industrial and Commercial Canal Side

1.4.7.1 The Industrial and Commercial Canal Side TCT includes areas within Uxbridge/Cowley, Yiewsley and Hayes/Bulls Bridge areas. These areas are characterised by the large scale industrial and commercial development and associated transport connections, with low levels of tranquillity in general. However, the Grand Union Canal contributes natural environment features and pockets of tranquillity.

1.4.7.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCT include the following:

- "Low density industrial and commercial development including industrial estates, business parks and offices.
- Cut by the Grand Union Canal, an important linear feature providing recreational and ecological interest in the built landscape.
- Development is within large plots, accessed by roads terminating in dead ends.
- Built form is generally large scale and simple, often comprising sheds buildings with smaller office buildings. In contrast Stockley Park, master-planned in the I980s, includes buildings by a number of leading British architects.
- Materials palette is simple, with sheds comprising brick and metal sheet cladding and brick office buildings. Glass frontages are common within Stockley Business Park.
- Open space includes car parking and ornamental landscape schemes in communal areas. Stockley Business Park has an impressive large scale designed landscape including a lakes and lime avenues.
- The Grand Union Canal is a Nature Conservation Site of Metropolitan Importance, particularly distinctive In terms of its aquatic, emergent and bankside vegetation at Stockley Bridge.
- Long distance trails (the London Loop, Grand Union Canal Walk and Hillingdon Trail) follow the towpath of the Grand Union Canal.
- Views are kept short by buildings or are channelled down the canal from towpaths and road bridges."

1.4.8 TCT 24: Inter-war Suburb / Metroland

1.4.8.1 The inter-war suburbs/Metroland T**CT** occupies large areas of Hillingdon, including areas within West Drayton, Hayes, Harlington, Yiewsley, Cowley, Uxbridge, Yeading, Hillingdon, North Hillingdon, and Ickenham. These areas

predominantly comprise low-rise residential estates, interspersed with green spaces. The auditory and visual influences of major transport corridors, including roads and railways, are such that, in general, there are relatively low levels of tranquillity. However, pockets of tranquillity can be found within residential streets and green spaces away from busy transport corridors. Key characteristics associated with this TCT include:

- "The early use of development plans influenced by the 'garden suburb' movement had an impact on the style, layout and density of development in the north of the Borough.
- This type evolved with the extension of the Metropolitan Railway in the north of the Borough from Harrow on the Hill to Uxbridge in the early 1900s and the gradual establishment of stops along the line, becoming known as Metroland.
- Suburbs in the south of the Borough developed along improved transport links, such as canals and the Great West Railway and reflect the growth of local industries.
- Medium density residential suburbs consisting of a distinctive network of curvilinear streets (crescents), linear streets (avenues) and 'dead ends' (closes).
- Pockets of late 19th century Victorian and Post War terraces and more recent housing provide variety in character within the suburbs.
- Built form is defined by suburban style semi-detached two storey houses in pebbledash or colour render. Brick is also a common building material.
- Residential streets often delineated by grass verges and small street trees.
- Large well planned Local Authority and railway estates (similar to those designed by the LCC) from the I920's and 30's are also found in the south.
- The leafy suburban character is reinforced by well vegetated domestic front gardens with ornamental shrubs, bounded by low brick walls and clipped hedges.
- Views are channelled down streets, framed by the regular facades of houses.
- Quiet and peaceful residential suburbs with a spacious character due to the relatively wide street proportions.
- Interspersed with publicly accessible greenspaces including parks (e.g. Hillingdon Court Park) and recreation grounds and cut by accessible river corridors (River Finn and Yeading Brook). Hillingdon Court park is a highly valued local open space surrounded by residential development.
- Accessible landscape on settlement edges includes open countryside, golf courses, Country Parks (e.g. Stockley) and nature reserves (e.g. Ruislip Woods).
- Often connected to the suburbs by footpaths and long distance paths."

1.5 Spelthorpe (2015)

1.5.1 LCA 52: Princes Lakes Significant Greenspaces with Urban Areas

1.5.1.1 Surrey Landscape Character Assessment, Surrey County Council and Surrey Planning Officers Association (2015) (includes the Borough of Spelthorne) summarises the landscape character of Princes Lakes Significant Green Spaces within Urban Areas (UW2) LCA as follows:

"Located within the urban area between Ashford to the south and Heathrow to the north, at the northern edge of the County. The eastern edge of the area is defined by the county boundary. Although varied, this character area provides pockets of quality landscape, of historic importance or importance for existing biodiversity and biodiversity potential, embedded within the built-up areas. It provides open areas that are rural or natural in character in direct contrast to the surrounding dense urban areas of north Surrey."

1.5.1.2 The presence of the A30 road results in relatively low levels of tranquillity in the northern part of the area, further south, around the lakes, lie the areas with greatest tranquillity.

1.5.1.3 Key characteristics associated with this LCA include the following:

- "Underlain by London Clay Formation Clay, Silt and Sand solid geology.
- Part of the wider Thames valley but annexed by settlement.
- Contains large lakes formed from gravel extraction, plus adjacent fields and sports pitches.
- There are roads and rail routes towards the perimeter of the area.
- There are no public rights of way, but there is a focus on recreation in the form of sports pitches and use of the lakes for water sports.
- The lakes are designated as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance.
- Provides a significant area of open water and relief from surrounding built-up areas.
- Bedfont Lakes to the east (within Greater London) have been restored from gravel workings to a successful country park and could be used as a role model for further restoration of Princes Lake to enhance the areas use as a recreational resource."

1.5.2 TCA 53: Staines

1.5.2.1 This Townscape Character Area (TCA) is largely made up of the suburban town of Staines-upon- Thames, which lies to the north and east of the River Thames and south of Staines Moor, King George VI Reservoir and Staines Reservoirs. The busy town centre, a Conservation Area, is located in the northern part of the character area, adjacent to the River Thames. Suburban residential areas predominantly lie to the south, with Laleham Conservation Area forming the southern extremity of the character area. Architecture

largely ranges from that of the late Victorian era to recent development, with Victorian, Georgian and older buildings within the Conservation Areas. The River Colne and Wraysbury River pass through the town and flow into the River Thames at the edge of the town centre, such that there is a considerable area of river frontage. Parks, recreation grounds and allotments contribute green spaces. The A30 dual carriageway separates the town from the open flood meadows of Staines Moor to the north, and the busy A308 and railway lines from London Waterloo pass through the town. These transport corridors, together with the more distant M25 and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general.

1.5.2.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCA include the following:

- “Flat, low lying area, underlain by a solid geology of London Clay with superficial gravel deposits
- Suburban town adjacent to the River Thames
- The Wraysbury River and River Colne Pass through the area and flow into the River Thames at the edge of the town centre, such that there is a considerable area of river frontage
- The town centre and Laleham are Conservation Areas, valued for their historic character
- Buildings are predominantly of the late Victorian era to recent development, with older buildings within the Conservation Areas
- Parks, recreation grounds and allotments contribute green spaces
- The A30 dual carriageway separates the town from the open flood meadows of Staines Moor, and the busy A308 and railway lines from London Waterloo pass through the town. These transport corridors, together with the more distant M25 and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general.”

1.5.3 TCA 54: Stanwell

1.5.3.1 This area comprises the residential settlement of Stanwell, to the south of Heathrow Airport. The historic core of Stanwell, which includes the parish church of St Mary the Virgin together with Georgian and early Victorian architecture, is designated as a Conservation Area for its special historic character. The wider settlement includes suburban housing, largely from the inter-war and post-war period, together with more recent development. Schools, hospitals, industrial estates are also present; parks and cemeteries contribute green spaces. Heathrow Airport’s Southern Perimeter Road passes immediately to the north of the character area, with the London Road (A30) passing through the southern end of the character area. Busy roads and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general.

1.5.3.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCA include the following:

- "Flat, low lying area, underlain by a solid geology of London Clay with superficial gravel deposits
- Residential settlement with historic core, a Conservation Area, predominantly surrounded by suburban residential areas
- Stanwell Conservation Area includes the parish church of St Mary the Virgin together with Georgian and early Victorian architecture
- Schools, hospitals and industrial estates fall within the character area
- Parks and cemeteries contribute green spaces
- Busy roads, including the London Road, and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general."

1.5.4 TCA 57: Ashford

1.5.4.1 This character area largely comprises residential suburbs, bordered by Staines Reservoirs, the Queen Mary Reservoir and Bedfont Lakes. Local centres include a parade of shops, with large-scale business parks (including BP International) and industrial estates also present within the character area. Residential suburbs primarily comprise semi-detached housing, with architecture ranging from the late Victorian era to recent development. Parks and recreation grounds contribute green spaces. The London Road (A30) passes along the northern edge of the area and Staines Road West (A308) passes through the southern end of the character area. The London Waterloo to Reading railway line traverses the northern part of the area, with Ashford train station within the character area. Busy roads, the railway and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general.

1.5.4.2 Key characteristics associated with this TCA include the following:

- "Flat, low lying area, underlain by a solid geology of London Clay with superficial gravel deposits
- Predominantly suburban residential areas with local centres
- Housing is largely semi-detached, with architecture ranging from the late Victorian era to recent development
- Business parks and industrial estates fall within the character area
- Parks and recreation grounds contribute green spaces
- Busy roads, including the London Road and Staines Road West, London Waterloo to Reading railway and flight paths to/from Heathrow Airport contribute to relatively low levels of tranquillity, in general."

1.6 Runnymede (2015)

1.6.1 LCA 62: Englefield Green West Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland

1.6.1.1 Surrey Landscape Character Assessment, Surrey County Council and Surrey Planning Officers Association (2015) (includes the Borough of

Runnymede) summarises the landscape character of Englefield Green West Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland (SS2) LCA as follows:

"*The Englefield Green West Settled and Wooded Sandy Farmland Character Area lies to the west of Egham, at the north-western corner of the county. It is defined by the edge of continuous woodland to the south and west, and by settlement to the north and east. In places the western boundary is aligned to roads.*"

1.6.1.2 Key characteristics associated with this LCA include the following:

- "Underlain by Bagshot Formation Sand solid geology, as well as small areas of Claygate Member Sand, Silt and Clay, and London Clay Formation Clay, Silt and Sand to the south.
- A relatively flat landscape, although falling south towards water courses and ponds which flow south towards Virginia Water.
- The character area consists of pastoral estate farmland with a number of paddocks and horse related uses. There are smaller parcels of land associated with large houses, enclosed by boundary vegetation.
- Woodland cover is limited to a few blocks of woodland, including an area of ancient woodland, tree belts and riparian vegetation which follows watercourses.
- Rural, partially enclosed, with few long distance views.
- A limited number of public rights of way cross through the middle of the character area, although some areas have no formal public access.
- Settlements consists of large, very low density dwellings set back from the rural lanes, buildings often associated with horse riding and training, and occasional farm buildings.
- Englefield Green in the north-east of the character area is registered as common land and is part of Englefield Green Conservation Area.
- A pleasant semi-rural landscape, but human influence in the form of large dwellings, horse ownership and farming is obvious across parts of the character area (albeit often filtered by vegetation) and limits the sense of remoteness and tranquillity. Public access is limited, with visitors drawn to nearby attractions such as the lake at Virginia Water and the Savill Garden, and Windsor Great Park to the west."

1.7 Windsor and Maidenhead (2004)

1.7.1 LCA 71: Datchet Settled Farmland Floodplain

1.7.1.1 Landscape Character Assessment for the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Landscape Character Assessment, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council (2004) summarises the landscape character of Datchet Settled Farmed Floodplain as follows:

"*This mixed settled agricultural landscape contains a great variety of elements. It is a 'transitional' landscape which is influenced by the*

settlements of Slough, Datchet and Wraysbury as well as the rich agricultural landscape of the Farmed Parkland landscape type to the south and the fragmented wetland landscape of the Developed Settled Floodplain to the east. Although the views are not retained by chalk escarpment in this landscape area, and although it shares similar characteristics to the Developed Settled Floodplain, it (importantly) retains 'historic' features such as field systems lined with hedgerows and mature trees and designed landscape features, which give it a relatively intact feel. To the north of Datchet the registered Historic Park and Garden at Ditton Park and the M4 motorway corridor are located. The urban edge of Slough influences the character of the landscape to the north of the M4 motorway corridor, including at Ditton Park, as built forms are visible above the tree cover. In the south the landscape is more tranquil and unified. There are large arable (cereal) fields with some tree cover, and the River Thames is wooded with a soft edge. The wooded 'greenness' of the surrounding Datchet landscape is an important characteristic. There is a notable absence of public access, in the form of Public Rights of Way, in this landscape. Loss of footpaths is partly due to the development of the M4 and Queen Mother Reservoir. New sections of the Thames Path are a recent improvement to the Public Rights of Way network, but paths are scrubby in quality."

1.7.1.2 The M4 motorway, together with other roads, nearby settlements and the overhead flight paths to/from Heathrow airport exert auditory and visual influences such that tranquillity levels are relatively low, in general.

1.7.1.3 Key characteristics associated with this LCA include the following:

- "Meadow grassland and willow belts along the riverside.
- Influences of Datchet and Slough urban edges.
- Queen Mother Reservoir embankment.
- M4 road corridor.
- Influence of the flight path.
- Views of Datchet church spire.
- Generous grass verges to roadways."

1.8 Hounslow (2014)

1.8.1 TCA 35: Bedfont

1.8.1.1 This TCA is located to the southwest of Hounslow borough on the edge of Greater London. It is bounded to the south and west by Green Belt land, to the east by Feltham and to the north by Heathrow Airport. The TCA is almost level with a slight upward slope to the north. To the north, south and west large areas of semi-rural open space with some woodland and extensive lakes derived from former gravel pits are notable features.

1.8.1.2 The TCA is dominated by residential use and the area may be classified as mostly post war outer suburban character. The main historic core lies to the

west, focussed around the parish church and the village green of East Bedfont. There are very large areas of open space, much of it natural or semi-natural, which reflects the areas Greater London fringe location. The TCA is acoustically and economically dominated by Heathrow Airport.

1.8.1.3 The London Borough of Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study (2014) divided the TCA into discrete character areas from A-Z. These areas were then quantified with regards to Design Quality, Sensitivity to Change, Permanence, and Suitability for Tall Buildings. The results of these are set out below:

- Design Quality: Largely of Medium quality, with one area (I) of high quality, and several (Y, A, X, T, S, V and R) of low quality.
- Sensitivity to change: Broadly split between medium (northern part) and high (southern part) with a number of low sensitivity areas (Y, X, L, T, S, V, R, G, and A).
- Permanence: Generally medium within western parts, and high within north-eastern parts, with area U to the southeast also high permanence.
- Suitability for tall buildings: All areas deemed not suitable.

1.8.2 TCA 36: Cranford and Heston

1.8.2.1 This TCA is located within the north-west of the borough, with the London Borough of Ealing to the north and the London Borough of Hillingdon to the west. It is relatively secluded and quiet, retaining a feeling of remoteness reinforced by its limited accessibility. The eastern edge of the TCA is lined by Osterley Park behind St Leonard's Churchyard and Heston Community School. It occupies the highest land in the borough rising from 20m in the west to its peak of 30m around Heston. The area has associations with aircraft, and Heston Aerodrome existed here from 1929 to 1947 until Heathrow Airport was built to the immediate west.

1.8.2.2 The area is bounded to the north by the Grand Union Canal to the north and the River Crane to the west. The M4 passes through the area in a east to west direction, dividing the area into two parts. The area is poorly served by public transport which contributes to its remote and secluded feel. Heathrow Airport acoustically and economically dominates the area, with the flight path generating a great deal of noise pollution.

1.8.2.3 The London Borough of Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study (2014) divided the TCA into discrete character areas from A-V. These areas were then quantified with regards to Design Quality, Sensitivity to Change, Permanence, and Suitability for Tall Buildings. The results of these are set out below:

- Design Quality: Largely of Medium quality, with several areas of high quality (K, M, P, and O), and some (A, G, H, I, L, N, and V) of low quality.

- Sensitivity to change: Largely medium with limited areas of high (S, R and P) with a number of low sensitivity areas (B, H, I, V and N).
- Permanence: Relatively mixed, with low permanence to the northwest, medium permanence to the southwest and high permanence to the east.
- Suitability for tall buildings: All areas deemed not suitable.

1.8.3 TCA 37: Feltham

1.8.3.1 This TCA is located within the southwest of the borough on the edge of Greater London. Central Feltham is a designated borough Town Centre and a District Centre in the London Plan. The TCA is bounded to the west by the Bedfont TCA and Green Belt, to the south by Hanworth TCA and Green Belt land, to the south by the River Crane and Hounslow Heath, and to the north by Heathrow Airport.

1.8.3.2 The TCA is almost level with a slight upward slope to the north. The TCA contains large areas of semi-rural open space to the north and southwest, with some spaces designated as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). It is predominantly residential with large areas of employment use and broadly classed as post-war outer suburban in nature. The TCA is one of the greenest areas in London, containing three rivers, access to Hounslow Heath, semi-rural land to the north and southwest, a lake-dotted country park to the west (Bedfont Lakes Country Park), historic Hanworth Park to the south in addition to its own large recreation spaces.

1.8.3.3 The London Borough of Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study (2014) divided the TCA into discrete character areas from A-Z. These areas were then quantified with regards to Design Quality, Sensitivity to Change, Permanence, and Suitability for Tall Buildings. The results of these are set out below:

- Design Quality: Largely of Medium quality, with limited areas of high quality (D, M and O), and some of low quality (A, B1, I, L, and U).
- Sensitivity to change: Largely medium with limited areas of high (D, O, M and X) with a number of low sensitivity areas (A, B1, C, I, L, and U).
- Permanence: Relatively mixed, with medium permanence to the north, southwest, central and southeast, one area of low (N), and the remainder high permanence.
- Suitability for tall buildings: Predominantly not suitable, with areas I, L, M, N and J having some suitability.

1.8.4 TCA 40: Hounslow West

1.8.4.1 This TCA lies almost central within the borough, flanked by Bath Road and Staines Road. The large expanse of Hounslow Heath dominates to the southwest, accessed along Staines Road. The TCA is relatively flat, sloping gently downhill south-eastwards to the Thames following the River Crane, which forms the areas western edge. Lying adjacent to the Hounslow TCA,

the distinction between the two is subtle and many may not appreciate any change in character; however the cluster of restaurants, shops and cafes in and around Hounslow West tube station has a distinct character.

1.8.4.2 The TCA benefits from having Hounslow Heath on its doorstep which includes around 80ha of heath, meadow and wetlands. Some of the housing estates within the TCA are characterised by their green landscape, street trees, grass verges and small greens. Some estates however, particularly on the western side have under-used, poorly defined or looked after amenity spaces. The housing estates tend to be pre-WWII or post-WWII which share many similar characteristics yet have subtle differences in style. The estates dominate Hounslow West, resulting in an overall suburban character.

1.8.4.3 The London Borough of Hounslow Urban Context and Character Study (2014) divided the TCA into discrete character areas from A-S. These areas were then quantified with regards to Design Quality, Sensitivity to Change, Permanence, and Suitability for Tall Buildings. The results of these are set out below:

- Design Quality: Largely of High quality to the south and east (S, E, G, and C), with some areas of low quality (F, Q, O, K, L, H and J), and the remainder medium quality.
- Sensitivity to change: Largely relates to design quality, with areas S, E, G and C being of high sensitivity to change, F, Q, O, K, L, H and J being of low sensitivity to change, and the remainder being of medium sensitivity to change.
- Permanence: The vast majority of areas were deemed as being of high permanence, with areas J, I, H, D, G, K, and O being of medium permanence. There are no areas of low permanence identified.
- Suitability for tall buildings: All areas deemed not suitable.

1.9 Slough (HAL PEIR / HWL 2020)

1.9.1 TCA 82: Slough

1.9.1.1 This TCA comprises housing, retail, industrial and commercial areas, interspersed with recreational space. The area is generally low lying, ranging between 20m and 55m AOD. There is a network of transport corridors crossing the TCA, with major routes including the M4, A4, A355 and A412 roads, together with the Great Western Main Line railway. Herschel Park (Formerly Upton Park) and parts of the Ditton Park Registered Park and Garden are also located within the TCA.

1.9.1.2 Within this built up area, traversed by significant transport corridors and with overhead flight paths to/from Heathrow airport, tranquillity levels are relatively low, in general. The greatest tranquillity is found within the smaller residential streets and open spaces away from the main transport corridors.

1.9.1.3 Key characteristics associated with this TCA are as follows:

- “20th century residential development dominates the area
- A tight urban grain is created by relatively high-density development with buildings often close to street frontages within urban centres
- Materials include red brick, yellow brick, render, timber cladding and tile roofing
- A variety of land uses (residential, retail, commercial and industrial)
- Urban centres are busy with less activity in urban edge residential estates
- Residential properties have front and back gardens
- Slough Trading Estate covers a large area in the central part of Slough
- There are a number of watercourses flowing across the area towards the River Thames
- Parks provide important open spaces within areas of settlement.”

Appendix 16.1

Ground Condition Policy

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 16.1 – Ground Conditions Policy

Contents

1 Policy Relevant to the Assessment of Ground Conditions 1

1.1 Introduction 1

Tables

Table 16-1.1: Policy relevant to the Ground Conditions assessment 1

1 Policy Relevant to the Assessment of Ground Conditions

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This appendix describes the topic specific policies that have informed the scope and, where relevant, the Study Areas of the assessment presented in **Chapter 16: Ground Conditions**.

1.1.2 As described within **Chapter 16**, the land within the Scoping Boundary and the Study Areas spans nine Local Planning Authorities[1], with the majority of the land (by area) located within the administrative area of the London Borough of Hillingdon. The relevant adopted and emerging local planning policies applicable to each host authority have been reviewed and are presented in **Table 16-1.1** below.

Table 16-1.1: Policy relevant to the Ground Conditions assessment

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Policy – National	
Airports National Policy Statement[2] (ANPS): new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the south-east of England, June 2018	
ANPS Paragraph 5.84 – "*The applicant should ensure that the environmental statement submitted with its application for development consent clearly sets out any likely significant effects on … designated sites of ecological or geological importance*". ANPS Paragraph 5.91 – "*The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of and maximised opportunities to conserve … geological conservation interests*". ANPS Paragraph 5.96 – "*…development should avoid significant harm to… geological conservation interests*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions Environmental Statement (ES) chapter will include consideration of this receptor.

[1] London Borough of Hillingdon, London Borough of Hounslow, London Borough of Ealing, London Borough of Richmond upon Thames, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Spelthorne Borough Council, Slough Borough Council, Buckinghamshire Council and Runnymede Borough Council.

[2] Department for Transport. Airports National Policy Statement. 2018. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/airports-national-policy-statement. (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
ANPS Paragraph 5.110 – "*Where preexisting land contamination is being considered through development, the objective is to ensure that the site is suitable for its intended use. Risks would require consideration in accordance with the contaminated land statutory guidance as a minimum".* ANPS Paragraph 5.116 – "*For developments where land may be affected by contamination, or existing mitigation is in place in respect of historic contamination, the applicant should have regard to the statutory regime contained in Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and relevant Government guidance relating to or dealing with contaminated land*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance. • A Land Contamination Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment (GQRA) and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
ANPS Paragraph 5.175 – "*Where the proposed development is subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment and the development is likely to have significant adverse effects on the water environment, the applicant should ascertain the existing status of, and carry out an assessment of, the impacts of the proposed project on water quality, water resources and physical characteristics as part of the environmental statement*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
ANPS Paragraph 5.176 – "*Any environmental statement should describe…the existing quality of water affected by the proposed project; existing water resources affected by the proposed project and the impacts of the proposed project on water resources*".	investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
ANPS Paragraph 5.227 – "*Where necessary, land stability should be considered in respect of new development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and supporting planning guidance. Specifically, proposals should be appropriate for the location, including preventing unacceptable risks from land instability. If land stability could be an issue, the applicant should seek appropriate technical and environmental expert advice to assess the likely consequences of proposed developments on sites where subsidence, landslides and ground compression is known or suspected*". ANPS Paragraph 5.228 – "*A preliminary assessment of ground instability should be carried out at the earliest possible stage before a detailed application for development consent is prepared. The applicant should ensure that any necessary investigations are undertaken to confirm that their sites are and will remain stable, or can be made so as part of the development. The site needs to be assessed in the context of*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by a Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
surrounding areas where subsidence, landslides and land compression could threaten the development during its anticipated life or damage neighbouring land or property. This could be in the form of a land stability or slope stability risk assessment report".	
Draft Heathrow Expansion National Policy Statement[3] (HENPS) published by the Department for Transport on 18th June 2026 (updated 22nd June 2026)	
HENPS Paragraph 5.157 – *"The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance… geological conservation interests*". HENPS Paragraph 5.164 – *"…development should avoid significant harm to … geological conservation interests*". HENPS Paragraph 5.168 – "*…development should, at first avoid significant harm to… geological conservation interests*".	Geologically designated sites are present within the Study Area and are identified as potential receptors. The assessments in Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
HENPS Paragraph 5.187 – *"…Any land affected by contamination will need to be remediated appropriately*". HENPS Paragraph 5.188 – *"Construction and operation of airport facilities is a potential source of contaminative substances (for example, through de-icing or leaks and spills of fuel). Where pre-existing land contamination is being considered through development, the objective is to ensure that the site is suitable for its intended use. Risks would require*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground

[3] Department for Transport. Draft Heathrow Expansion National Policy Statement. 2026. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-heathrow-expansion-national-policy-statement. (accessed on: 22/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
consideration in accordance with the contaminated land statutory guidance as a minimum". HENPS Paragraph 5.194 – *"The applicant should ensure that a site is suitable for its proposed use, taking account of ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination*". HENPS Paragraph 5.195 – *"For developments on previously developed land, the applicant should ensure that they have considered the risk posed by land contamination, and where contamination is present, the applicant should consider opportunities for remediation where possible*". HENPS Paragraph 5.198 – *"Where land is remediated it should, as a minimum, not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The applicant should have regard to statutory regimes and relevant Government policy and guidance such as the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice guidance*". HENPS Paragraph 5.262 – *"Airport development could impact the water environment, especially the quality of the surface and groundwater… The applicant should ensure that it takes into account the Government's PFAS plan and any legislative changes in this respect that affect its planned operations*". HENPS Paragraph 5.263 – *"Where the development is likely to have significant adverse effects on the water environment, the applicant should undertake an assessment of the existing status of the water environment and*	investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
impacts of the proposed scheme on water quality, water resources and physical characteristics of the water environment as part of any Environmental Statement".	
HENPS Paragraph 5.327 – "*The effects of land instability may include subsidence, ground heave, settlement or slope instability. If not properly identified and addressed, these issues could cause harm to human health, property, infrastructure and the wider environment. Such risks can arise in different circumstances, vary in their predictability and may affect the suitability of land for development*". HENPS Paragraph 5.328 – "*Given the nature and location of the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme, the applicant should assess the risk of land instability, subsidence and any other relevant ground condition impacts arising from the development, and should consult the relevant statutory bodies and technical authorities where such risks are identified*". HENPS Paragraph 5.329 – "*A preliminary assessment of ground instability should be carried out at the earliest possible stage before a detailed application for development consent is prepared. The applicant should ensure that any necessary investigations are undertaken by a competent person to confirm that their sites are and will remain stable, or can be made so as part of the development. The site needs to be assessed in the context of surrounding areas where subsidence, landslides and land compression could threaten the development during its anticipated life or damage neighbouring land or property. This could be in the*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
form of a land stability or slope stability risk assessment report". HENPS Paragraph 5.330 – "*The applicant has a range of mechanisms available to mitigate and minimise risks of land instability. These include:* *Establishing the principle and layout of new development, so as to avoid or reduce exposure to identified ground hazards;* *Ensuring the proper design of structures and earthworks to accommodate or withstand anticipated ground movement and other relevant geotechnical risks; or* *Using ground improvement techniques, where necessary, including the removal or treatment of unsuitable material and its replacement with suitable inert and stable material*".	
National Networks National Policy Statement[4] (NNNPS)	
Paragraph 5.154 – "*Where necessary, land contamination and instability should be considered in respect of new development. Specifically, proposals should be appropriate for the location, including preventing unacceptable risks from land contamination or instability. If land instability and/or land contamination may be an issue, applicants should seek appropriate technical and environmental expert advice from a competent person to prepare and carry out the appropriate assessments. Applicants should consult with the Coal Authority, Environment Agency and Local Authority if necessary*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory

[4] Department for Transport. National Networks National Policy Statement. 2024. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/draft-heathrow-expansion-national-policy-statement. (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
NNNPS Paragraph 5.155 – "*For developments on previously developed land, applicants should ensure and demonstrate that they have considered the risks posed by land contamination in accordance with the Land Contamination Risk Management guidance. A preliminary assessment of land contamination and/or ground instability should be carried out at the earliest possible stage before a detailed application for development consent is prepared*". NNNPS Paragraph 5.156 – "*Applicants should ensure that any necessary investigations are undertaken, in accordance with Land Contamination Risk Management guidance, to ascertain the risk from contamination and identify sensitive receptors and that their sites are, and will, remain stable or can be made so as part of the development. The site needs to be assessed in the context of surrounding areas where subsidence, landslides and land compression could threaten the development during its anticipated life or damage neighbouring land or property. This could be in the form of a land stability or slope stability risk assessment report*".	Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
National Planning Policy Framework[5] (NPPF)	
NPPF Section P1 states "*To support efforts to avoid and mitigate risks from natural and man-made hazards, minimise levels of pollution and create clean, liveable and safe places for people to live, work and visit, development plans should:*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground

[5] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. National Planning Policy Framework. 2026. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework (accessed on: 17/08/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
a. Allocate land for development where, taking into account the potential for mitigation: *i. Opportunities can be taken to improve local environmental conditions, such as by remediating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land;* *ii. Ground conditions will not inhibit or pose a risk to the nature of the development proposed (such as due to land instability), and occupiers and users will not be put at risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution;* *iii. Development proposals will not cause unacceptable levels of pollution, either alone or in combination with other pollution sources…* *b. Consider any wider opportunities to reduce air, water, soil, noise or other forms of pollution, and contribute to compliance with national and local environmental targets and objectives".*	conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements. • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
NPPF Section P2 states: "*1. Sites proposed for development should be suitable for their proposed use taking into account:* *a. Ground conditions, including any risks arising from land instability and contamination (whether due to natural hazards or current and former activities such as mining or fuel storage); and* *b. The extent to which any such risks can be mitigated, and the potential*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Land Instability), Preliminary Ground Investigation and Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Reports which will include an assessment of the ground conditions, and preliminary recommendations in respect of foundations and other geotechnical elements. • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land)

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
impacts on the natural environment arising from remediation. *2. Where land is remediated it should, as a minimum, not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.* *3. Adequate site assessment information, prepared by a competent person, should be available to inform these considerations.* *4. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner".*	including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
NPPF Section N6 states "*To support the conservation of… sites of geodiversity value, development proposals affecting…* *b. A site of national importance, which for the purpose of this policy is one designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest, should only be supported if:* *i. There would be no adverse effect (either individually or in combination with other developments) on the site's features of special scientific interest; or* *ii. The benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both the likely impact on the features of special scientific interest, and any broader impact on the*	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest… *c. A site of local importance, which for the purpose of this policy is one designated as a… local geological site or equivalent in the development plan, should only be supported if:* *i. There would not be a significant adverse effect on the integrity of the site; or* *ii. The benefits of development in the location proposed clearly outweigh the likely impact on the features which make the site valuable for nature conservation…* *…This policy applies to development on land inside or outside a designated area, if it would have an impact on the identified biodiversity or geodiversity value of the area concerned".*	
Policy – Regional	
The London Plan[6] (published March 2021) <u>Policy SD1 - Opportunity Areas</u> *"To ensure that Opportunity Areas fully realise their growth and regeneration potential, the Mayor will… encourage the strategic remediation of contaminated land.* *Boroughs, through Development Plans and decisions, should… take appropriate measures to deal with contamination that may exist*". <u>Policy SI 5 – Water Infrastructure</u> *"Development proposals should… seek to improve the water environment".*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A

[6] Mayor of London. The London Plan. 2021. Available at https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/london-plan/london-plan-2021 (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
Policy G9 – Geodiversity "*Development proposals should:* *1) make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of geodiversity* *2) protect Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS)* *3) give Locally Important Geological Sites (LIGS) the level of protection commensurate with their importance*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
The London Plan (Draft)[7] (2026)	
Policy GHR6 – Trees, biodiversity and geodiversity *"Development should make a positive contribution to the protection and enhancement of geodiversity, avoiding harm to Regionally Important Geological Sites and Locally Important Geological Sites".*	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Policy – Local	

[7] Mayor of London. The London Plan (Draft). 2026. Available at https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/london-plan/next-london-plan/draft-london-plan-consultation/draft-london-plan-consultation-resources/draft-london-plan (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 – Strategic Policies[8] (adopted November 2012)	
Policy EM7: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation "*Hillingdon's biodiversity and geological conservation will be preserved and enhanced with particular attention given to:* *1. The conservation and enhancement of the natural state of: Harefield Gravel Pits Colne Valley Regional Park Fray's Farm Meadows Harefield Pit* *2. The protection and enhancement of all Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation. Sites with Metropolitan and Borough Grade 1 importance will be protected from any adverse impacts and loss. Borough Grade 2 and Sites of Local Importance will be protected from loss with harmful impacts mitigated through appropriate compensation".*	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Policy EM8: Land, Water, Air and Noise *"Water Quality - The Council will seek to safeguard and improve all water quality, both ground and surface. Principal Aquifers, and Source Protection Zones will be given priority along with the:* • *River Colne* • *Grand Union Canal* • *River Pinn* • *Yeading Brook* • *Porter Land Brook* • *River Crane* • *Ruislip Lido*" "*Land Contamination - The Council will expect proposals for development on*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory

[8] London Borough of Hillingdon. Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies. 2012. Available at: https://pre.hillingdon.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-review (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
contaminated land to provide mitigation strategies that reduce the impacts on surrounding land uses. Major development proposals will be expected to demonstrate a sustainable approach to remediation that includes techniques to reduce the need to landfill".	Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies[9] (adopted January 2020)	
Policy DMEI 7: Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement "*A) The design and layout of new development should retain and enhance any existing features of biodiversity or geological value within the site… B) If development is proposed on or near to a site considered to have features of ecological or geological value, applicants must submit appropriate surveys and assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have unacceptable effects…*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Policy DMEI 11: Protection of Groundwater Resources "*All development proposals within a Source Protection Zone, Safeguard Zone or Water Protection Zone must assess any risk to groundwater resources and demonstrate that these would be protected throughout the construction and operational phases of development*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal &

[9] London Borough of Hillingdon. Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies. 2020. Available at: https://pre.hillingdon.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-review (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Policy DMEI 12: Development of Land Affected by Contamination "*A) Proposals for development on potentially contaminated sites will be expected to be accompanied by at least an initial study of the likely contaminants. The Council will support planning permission for any development of land which is affected by contamination where it can be demonstrated that contamination issues have been adequately assessed and the site can be safely remediated so that the development can be made suitable for the proposed use…* *C) Where initial studies reveal potentially harmful levels of contamination, either to human health or controlled waters and other environmental features, full intrusive ground investigations and remediation proposals will be expected prior to any approvals".*	Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Volume 1[10,11] (adopted 2015)	
Policy EQ8 – Contamination "*We will expect development proposals to:* *d) Present adequate site investigation information, including an assessment of the site's history, potential contamination sources, pathways and receptors, and where appropriate, physical investigation, chemical testing, assessment of ground gas risks and assessments of risks to groundwater;*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground

[10] London Borough of Hounslow. Local Plan 2015 – 2030 – Volume 1. 2015. Available at: https://www.hounslow.gov.uk/local-plan/local-plan-1 (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

[11] Volume 2 of the Hounslow Local Plan provides site allocations only, and does not provide any relevant policy. The only allocated site within the Scoping Boundary is Site 58: Rectory Farm which is allocated for mineral development and is discussed in **Chapter 18: Materials and Waste**.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
e) Present proposals for the control of any risks from contamination that may be present; *(f) Demonstrate that contamination has not been caused during development, including demonstrating that imported materials are of suitable quality;* *(g) Have regard to sustainability considerations where remediation is required, including controlling the quantities of material removed from or imported to the site;* *(h) Present evidence to demonstrate that following completion the risks from contamination have been controlled effectively in accordance with the development proposals; and* *(i) Ensure that the contamination of water is avoided, and where possible include measures to improve water quality through sustainable design and construction*".	investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
<u>Policy GB7 – Biodiversity</u> *"To prevent the degradation of natural habitats, designated sites will be protected, and development proposals must demonstrate that they do not cause adverse impacts*" The "Supporting Facts" box to Policy GB7 notes that the borough's biodiversity designations include Local Nature Reserves that protect wildlife or geological features that are of special interest locally.	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2020 – 2041 – Proposed Submission Version (Regulation 19)[12] (July 2024)	

[12] London Borough of Hounslow. Hounslow Local Plan 2020 – 2041, Proposed Submission Version (Regulation 19). 2024. Available at: https://www.hounslow.gov.uk/local-plan/local-plan-review/6 (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Policy CC2 – Urban Design and Architecture *"We will expect development proposals to* *Understand, integrate, protect and enhance, restore or introduce natural landscape, including the topography, geology, existing green and blue infrastructure, landscape context, ecological assets, biodiversity, local flora and fauna and wider ecological setting of an area*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Policy EQ8 – Contamination *"We will expect development proposals to* *D. Effectively treat, contain, or control any contamination. Developers will be required to provide Preliminary Risk Assessments (PRAs) where the application site or neighbouring land is known or suspected of being contaminated, or where a sensitive use is proposed, so as not to:* *I. expose the occupiers of the development and neighbouring land uses to an unacceptable risk;* *II. threaten the structural integrity of any building built, or to be built, on or adjoining the site;* *III. lead to the contamination of any watercourse, water body or aquifer; or* *IV. cause the contamination of adjoining land or allow such contamination to continue;* *E. Present adequate site investigation information, including an assessment of the site's history, potential contamination sources, pathways and receptors, and where appropriate, physical*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
investigation, chemical testing, assessment of ground gas risks and assessments of risks to surface and groundwater; *F. Present proposals for the control of any risks from contamination that may be present;* *G. Demonstrate that contamination has not been caused during development, including demonstrating that imported materials are of suitable quality;* *H. Have regard to sustainability considerations where remediation is required, including controlling the quantities of material removed from or imported to the site;* *I. Present evidence to demonstrate that following completion of any remedial works the risks from contamination have been controlled effectively in accordance with the development proposals;* *J. Ensure that the contamination of surface water and groundwater is avoided, and where possible include measures to improve water quality through sustainable design and construction in line with the Water Framework Directive; and* *K. Carry out long-term monitoring, where required, in accordance with current statutory guidance and legislation for the required length of time needed to demonstrate the effectiveness of the remedial works".*	
London Borough of Ealing Local Plan – Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document[13] (adopted April 2012)	

[13] London Borough of Ealing. Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document. 2012. Available at: https://www.ealing.gov.uk/downloads/download/7530/development_or_core_strategy_dpd (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
London Borough of Ealing Local Plan – Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document	The London Borough of Ealing does not appear to have any policies in any of its current or emerging plans that relate directly to contamination or geodiversity.
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan (2024 to 2039)[14] (adopted October 2025)	
<u>Policy 9 – Water Resources and Infrastructure</u> "*A. The borough's water resources and supplies will be protected by preventing development that would pose a threat to the borough's rivers, surface water and groundwater quality and quantity. This includes pollution caused by water run-off from developments into waterways*". "*C. The Council expects development proposals to:* *1. protect the water quality of rivers and groundwater…* *2. seek to improve the water environment…* *4. demonstrate within a Construction Management Plan that there will be no potential contamination of surface or ground water*". <u>Policy 53 – Local Environmental Impacts (Land Contamination)</u> "*The Council promotes, where necessary, the remediation of contaminated land where development comes forward. Potential contamination risks will need to be properly considered and adequately mitigated before development proceeds. New development must not pose an unacceptable risk to water quality. Development which has the potential to*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.

[14] London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2024 – 2039). 2025. Available at: https://www.richmond.gov.uk/adopted_local_plan (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
adversely impact water quality will be required to provide appropriate mitigation to alleviate the risk".	
Policy 39 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity "*Development proposals which would cause harm to a designated site with geodiversity value will not be permitted unless any damaging impacts can be prevented by appropriate mitigation measures. Development proposals which would affect a designated site with geodiversity value should seek to retain, restore and enhance the geological interest where possible".*	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Spelthorne Local Plan 2024 – 2039/40[15] (adopted March 2026)	
Policy E4: Environmental Protection – Development of Land Affected by Contamination "*where development is proposed on land that may be affected by contamination, the applicant must undertake appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, remediation to ensure the development is safe or will be made safe for its intended use and should be carried out by a competent person. Through the incorporation of mitigation measures, treatment to reduce contamination or remove pollutant pathways and soil/ground gas/groundwater remediation initiatives, receptors exposure to land contamination will be minimised.* *The Council will:* *i) Require development proposals to be accompanied by an assessment of risk from contamination where the development is on or adjacent to*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and

[15] Spelthorne Borough Council. Spelthorne Local Plan 2024 – 2039/40. 2026. Available at: https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/page/1383/local-plan-march-2026 (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
previous industrial uses or other land known to be affected by contamination... *ii) Impose conditions on planning permissions requiring appropriate investigation and remediation of contamination before development can proceed. This will also include conditions at sites affected by land contamination to ensure verification of remediation is completed to a sufficient standard.* *iii) Require applicants to demonstrate the investigation and remediation of contamination has been carried out appropriately to a standard sufficient to enable the development to be safely occupied*".	the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead – Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033[16] (adopted February 2022)	
Policy EP 5: Contaminated Land and Water "*1. Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that proposals will not cause unacceptable harm to the quality of groundwater, including Source Protection Zones, and do not have a detrimental effect on the quality of surface water. Development proposals should demonstrate how they will achieve remedial or preventative measures and submit any supporting assessments.* *2. Development proposals on, or near to land which is, or is suspected to be contaminated will be supported where the applicant can demonstrate that there will be no harm arising from the contamination to the health of future*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance.

[16] Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Borough Local Plan 2013 – 2033. 2022. Available at: https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/development-plan/adopted-local-plan (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
users or occupiers of the site or neighbouring land, and that the proposals will not cause unacceptable harm to the environment. *3. Development proposals will be reviewed under pollutant linkage (source-pathway-receptor) risk assessments which should be represented by a conceptual model for the proposed use...* *4. Development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that adequate and effective remedial measures to remove the potential harm to human health and the environment are successfully mitigated*".	• A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 – Development Plan Document[17] (adopted December 2008)	
<u>Core Policy 8 (Sustainability and the Environment)</u> "*Development shall not:* *...cause contamination or a deterioration in land, soil or water quality; and* *c) Be located on polluted land, areas affected by air pollution or in noisy environments unless the development incorporates appropriate mitigation measures to limit the adverse effects on occupiers and other appropriate receptors*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated

[17] Slough Borough Council. Slough Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006 – 2026 Development Plan Document. 2008. Available at: https://www.slough.gov.uk/downloads/download/581/development-plan-core-strategy-2006---2026 (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
South Bucks Core Strategy Development Plan Document[18] (adopted February 2011) and South Bucks District Local Plan	
Following the combining of the various Buckinghamshire Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) into Buckinghamshire Council in 2020, and prior to the completion and adoption of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan, the policies in the pre-existing South Bucks Core Strategy remain in force. <u>Core Policy 13</u> "*The Council will seek to ensure the prudent and sustainable management of the District's environmental resources by… Protecting and enhancing water quality and encouraging the remediation of land affected by contamination to bring it back to beneficial use*".	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.

[18] South Bucks District Council. South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document. 2011. Available at: https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/South_Bucks_Core_Strategy_-_Adopted_February_2011_bb48FA7.pdf (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
South Bucks Local Plan[19] (adopted March 1999)	
Following the combining of the various Buckinghamshire Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) into Buckinghamshire Council in 2020, and prior to the completion and adoption of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan, the policies in the pre-existing South Bucks Core Strategy remain in force. The Local Plan was adopted in 1999, and consolidated in September 2007 and February 2011. <u>Policy C15 – Sites of Geological Importance</u> *"Development will not be permitted which would be likely, directly or indirectly, to destroy or have a significantly adverse effect on the geological interests of any Site of Special Scientific Interest, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological site or other site of geological importance.* *Development will only be permitted on, or close to, such sites where the Council considers the effect on the geological interest of the site could be effectively limited by the imposition of appropriate conditions. The Council may seek a legal agreement in order to secure the geological interest*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.
Local Plan for Buckinghamshire, Draft Plan Consultation Part B – Development Management Policies[20] (October 2025)	
<u>Policy NE1 – Water Quality</u>	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by:

[19] South Bucks District Council. South Bucks District Local Plan. 1999. Available at: https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/South_Bucks_local_plan_j4D6YG4.pdf (accessed on: 10/06/2026).

[20] Buckinghamshire Council. Part B Development Management Policy - Draft Local Plan for Buckinghamshire (Reg 18). 2025. Available at: https://buckinghamshire.oc2.uk/document/101/2090 (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
"*1. Development proposals will only be supported where they will not adversely affect the water quality of surface or underground water bodies (including rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, drinking water safeguard zones, source protection zones and groundwater aquifers)…* *3. In order to protect and improve water quality, potentially contaminating developments affecting principal aquifers, including the Chalk Aquifer, or within the county's Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (surface water) or Source Protection Zones (SPZ) (groundwater) as defined by the Environment Agency and water companies, will need to demonstrate that surface water and groundwater are adequately protected to prevent a deterioration of water quality and pollution of the water source.* *4. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for developments located within Drinking Water safeguard zones and SPZ must carefully consider the risk of contamination to both surface and ground water sources and ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented to minimise impacts.* *5. Developments which fall within a Groundwater SPZ will be required to be designed to allow for all the following:* *a) The potential to encounter shallow groundwater and the restriction on the use of soakaways;* *b) Avoiding direct discharge of hazardous substances to groundwater;* *c) The potential for historic contamination to be encountered during development;*	• A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
d) Restrictions on deep penetrative foundation methods if contamination is encountered". Policy NE20 – Pollution, Air Quality and Contaminated Land "*Development on or near land that is or may be affected by contamination will only be permitted where:* *c. an appropriate contaminated Land Assessment has been carried out as part of the application to identify any risks to human health, the natural environment, water quality or food production.* *d. where contamination is found which would pose an unacceptable risk to people's health, the natural environment or water quality, the council will impose a condition, if appropriate, to ensure the applicant undertakes a desktop study, and if required, an intrusive site investigation, remedial measures and a validation report to ensure that the site is suitable for the proposed use and that the development can safely proceed.* *Remediation works will usually be carried out prior to first occupation or use of any part of the development. Required remediation methods will be secured through a planning condition*".	
Runnymede 2030 Local Plan[21] (adopted July 2020)	
<u>Policy EE2: Environmental Protection</u> "*Development proposals on land which is suspected of being affected by historic or current land contamination will be required to investigate the nature and risk of the contamination both to the development proposal and to the wider environment. Where contamination is*	The Ground Conditions ES chapter will be informed by: • A Phase 1 Ground Conditions Assessment (Contaminated Land) including a contaminated land Preliminary Risk Assessment prepared in accordance with the

[21] Runnymede Borough Council. Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. 2020. Available at: https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/planning-policy/runnymede-2030-local-plan (accessed on 10/06/2026).

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
revealed, the applicant will be required to submit and implement a scheme of remediation which demonstrates that the land and where necessary groundwater will be remediated to the point where it no longer meets the definition of statutory contaminated land".	Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Land Contamination GQRA and a Remediation Options Appraisal & Outline Remediation Strategy, informed by a preliminary ground investigation, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance and the Environment Agency's LCRM guidance. • A Landfill Risk Assessment evaluating the hazards associated with the identified landfill sites and the risks to Human Health and the Environment. • A PFAS assessment that will assess the potential risks to the environment including Controlled Waters and Human Health.
<u>Policy EE9: Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Conservation</u> "*…For development proposals that affect national, regional or locally protected sites not forming part of a Ramsar, Special Protection Area (SPA) or Special Area of Conservation (SAC), permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development proposal clearly outweigh the harm to the site and has followed the hierarchy of mitigation so that biodiversity/geodiversity damage from development should first be avoided, then mitigated on-site and finally, as a last resort and where acceptable, offset*".	Geologically designated sites are identified as potential receptors. The assessment in the Ground Conditions ES chapter will include consideration of this receptor.

Appendix 18.1

Material and Waste Policy

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 18.1 Materials and Waste Policy

Contents

1 Policy Relevant to the Assessment of Materials and Waste 1

1.1 Introduction 1

Tables

Table 18-1.1: Policy relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment 1
Table 18.1-2: Legislation relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment 12
Table 18.1-3: Guidance relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment 14

1 Policy Relevant to the Assessment of Materials and Waste

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This appendix describes the topic-specific policies that have informed the scope and, where relevant, the Study Areas of the assessment presented in **Chapter 18: Materials and Waste**.

1.1.2 As described in **Chapter 18**, this is intended to be a high-level overview of relevant policy, legislation and guidance relevant to the assessment. Further documents are likely to be identified as the EIA progresses, and will be referenced within material produced later in the process.

Table 18-1.1: Policy relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Policy – National	
National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the overarching national planning policies for England. Minerals are principally addressed in Chapter 11 (Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals). The NPPF does not contain comprehensive policies for waste, which continues to be addressed principally through the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) and the Waste Management Plan for England. The NPPF is supplemented by Planning Practice Guidance, including guidance on minerals and the operation of the Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS). The following policies are of particular relevance: Policy CC2 (Mitigation of climate change) is relevant to the sustainable use of materials. It supports design approaches which conserve energy and other resources and opportunities to reuse existing structures and materials. These principles are relevant to resource efficiency, material reuse and the application of circular-economy principles through the Proposed Development. Policy P4 (Impact of development on existing activities) seeks to ensure that existing businesses, community facilities, public services and other established activities do not have unreasonable restrictions placed upon their current or permitted operation as a consequence of subsequent development. It expressly identifies industrial and waste sites amongst the activities and infrastructure to which the policy may apply. The policy is therefore relevant to consideration of the potential effects of the Proposed Development upon existing waste-management

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	facilities and other relevant established activities, housing and infrastructure within and around the development area. Policy M1 (Planning for a sufficient supply of minerals) requires development plans to provide for a sufficient supply of minerals of national and local importance. It requires account to be taken of the contribution that substitute, secondary and recycled materials and mineral waste can make to the supply of materials before considering extraction of primary materials. This is relevant to both the assessment of construction aggregate requirements and consideration of opportunities to use secondary and recycled aggregates. Policy M2 (Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure through plan-making) seeks to prevent mineral resources from being unnecessarily sterilised by non-mineral development. It provides for the identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas and, where necessary to prevent sterilisation, requires development plans to provide for prior extraction on sites allocated for non-mineral development where this is practical and environmentally feasible. It also provides for the safeguarding of existing, planned and potential infrastructure for the transport, handling and processing of minerals; manufacture of concrete and concrete products; and handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregates. Policy M3 (Assessing the benefits of mineral development) requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of mineral extraction and processing, including to the economy. It is relevant where mineral extraction, including potential prior extraction or the use of borrow sources, forms part of the Proposed Development. For decision-making, Policy M6 (Safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure through decision-making) is particularly relevant to the Proposed Development. It seeks to ensure that non-mineral development does not constrain the likely or foreseeable future working of mineral resources within Mineral Safeguarding Areas or prevent the use of existing, planned and potential mineral infrastructure. The potential sterilisation of mineral resources, effects upon existing mineral sites and infrastructure and opportunities for prior extraction will therefore be considered through the Materials and Waste assessment.
National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)	NPPW states in paragraph 8 that when considering planning applications for non-waste development, local planning authorities should ensure that:

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	"the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy and/or the efficient operation of such facilities; "new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development…", and; "the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development maximises reuse/recovery opportunities, and minimises off-site disposal".
Environmental Improvement Plan (2025)	The EIP 2025 is the Government's current cross-government plan for improving the natural environment. Its circular economy chapter includes goals for waste and resources, seeking to design waste out of the system, maximise reuse and recycling, reduce the consumption of virgin resources and move towards more sustainable use of materials. These principles are relevant to the assessment of material consumption, resource efficiency and waste generation associated with the Proposed Development.
Waste Management Plan for England (2021)	The Waste Management Plan for England is a high-level, non-site specific document. It provides an analysis of the current waste management situation in England and evaluates how the Plan will support implementation of the objectives and provisions of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. It sets a number of commitments to recovering at least 70% by weight of non-hazardous construction and demolition waste (excluding soils and stones) from 2020, but notes that the recovery rate is already in excess of 90% based on 2016 data. It reiterates the requirement for all waste producers and waste management providers to implement the waste hierarchy. The Plan highlights the continued need for waste to be managed using the proximity principle.
Maximising Resources, Minimising Waste: Waste Prevention Programme for England (2023)	The Programme sets out Government priorities for waste prevention and resource efficiency, with the objective of moving towards a circular economy by keeping products and materials in circulation for as long as possible and at their highest value. Construction is identified as one of seven priority sectors. The Programme is relevant to the avoidance of waste, efficient use of construction materials and opportunities for reuse and recycling associated with the Proposed Development.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Resources and Waste Strategy for England (2018)	The Strategy establishes the Government's long-term approach to preserving material resources, minimising waste, promoting resource efficiency and moving towards a circular economy. It includes the ambition to eliminate avoidable waste by 2050 and provides the policy basis for subsequent reforms to waste prevention, recycling and producer responsibility. It is relevant to the Proposed Development's approach to material efficiency, waste prevention, reuse, recycling and recovery.
Draft Heathrow Expansion National Policy Statement June 2026 (Proposed Revisions)	The draft Heathrow Expansion National Policy Statement (HENPS) sets out the emerging policy framework for development consent applications for expansion at Heathrow through a Northwest Runway. The 2018 Airports National Policy Statement remains the designated NPS pending completion of the review and designation of any revised NPS. In relation to resources and waste, it requires application of the waste hierarchy and identifies statutory recycling and residual-waste targets as minimum acceptable practice, whilst encouraging exemplar performance in resource efficiency and waste management. Applicants are required to consider material efficiency, waste prevention and circularity, identify arrangements for recovery and disposal of waste, and assess whether available waste infrastructure has sufficient capacity. The draft HENPS specifically requires assessment of the effects of the removal of the Lakeside Energy from Waste plant and requires reasonable endeavours to secure broadly equivalent alternative treatment capacity. It also requires mineral resources and Mineral Safeguarding Areas to be appropriately safeguarded. Where necessary, a Resource Management Plan will be required to secure sustainable resource and waste-management measures.
Airports NPS (2018)	The 2018 Airports National Policy Statement remains the designated NPS pending completion of the review and designation of the revised HENPS and remains a material consideration alongside emerging amendments contained within the draft HENPS.
Flightpath to the Future: a strategic framework for the aviation sector (2022)	Flightpath to the Future sets out the Government's medium-term strategic framework for the aviation sector and its vision for a modern, innovative and efficient aviation sector over the following ten years. It supports the sustainable growth of aviation and identifies environmental sustainability as part of the wider strategic context for the sector. The framework does not establish a specific materials or waste assessment methodology or topic-specific requirements for the Proposed Development; relevant requirements for materials, resource efficiency, waste

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	management and Heathrow expansion are addressed more directly through the policies and guidance identified elsewhere in this table.
Policy – Regional	
London Plan 2021	The London Plan covers the period 2019 – 2041 and provides the strategic framework within which all these decisions are made. It guides Boroughs Development Plans to ensure that they are working towards a shared vision for London, and it establishes policies that allow everyone involved in new developments to know what is expected from them. Policy SI 7 (Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy) includes the targets of zero biodegradable/recyclable waste to landfill by 2026, 65% municipal recycling by 2030, 95% reuse/recycling/recovery of construction and demolition waste and 95% beneficial use of excavation waste. Policy SI 8 (Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency) aims to manage the equivalent of 100% of London's waste within London (net self-sufficiency), safeguard existing waste management sites, optimise waste management capacity, provide new waste sites where required, and create environmental, social and economic benefits from waste and secondary materials management. It includes objectives for Development Plans, encourages the development of materials and waste management sites where they comply with Plan criteria, including the economic benefits and local need. The Plan sets out apportionments to the Boroughs for waste management capacity in order to ensure London provides sufficient infrastructure as a whole to be self-sufficient. Policy SI 9 (Safeguarded waste sites) sets out the considerations in safeguarding existing waste management facilities. The supporting text (9.9.2) explains "Any proposed release of current waste sites or those identified for future waste management capacity should be part of a plan-led process, rather than done on an ad-hoc basis. Waste sites should only be released to other land uses where waste processing capacity is re-provided elsewhere within London, based on the maximum achievable throughput of the site proposed to be lost." Policy SI 10 (Aggregates) aims to ensure there is an adequate supply of aggregates to support construction in London by encouraging reuse and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste in London (including on-site), extracting land-won aggregates, and importing aggregates to London by sustainable transport modes. It sets out a requirement for Development Plans to maintain seven-year aggregates landbanks

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	up to 2041, including in applying specific landbank apportionments to four Boroughs of at least 1.75 mt (Hillingdon), 0.7 mt (Hounslow), 1.75 mt (Havering) and 0.7 mt (Redbridge). The Policy also emphasises that the production of recycled/secondary aggregates will be supported, that mineral resources and sites associated with the transportation, distribution, processing, and/or production of aggregates will be safeguarded from development which results in their sterilisation.
Draft London Plan 2026	The Draft London Plan 2026 is emerging strategic planning policy and will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation. Policy GLE11 (Circular Economy) requires development to promote circular economy outcomes and retains targets of 95% reuse/recycling/recovery of demolition and construction waste and 95% beneficial reuse of excavation waste, while introducing a 20% by-value target for reused or recycled content for referable development. Policy GLE12 addresses waste capacity and safeguarding, while Policy GLE13 addresses aggregates and mineral resources, including continued landbank provision in Hillingdon.
West London Waste Plan (2015)	The West London Waste Plan was adopted in 2015 and details the estimated amounts of different types of waste expected to be produced in West London up to 2031; identifies and safeguards existing waste-management sites; identifies additional capacity requirements over the Plan period; and identifies sites considered suitable for waste-related development. The Plan records the established role of Lakeside Energy from Waste in managing residual waste from West London, including a contractual arrangement with the West London Waste Authority extending to 2034/35. The Plan identifies sites for new waste-management development to support net self-sufficiency, contains policies to protect existing waste infrastructure, and includes development-management policies applying to waste development on allocated and unallocated sites. The Plan is currently being reviewed, and a Proposed Submission version of the updated West London Waste Plan was approved for Regulation 19 consultation in July 2026 and is being consulted on ahead of proposed submission for independent examination. The assessment will therefore have regard to the adopted 2015 Plan and, as appropriate having regard to its stage of preparation, the emerging replacement Plan.
Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint	The Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan was prepared jointly by Bracknell Forest Council, Reading

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Minerals and Waste Plan	Borough Council, the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and Wokingham Borough Council, and provides the principal minerals and waste planning framework for those areas to 2036. The Plan was adopted separately by the four authorities between November 2022 and January 2023. The Plan contains policies relating to sustainable mineral supply, mineral safeguarding, sand and gravel provision, sustainable waste management and the safeguarding of waste-management capacity. It is therefore relevant to the assessment of aggregate supply, mineral safeguarding and prior extraction, recycled and secondary aggregates, and waste-management capacity.
Policy – Local	
Development Plan - The Hillingdon Local Plan is comprised of the Strategic Policies, adopted 2012, and Part 2 (Development Management Policies), adopted January 2020	Part 1 contains strategic policies of direct relevance to the Materials and Waste assessment. Policy EM9 (Safeguarding Mineral Resources) seeks to safeguard mineral resources from development that would prejudice their future extraction and provides for consideration of prior extraction and other circumstances in which development within safeguarded areas may be acceptable. Policy EM10 (Mineral Extraction) provides the strategic framework for mineral extraction in the Borough, including the contribution to the West London aggregates apportionment, maintenance of the landbank and the principal broad locations for mineral development around Harmondsworth and Sipson. Policy EM11 (Sustainable Waste Management) requires development to address waste management throughout its lifecycle, apply the waste hierarchy, promote reuse and recycling and the use of waste as a resource, and safeguard existing waste-management sites unless compensatory provision is made. Part 1 also recognises the role of recycled and secondary aggregates and the safeguarding of railheads and associated mineral infrastructure. Part 2 contains several policies of relevance to the management of materials and waste. The Plan recognises (6.58) that “The increasing costs and reducing capacity of landfills has opened up opportunities for the placement of various types of waste, usually inert, to be used within new development. The importation of this material can be positive, and can transform complex sites into suitable development platforms. It can also assist in land remodelling…”, however, it seeks to ensure that lower regulatory oversight of these types of schemes is not exploited. Policy DMEI 13

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	(Importation of Waste Material) is a criteria-based policy which sets out the information requirements for planning applications to ensure effective safeguards and controls can be applied. Policy DMIN 1 (Preferred Areas of Mineral Extraction and Aggregates Railheads) identifies a specific site, preferred areas and an area of search for future mineral extraction. They are: 1. Land west of Harmondsworth Quarry (Preferred Area) 2. Land north of Harmondsworth (Preferred Area) 3. Land at Sipson Lane east of the M4 Spur (Specific Site) 4. Bedfont Court Estate (Area of Search) The Policy also states that where sand and gravel reserves are identified, these will be safeguarded from sterilisation from surface development, whilst not creating a presumption that mineral extraction will be acceptable. The policy also safeguards the existing railheads at Hayes, West Drayton, West Drayton Tavistock Road and West Ruislip from alternative use. Policy DMIN 2 (Prior Extraction) requires the prior extraction of the mineral resources in the areas identified in Policy DMIN1 where surface development is proposed, but also sets out criteria where it would be acceptable for this not to occur (there is no commercial interest, or there are overriding environmental or other issues which mean planning permission is unlikely to be granted, or where there is an overriding community need which outweighs the need for the minerals). Policy DMIN 4 (Re-use and Recycling of Aggregates) states that the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste will be promoted, and all developments will be encouraged to recycle these materials as aggregates, process and re-use recyclable material on-site (or where not possible re-use at another site or for land restoration), and use substitute or recycled materials in new development in place of primary minerals. Hillingdon has now begun work on its replacement Local Plan, and the scoping consultation ran from 9 July to 21 August 2026. The new Local Plan will include minerals policies, while waste continues to be dealt with through the West London Waste Plan.
London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015–2030 (Volumes 1 and 2), including emerging Hounslow Local Plan 2020–2041	The adopted Hounslow Local Plan forms part of the development plan for land immediately to the east of the Proposed Development. Policy EQ10 (Minerals) is particularly relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment. It safeguards mineral resources and infrastructure within the Borough, allocates Rectory Farm for mineral extraction and promotes the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste. The Local Plan therefore

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	provides relevant context for the assessment of aggregate supply, mineral safeguarding, potential effects on mineral sites and infrastructure, and opportunities for the use of recycled aggregates. Hounslow is currently progressing a replacement Local Plan for the period to 2041, which will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation.
London Borough of Ealing Development Plan	The adopted Ealing development plan includes the Development Strategy 2026, Development Sites Development Plan Document and Development Management Development Plan Document, together with the West London Waste Plan. The documents provide the local planning framework for development within Ealing and are relevant principally to the consideration of waste-management infrastructure, safeguarded waste sites and the wider spatial context for waste management within West London. Ealing has also submitted a new Local Plan for examination, which will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation.
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan 2013–2033	The Borough Local Plan 2013–2033 provides the strategic planning framework for development within the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, including the distribution of development, housing and employment growth, infrastructure provision and the protection and enhancement of the environment. It therefore provides relevant context for the future baseline and for consideration of planned development which may contribute to cumulative demand for construction materials and waste-management capacity. Minerals and waste planning matters are addressed principally through the separate Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan, which is considered separately above.
Slough Core Strategy 2006–2026, Site Allocations DPD and saved Local Plan, Minerals and Waste Local Plan policies	The adopted development plan for Slough includes the Core Strategy, Site Allocations Development Plan Document and saved Local Plan policies. These documents provide the strategic and spatial planning framework for the Borough and are relevant to the future baseline and consideration of planned development. Lakeside Energy from Waste is located at Colnbrook within Slough and its relationship with the Proposed Development is directly relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment. Minerals and waste planning matters are addressed through saved Berkshire minerals and waste policies, which are considered separately below. Slough Borough Council has commenced preparation of a new Local Plan for 2026–2046; minerals and waste matters are proposed to be addressed separately.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Saved Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan policies applying in Slough	Slough Borough Council continues to apply saved policies from the Replacement Minerals Local Plan for Berkshire 1995, as revised in 1997 and 2001, and the Waste Local Plan for Berkshire 1998. These policies form part of the minerals and waste planning framework for Slough and are relevant to mineral resources and development, mineral safeguarding and waste-management development and infrastructure. The saved waste policies are particularly relevant given the location of Lakeside Energy from Waste within Slough and the role of the Borough in accommodating strategic waste-management infrastructure.
Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016–2036	The Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016–2036 was adopted in July 2019 and provides the minerals and waste planning framework for Buckinghamshire. It includes policies relating to the provision and safeguarding of mineral resources and infrastructure, borrow pits, secondary and recycled aggregates, and waste-management provision. Given Buckinghamshire's proximity to the Proposed Development and its potential role within wider minerals supply and waste-management markets, the Plan will be particularly relevant to the assessment of aggregate availability, mineral supply and waste-management capacity.
Surrey Minerals Plan 2011 (Core Strategy and Primary Aggregates DPD), Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD 2013, and Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020	Surrey County Council is the minerals and waste planning authority for Surrey. The adopted minerals planning framework comprises the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011, the Primary Aggregates Development Plan Document 2011 and the Aggregates Recycling Joint Development Plan Document 2013. The Core Strategy includes Policy MC6 (Safeguarding Mineral Resources and Development), which seeks to prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources and safeguard existing and proposed mineral infrastructure, including rail aggregate depots and sites for recycled and secondary aggregates. The Primary Aggregates DPD identifies preferred areas for sand and gravel and soft sand extraction, including a number of sites in north-west Surrey, while the Aggregates Recycling Joint DPD identifies locations for aggregates recycling facilities. The Surrey Waste Local Plan 2020 provides the waste planning framework to 2033. Policy 4 seeks to minimise construction, demolition and excavation waste and maximise opportunities for its reuse and recycling, while Policy 7 safeguards existing, planned and allocated waste-management sites and capacity. These plans are relevant to the assessment of aggregate supply, mineral safeguarding and infrastructure, recycled aggregates and

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
	waste-management capacity within the wider area potentially serving the Proposed Development. Surrey County Council has commenced preparation of a replacement Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2022–2037	The West Berkshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2022–2037 was adopted in December 2022 and forms part of the development plan for West Berkshire. It provides the planning framework for mineral supply and waste-management capacity within the authority area. The Plan seeks to maintain an adequate and steady supply of minerals, encourage the use of recycled minerals and secondary aggregates, prevent unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources and safeguard mineral infrastructure. It also provides for the recovery and reuse of aggregate from construction and demolition waste and contains policies addressing the provision and safeguarding of waste-management capacity. The Plan is therefore relevant to the wider assessment of aggregate availability and supply, recycled and secondary aggregates and waste-management capacity.
Spelthorne Local Plan 2024–2039/40 (adopted March 2026), and emerging new Spelthorne Local Plan	Provides the current local planning framework for land within Spelthorne and is relevant to the future baseline, planned development and the consideration of minerals and waste-related matters affecting the area. The Council has commenced preparation of a new Local Plan, which is currently at the pre-commencement/scoping stage, with Gateway 1 scheduled for October 2026; it will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation.
South Bucks District Local Plan (1999) and South Bucks Core Strategy (2011), together with the emerging Local Plan for Buckinghamshire	Provides the current local planning framework for the former South Bucks area and is relevant to the future baseline and planned development. The emerging Local Plan for Buckinghamshire is at Regulation 19 publication stage and is intended to be submitted for examination by the end of 2026; it will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation.
Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (2020) and emerging Runnymede Local Plan	The adopted Runnymede 2030 Local Plan provides the current local planning framework for the Borough and is relevant to the future baseline, planned development and cross-boundary minerals and waste matters. A replacement Runnymede Local Plan is at the scoping/getting-ready stage, with public scoping consultation taking place in September–October 2026; it will be taken into account having regard to its stage of preparation.

Relevant Policy	Relevance to assessment
Richmond Local Plan 2024–2039 (adopted October 2025), and emerging future Richmond Local Plan	Provides the current local planning framework for Richmond upon Thames and is relevant to the future baseline, planned development and cross-boundary waste-planning matters. The Council is at an early preparatory stage in developing its next Local Plan under the new plan-making system, with formal plan preparation expected to commence in 2027.

Table 18.1-2: Legislation relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment

Relevant Legislation	Relevance to assessment
Legislation - International	
Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC)	The objective of the Landfill Directive was to prevent or reduce as far as possible negative effects on the environment, in particular on surface water, groundwater, soil, air, and on human health from the landfilling of waste. It defined the different categories of waste depending on their environmental risk, and landfill sites must comply with the requirements of the Directive as transposed into UK law, which set out stringent technical standards.
Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)	In England and Wales, the Directive was implemented principally through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended), together with amendments to and requirements contained within other domestic waste-management and environmental permitting legislation. The Directive includes some concepts and definitions related to waste management, such as definitions of waste, recycling and recovery. It sets out the circumstances in which waste can be considered to become a secondary raw material (end-of-waste criteria), and how to distinguish between waste and secondary/recycled products. The Directive lays down some basic waste management principles: it requires that waste be managed without endangering human health and harming the environment. It also introduced the concept of the waste hierarchy and provided a direction for the management of waste by applying a priority order to the management of waste. The Directive required that Member States adopted waste management plans and waste prevention programmes.
Legislation - National	
Environment Act 2021	Provides the statutory framework for a range of resource-efficiency and waste reforms in England, including measures relating to recycling, producer responsibility and waste tracking. It

Relevant Legislation	Relevance to assessment
	also provides the statutory basis for long-term environmental targets, including the residual-waste target. It is relevant to the approach to waste prevention, segregation, recycling and reporting during construction and operation.
Environmental Protection Act 1990	Establishes key controls governing the management of controlled waste, including the waste duty of care. Producers and holders of waste must take reasonable steps to prevent its escape or unlawful management, transfer it only to appropriately authorised persons and provide an accurate description of the waste. The requirements are relevant to the management and transfer of construction and operational wastes generated by the Proposed Development.
Climate Change Act 2008 and 2050 Target Amendment Order 2019	Establishes the UK's statutory net-zero greenhouse-gas target. The Act (and amendment) are indirectly relevant to materials and waste because material efficiency, reuse and recycling, reduced consumption of virgin materials and diversion of waste from disposal can reduce embodied and supply-chain greenhouse-gas emissions. Detailed greenhouse-gas effects will be considered within the Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change chapters.
Environmental Targets (Residual Waste) (England) Regulations 2023	These Regulations, which apply to England, set a long-term target in relation to the reduction of residual waste, within the priority area of resource efficiency and waste reduction established by the Environment Act 2021. The Regulations require that the total mass of residual waste per head of population in England does not exceed 287 kilograms by 31 December 2042. However, the target expressly excludes major mineral wastes – which comprise largely inert wastes arising from construction, demolition, excavation and mining activities, including concrete, bricks, sand, soils and other mineral wastes. The draft HENPS sets out a requirement to meet waste-management targets included within this legislation.
Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended)	The Regulations establish core requirements relating to waste management, including application of the waste hierarchy. The hierarchy requires priority to be given to prevention, followed by preparing for reuse, recycling, other recovery and, as a last resort, disposal. The draft HENPS sets out a requirement to meet waste management targets included within this legislation.
The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016	Establish the environmental permitting and exemptions regime applicable to waste storage, treatment, recovery and disposal activities. They are relevant to determining whether proposed on-site waste activities require permitting and to ensuring that off-site facilities receiving project wastes are appropriately authorised.

Relevant Legislation	Relevance to assessment
Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005 (as amended)	Establish controls applying to the production, handling and movement of hazardous waste, including requirements relating to classification and consignment and restrictions on the mixing of hazardous waste. They are relevant where hazardous wastes arise during construction or operation, including potentially contaminated materials and other hazardous substances.
Waste (Circular Economy) (Amendment) Regulations 2020	Amended waste legislation to implement circular-economy requirements affecting matters including recycling, recovery and separate collection.
Separation of Waste (England) Regulations 2024, and Separation of Waste (England) Regulations 2025	The Simpler Recycling reforms introduce requirements for businesses and relevant non-domestic premises to separate specified recyclable waste streams, food waste, and residual waste for collection. . These requirements are particularly relevant to the design of operational waste storage, segregation and collection arrangements.
Digital Waste Tracking (England) Regulations 2026	The Regulations introduce mandatory digital reporting of waste receipts through the Government's digital waste tracking service. The Regulations come into force from 1 October 2026, and permitted or licensed waste receiving sites in England must then report waste received using the service. Subsequent phases will extend digital tracking to other waste operators. The requirements are relevant to project waste-data management, auditable reporting and the selection and management of contractors and receiving facilities.

Table 18.1-3: Guidance relevant to the Materials and Waste assessment

Relevant Guidance Guidance - National	Relevance to assessment
ISEP (formerly IEMA) guide to: Materials and Waste in Environmental Impact Assessment (2020)	Provides industry best-practice guidance for the consideration of materials and waste in EIA, including screening, scoping, consultation, assessment, reporting and monitoring. It provides a framework for identifying relevant receptors and effects associated with material consumption and waste generation and promotes sustainable resource management and circular-economy principles. The guidance will inform the methodology adopted for the Materials and Waste assessment.
Planning Practice Guidance - Minerals	Provides Government guidance on the implementation of national minerals planning policy, including mineral safeguarding, assessment of mineral resources, aggregate landbanks, Local Aggregate Assessments, Aggregate Working Parties and

Relevant Guidance	Relevance to assessment
	operation of the Managed Aggregate Supply System. It will inform assessment of mineral safeguarding and the availability and supply of aggregate materials.
Planning Practice Guidance - Waste	Provides Government guidance supporting implementation of national waste planning policy, including application of the waste hierarchy, assessment of waste-management needs and capacity, planning for waste infrastructure and consideration of waste matters in development proposals. It will inform the assessment of waste generation, treatment capacity and effects upon existing waste-management infrastructure.
CL:AIRE Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice Version 2 (2011)	Provides a recognised framework for the legitimate reuse of excavated materials on-site and between development sites, including the use of Material Management Plans and Qualified Person declarations. It is directly relevant to determining when excavated soils and other naturally occurring materials may be reused without being treated as waste and will inform the project's approach to earthworks and material reuse. The current Code of Practice is Version 2, published in March 2011. CL:AIRE and the Environment Agency are undertaking a comprehensive review of the Code, with the replacement document to be published as the *Soil Passport Scheme Code of Practice*.
Waste Duty of Care Code of Practice	Provides practical guidance on meeting the waste duty-of-care requirements, including secure containment, checking the authorisation of persons receiving waste and accurately describing waste transferred from the site. It will inform construction and operational waste-management procedures.
Designing Out Waste: A Design Team Guide for Civil Engineering (WRAP)	Provides best-practice principles for reducing material consumption and designing out waste through early consideration of construction methods, specifications, reuse opportunities and material efficiency. It may be used as supplementary good-practice guidance in developing project resource-efficiency measures.
MPA and POS Minerals Safeguarding Practice Guidance (2019)	Provides practical advice on the implementation of policy for safeguarding mineral resources and infrastructure through plan-making and development management.
Guidance – Regional	
South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) Joint	Provides a jointly agreed evidence base and planning approach for the permanent deposit of inert waste on land across the South East of England. It distinguishes between disposal and recovery,

Relevant Guidance	Relevance to assessment
Position Statement: Permanent Deposit of Inert Waste on Land in the South East of England (2019)	recognising that inert excavation waste may be beneficially used, including for the restoration of mineral workings, where it substitutes for non-waste material and is limited to the quantity necessary. The Statement considers construction, demolition and excavation waste arisings, inert landfill capacity, cross-boundary movements (including exports from London), and the need for Waste Planning Authorities to plan flexibly for appropriate recovery and disposal capacity. It identifies declining inert landfill capacity, while also recognising the importance of securing timely mineral restoration and beneficial uses for inert excavation material.
South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) Joint Position Statement: Non-hazardous Landfill in the South East of England (2018)	Provides a jointly agreed evidence base on non-hazardous landfill provision across the South East of England, including waste inputs, remaining capacity, anticipated site closures and approaches to planning for future provision. It identifies declining landfill capacity across the region while recognising an ongoing requirement for some non-hazardous landfill for wastes that cannot practicably be reused, recycled or recovered. The Statement supports collaborative planning between Waste Planning Authorities and identifies criteria-based policies and extensions to existing facilities as potential approaches to maintaining necessary capacity.
GLA Circular Economy Statement Guidance	Provides detailed guidance for applying London Plan Policy SI7 and embedding circular-economy principles within development, including retention and reuse, material efficiency, designing out waste, adaptability and disassembly, and reporting of excavation, construction, demolition and operational waste. It applies directly to referable applications and can also inform other development.
Guidance – Local	
Heathrow Resource and Waste Strategy (2025)	Heathrow's Resource and Waste Strategy sets the airport-wide direction for avoiding unnecessary material consumption and maximising reuse, recycling and recovery. It is relevant to the assessment of operational waste, resource-efficiency measures and the relationship of the Proposed Development with Heathrow's existing sustainability objectives.

Appendix 19.1

Major Accidents and Disasters: Long List

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 19.1 Major Accidents and Disasters Long List

Contents

1 Long List..... 1

Tables

Table 1.1 Major Accidents and Disaster Long List 1

1 Long List

Table 1.1 Major Accidents and Disaster Long List

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
Construction												
Natural Disasters												
High Temperatures and Heatwaves and Drought	On-site construction workers and equipment.	Extreme heat	• Heat exhaustion to construction workers. • Damage to construction equipment.	Yes	Site	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term	Category C to D	Reasonably Probable	Tolerable to TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Wildfires	On-site construction workers and equipment	The application site is not located within an area at risk of wildfires - CHECK	• Smoke inhalation and fatality of construction workers and existing operational airport taskforce and passengers • Damage to construction equipment	Yes	Site	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Snow and icy conditions	On-site construction workers and equipment	Extremely cold weather resulting in snow and icy conditions	• Hyperthermia of construction workers • Construction machinery failure	Yes	Site	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Strong winds and tornadoes and hurricanes	• On-site construction workers and equipment. • Existing airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	• Hazardous operation of lifting equipment i.e. cranes • Debris from construction site	• Injury to construction workers • Damage to construction equipment • Damage to existing airport infrastructure • Damage to aircrafts from construction debris	Yes	Site	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term or permanent	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
Extreme rainfall and subsequent flooding	• Construction workers and equipment • Groundwater	Construction site flooding	• Injury to construction workers • Damage to construction equipment and existing airport infrastructure • Release of contaminants into the environment • Damage to existing airport infrastructure and equipment affecting airport operations	Yes	Flood risk catchment area	Major	Medium	Category B	Remote	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Seismic hazards i.e. earthquakes	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Earthquake tremors affecting physical damage to buildings	• Damage to construction equipment and existing airport infrastructure • Injury or fatality of construction workers, passengers or existing airport personnel from building collapse	No – Site is not located in area prone to seismic activity	Site	No serious damage	Short term	Not a MA&D	N/A	N/A	N/A	Out
Geological hazards, i.e. ground stability, landslides and sinkholes	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Unstable ground conditions, landslides, sinkholes following heavy rainfall causing ground to collapse	• Damage to construction equipment and existing airport infrastructure • Injury or fatality of construction workers, passengers or existing airport personnel from building and ground collapse	Yes	Site	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term or permanent	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out - Ground Conditions
Sea-level rise and tsunamis	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Flooding of Site	• Injury or fatality of construction workers, passengers or existing airport personnel • Damage to construction equipment and	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category A	Extremely remote	Tolerable	Not Significant	Out

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
			existing airport infrastructure									
Space weather including solar flares and radiation storms	Onsite construction workers and equipment	• Disruption of telecommunication • Increased radiation	• Damage to construction equipment and existing airport infrastructure • Aircraft incident • Interference with radio and telecommunications systems and navigational systems	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
Major accidents from on-site sources												
Fire and/or explosion at construction site	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • Neighbouring properties and local residents • Sensitive environmental receptors/sites	Fire at a neighbouring site impacting on construction activities	• Damage to construction equipment and injury or fatality of construction personnel • Increased risk of injury or fatality of the users and workers at the existing airport • Damage to existing airport infrastructure • Reduced visibility due to smoke from fire, affecting aircraft operations • Damage/loss of property and risk of injury or fatality to the general public • Indirect effects on human health, property, heritage assets and wildlife due to smoke and ash deposition.	Yes	Site and a 5km radius	Catastrophic	Very Long Term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
Leaks or spillages of hazardous substances	• Existing airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • Neighbouring properties and local residents • Sensitive environmental receptors/sites	• Storage of hazardous substances including chemicals and fuels • Loss of containment of these substances	• Risk of contact with hazardous substances • Contamination of sensitive environmental receptors	Yes	Site and 2km radius	Major	Long term	Category C	Extremely remote	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Structural collapse including tunnelling collapse	• Onsite construction equipment • Existing airport infrastructure • Neighbouring airport infrastructure	• Explosion and structural collapse impacting on the construction of the Proposed Development and affecting existing airport operations	• Fatality or risk of injury to construction personnel, airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and up to 2-5km radius	No serious damage unless but potential for catastrophic	Short term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Loss of utilities	• Onsite construction equipment • Existing airport infrastructure • Neighbouring airport infrastructure	Unidentified utilities, impacted by construction activities	• Interruption of existing airport operations causing further MA&Ds • Distribution to operations of utilities for offsite infrastructure and properties	Yes	Site and up to 2-5km radius	No serious damage unless but potential for catastrophic	Short term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Traffic Incidents	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • Existing airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Road traffic collisions resulting from construction activities	Fatality or injury	Yes	Site and construction traffic routes	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Accidents resulting from interface with current airport operations and construction activities	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • Existing airport personnel and passengers	• Construction activities causing an aircraft accident due to infringement of clearance zones • Construction works causing electronic	• Disruption to airport operations • Aircraft accident • Fatality or injury of aircraft passengers, airport users and workers, and construction workers	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very Long Term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In - addressed elsewhere

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
	and infrastructure	interference to airport radio and telecommunication systems. • Construction lighting disrupting visibility. • Collision of aircraft or airport vehicles with construction traffic	• Damage to existing airport infrastructure and construction equipment									
Bird Strike	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • Existing airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Increased risk of bird strike due to construction activities	• Aircraft accident • Risk of injury or fatality	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	Out - Covered in Chapter 7 Ornithology
Reduced security provision/terrorism	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • Existing airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Increased risk of terrorism	• Risk of injury or fatality • Loss of airport infrastructure • Disruption to airport operations	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	Out
UXO	• Onsite construction workers • Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • General public	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Loss of airport infrastructure • Disruption to airport operations	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
Emergency response hazards resulting in environmental incidents and non-aircraft safety incidents caused by incorrect action (e.g. release of	• construction workers • Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • General public	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	• Death or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
contaminated firewater, firefighting foam, use of incorrect chemical, failure to act or evacuate) or equipment failure												
Major accidents from off-site sources												
Fire at a neighbouring site	• Onsite construction workers and equipment • General public • Sensitive environmental receptors	Fire at a neighbouring site impacting on construction activities	• Damage to construction equipment and injury or fatality of construction personnel • Increased risk of injury or fatality of the users and workers at the existing airport • Damage to existing airport infrastructure • Reduced visibility due to smoke from fire, affecting aircraft operations • Damage/loss of property and risk of injury or fatality to the general public • Indirect effects on human health, property, heritage assets and wildlife due to smoke and ash deposition	Yes	Site and a 5km radius	Catastrophic	Very Long Term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Disease outbreak/pandemic	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Disease outbreak or epidemics impacting the construction workers	Fatality or risk of injury to construction personnel, airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and national/international	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out (HIA)
Cyber attack	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Security breach of existing airport systems	• Loss of data confidentiality and integrity • Airport operations failure	No	Site	No serious harm	Short term	Not MA&D	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Out
				Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D		TifALARP		In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
Explosion or structural collapse at neighbouring site	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Explosion and structural collapse impacting on the construction of the Proposed Development and affecting existing airport operations	Fatality or risk of injury to construction personnel, airport users, workers and the general public						Extremely Improbable		Not Significant	
Civil unrest or protest	Onsite construction workers and equipment	Construction workers and existing airport staff industrial action	Airport operations failure and disruption	No	Site	No serious harm	Short term	Not MA&D	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Out
Operation												
Natural Disasters												
High Temperatures and Heatwaves and Drought	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Heat	• Heat exhaustion to airport personnel and passengers • Overheating of buildings and equipment • Damage to airport buildings and equipment • Reduced visibility as result of dust	Yes	Site	Major	Short term	Category D	Remote	Intolerable	Significant	In
Wildfires	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Wildfires from off-site sources spreading to Proposed Development Site	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Smoke Inhalation • Damage to airport buildings and equipment • Reduced visibility as result of smoke	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Snow and icy conditions	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Extreme cold weather resulting in snow and ice on runway, taxiways and apron	• Aircraft accident • Fatality or injury to airport users or workers	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
			• Road traffic incident at the airport									
Strong winds and tornadoes and hurricanes	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Aircraft incidents as a result of strong winds	• Aircraft accident • Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone and Flight Path	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Extreme rainfall and subsequent flooding	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • Sensitive environmental receptors	Flooding of the site	• Damage to airport infrastructure • Release of contaminants into sensitive environmental receptors • Fatality or injury to airport users or workers	Yes	Flood zone catchment area	Major to catastrophic	Long to very long term	Category B	Remote	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Seismic hazards, i.e. earthquakes	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Earthquake tremors affecting physical damage to buildings	Injury or fatality of construction workers, passengers or existing airport personnel from building collapse	No – Site is not located in area prone to seismic activity	Site	No serious damage	Short term	Not a MA&D	N/A	N/A	N/A	Out
Geological hazards, i.e. ground stability, landslides and sinkholes	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Unstable ground conditions, landslides, sinkholes following heavy rainfall causing ground to collapse	Injury or fatality of, passengers or existing airport personnel from building and ground collapse	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Major to Catastrophic	Very long term or permanent	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out - Ground Conditions
Sea-level rise and tsunamis	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure Sensitive environmental receptors	Flooding of Site	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category A	Extremely remote	Tolerable	Not Significant	Out
Space weather including solar flares and radiation storms	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	• Disruption of telecommunication • Increased radiation	• Aircraft incident • Interference with radio and telecommunications systems and navigational systems	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
Reduced visibility from volcanic ash, sand or fog	Airport personnel and passengers	Reduced visibility due to eruption of volcanoes outside the UK producing ash clous which reach UK weather systems	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Aircraft incident • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
Major accidents from on-site sources												
Fire and/or explosion	Airport personnel and passengers	• Aircraft accidents • Storage and handling of fuel or other flammable and combustible material • Equipment failure and electrical faults • Smoking • Arson and terrorism attacks	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Aircraft incident • Damage to airport infrastructure • Reduced visibility as result of smoke	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Leaks or spillages of hazardous substances	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • Neighbouring properties and local residents • Sensitive environmental receptors/sites	• Storage of hazardous substances including chemicals and fuels • Loss of containment of these substances	• Risk of contact with hazardous substances • Contamination of sensitive environmental receptors	Yes	Site and 5-10km radius	Major	Long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Structural collapse including tunnelling collapse	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • Neighbouring properties and local residents • Sensitive environmental receptors/sites	• Structural collapse including tunnelling collapse impacting on driver risk and traffic accidents with potential to affect existing airport operations	• Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and up to 2-5km radius	No serious damage unless but potential for catastrophic	Short term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not significant	In
Loss of utilities	Airport infrastructure	Technical failure of utilities infrastructure	Interruption of existing airport operations causing further MA&Ds	Yes	Site	Major	Medium term	Category B	Extremely remote	Tolerable	Not Significant	In
Traffic Incidents	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Road traffic collisions resulting from operational activities	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and operational traffic assessed routes	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
	• General public											
Aircraft accidents	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	• Increased number of aircraft using the airport • Changes to the airport layout and surrounding areas • Failure of safety systems leading to aircraft failure, signalling failure, air traffic coordination failure	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Emergency response activities implemented on the Main Application Site impacting on sensitive receptors	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure		• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Bird Strike	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Increased risk due to changes to the airport layout and surrounding areas attracting birds, and due to the increase in air traffic	• Aircraft accidents • Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Damage to airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very Long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out - Covered in Chapter 7 Ornithology
Reduced security provision	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Increased risk of terrorism	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Loss of airport infrastructure • Disruption to airport operations	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
Structural collapse	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Structural collapse of the Proposed Development and affecting airport operations	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Loss of airport infrastructure • Disruption to airport operations	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
UXO	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Identification of UXO leading to potential explosion	• Fatality or injury to airport users or workers • Loss of airport infrastructure	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out - Covered in contamination land

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
			• Disruption to airport operations									
Major accidents from off-site sources												
Fire at a neighbouring site	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • General public • Sensitive environmental receptors	Fire at a neighbouring site impacting on operational activities	• Increased risk of injury or fatality of airport users and workers • Damage to airport infrastructure • Reduced visibility due to smoke from fire, affecting aircraft operations • Damage/loss of property and risk of injury or fatality to the general public • Indirect effects on human health, property, heritage assets and wildlife due to smoke and ash deposition	Yes	Site and a 5km radius	Catastrophic	Very Long Term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Disease outbreak/pandemic	• Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure • General public	Disease outbreak or epidemics impacting operational airport workers and public health	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and national/international	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out - HIA
Cyber attack	Airport personnel and passengers	Security breach of airport systems	• Loss of data confidentiality and integrity • Airport operations failure	No	Site	No serious harm	Short term	Not MA&D	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	In Scope
Vandalism/terrorism	Airport personnel and passengers	• Hijacked aircraft • Criminal damage/ vandalism • Theft • Terrorist attacks • Unauthorised personnel accessing the airport	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
Explosion or structural collapse at neighbouring site	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure General public	Explosion and structural collapse of the Proposed Development and	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category A	Remote	Tolerable	Not Significant	In

Hazard	Receptor	Hazard source and/ or pathway	Reasonable worst consequence if event occurred	Could the risk result in serious damage?	Study area of potential impact	Worst Case Severity of Harm	Duration/Recovery Period	Category of Consequence	Likelihood of Worse Case Severity of Harm Pre-Mitigation	Tolerability	Significance of Risk Post Mitigation	Scoped In or Out
		affecting airport operations										
Civil unrest or protest	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Airport staff industrial action	Airport operations failure and disruption	No	Site	No serious harm	Short term	Not MA&D	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Out
Absent Environmental Management Systems	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Increased risk of MA&D hazards described within this register	As described within this register for all hazards relevant to the operation of the Proposed Development	Yes	Site and Public Safety Zone	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	In
Wake vortex leading to property damage	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Structural collapse of the Proposed Development and affecting airport operations	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category A		Tolerable	Not Significant	In
Importation of Biological agents	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure General public	Explosion and structural collapse of the Proposed Development and affecting airport operations	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site and national/international	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	TifALARP	Not Significant	Out
External Aircraft Interference (i.e. lasers, drones)	Airport personnel and passengers and infrastructure	Drones, lasers, fireworks etc. interfering with aircraft or telecommunications	Fatality or risk of injury to airport users, workers and the general public	Yes	Site	Catastrophic	Very long term	Category D	Extremely Improbable	Tolerable	Not Significant	In

Appendix 22.1

Groundwater Modelling Method Statement

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 22.1 – Groundwater Modelling Method Statement

Contents

1	**Introduction**		**1**
	1.1	Background	1
	1.2	Objectives	1
	1.3	Regulatory Context	1
	1.4	Stakeholder Engagement	2
2	**Scope**		**3**
	2.1	Model Study Area	3
	2.2	Key Groundwater Issues	3
	2.1	Groundwater Receptors	3
3	**Existing Information and Conceptual Model**		**5**
	3.1	Existing Models	5
	3.2	Conceptual Hydrogeological Model	5
	3.1	Data Requirements	5
	3.2	Recharge Assessment	5
4	**Numerical Modelling Approach**		**7**
	4.1	Overview	7
	4.2	Model Design	7
	4.3	Model Calibration	8
	4.4	Impact Assessment and Scenario Testing	8

Tables

Table 2-1: Main groundwater receptors 3

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Proposed Development comprises the expansion of Heathrow Airport through the construction of a new long third runway and associated infrastructure and a new Terminal 6 buildings to the west of the current Terminal 5. Detailed description of the Proposed Development is included in Chapter 2: Proposed Development.

1.1.2 The Proposed Development includes major infrastructure works that have the potential to impact on groundwater resource within the underlying superficial and bedrock aquifers, hydraulically connected surface water bodies and other groundwater receptors in the study. Accordingly, an appropriate groundwater model is proposed to assess the potential effects on the groundwater receptors and support stakeholder engagement

1.1.3 The numerical groundwater model will be developed to support the Environmental Statement (ES) and Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Proposed Development. The model will provide a quantitative assessment of the potential effects of construction and operation on groundwater resources, groundwater-dependent receptors and groundwater-surface water interactions.

1.2 Objectives

1.2.1 The model will be used to:

- Establish baseline groundwater conditions.
- Quantify groundwater level changes associated with the construction and operation of the scheme.
- Assess potential changes in groundwater flow directions and flow paths.
- Evaluate groundwater interaction with surface water bodies.
- Assess potential risks to groundwater abstractions and Source Protection Zones (SPZs).
- Assess potential impacts on any groundwater-dependent terrestrial ecosystems (GWDTEs).
- Evaluate design mitigation measures to minimise impacts on groundwater receptors.
- Quantify potential uncertainties through sensitivity testing.

1.3 Regulatory Context

1.3.1 The groundwater impact assessment will support compliance with:

- EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60) objectives;
- Groundwater Body quantitative and chemical status requirements;

- Drinking Water Protected Area objectives;
- Planning Act 2008 requirements;
- Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations;
- Relevant Environment Agency guidance and policy.

1.4 Stakeholder Engagement

1.4.1 It is proposed that the detailed groundwater modelling strategy and subsequent impact assessment will be developed in consultation with the Environment Agency and other stakeholders, as appropriate

2 Scope

2.1 Model Study Area

2.1.1 The model domain will encompass the principal groundwater body that will potentially be influenced by the Proposed Development with an appropriate spatial boundary extensive to minimise boundary-condition uncertainty.

2.1.2 The proposed model extent is shown in Figure 22.1.

2.2 Key Groundwater Issues

2.2.1 The model will consider the following issues with regards to potential effects on the groundwater regime and groundwater resource within the study area during construction and operational phases as appropriate:

- Temporary dewatering during cons;
- Construction excavations;
- Piling and other below-ground structures;
- Watercourse diversions and modifications;
- Drainage infrastructure;
- Changes in recharge during operational phase;
- Groundwater flooding risks;
- Permanent operational impacts.

2.1 Groundwater Receptors

2.1.1 The main groundwater receptors that will be considered in the assessment include:

Table 2-1: Main groundwater receptors

Element	Main Receptors
Groundwater	• Lower Thames Gravels Groundwater Body; • Chalk Groundwater Body; • Secondary aquifers and perched groundwater systems.
Surface Water (details included in the Surface Locations, see Figure 22.3)	• River Colne; • Longford River; • Duke of Northumberland's River; • Tributaries, lakes and ponds; • Wetland habitats.

Element	Main Receptors
Water Resources	• Source Protection Zones; • Licensed abstractions; • Private water supplies.
Ecological Receptors	• Groundwater-dependent terrestrial ecosystems; • Wetlands and associated habitats; • Designated nature conservation sites.

3 Existing Information and Conceptual Model

3.1 Existing Models

3.1.1 Regional Environment Agency groundwater models and supporting hydrogeological studies will be reviewed to inform conceptual understanding and establish appropriate hydraulic boundary conditions for the groundwater model. Available existing datasets and interpretations will be incorporated as appropriate to improve confidence in the model design.

3.2 Conceptual Hydrogeological Model

3.2.1 The numerical model will be developed mainly based on a conceptual understanding of the following for the study area:

- Geological succession;
- Hydrostratigraphy;
- Recharge mechanisms;
- Groundwater flow paths and flow regime;
- Groundwater-surface water interaction;
- Potetial anthropogenic influences;
- Groundwater abstractions.

3.1 Data Requirements

3.1.1 At this stage, the main data requirements for the model includes the following:

- Geological maps and historical borehole logs from the British Geological Survey (BGS) records), relevant BGS reports;
- Site specific ground investigation reports, borehole logs, in situ test data;
- Available groundwater level data from the Environment Agency records and data collected as part of the proposed site specific ground investigation and groundwater monitoring;
- Available records of surface water levels and flow data;
- Available groundwater and surface water abstraction records;
- Meteorological datasets from the Met office records;
- Land-use datasets obtained as part of the project; and
- Topographic datasets available from the project data records.

3.2 Recharge Assessment

3.2.1 Recharge estimates will be developed using rainfall, evapotranspiration, soils, geology and land-use information.

3.2.2 Recharge inputs will vary spatially and temporally to support the groundwater model simulations and assessment of seasonal variations, climatic extremes and future climate scenarios. Recharge estimates will be incorporated directly into the MODFLOW 6 model.

4 Numerical Modelling Approach

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 It is proposed that the groundwater model is developed using MODFLOW 6 as it is an acceptable and widely used groundwater simulation model. The model supports:

- multi-layered groundwater systems;
- assessment of groundwater-surface water interaction;
- appropriate transient simulation;
- uncertainty assessment and
- provides a transparent and auditable modelling workflow.

4.1.2 The model will be utilised to:

- Simulate groundwater flow regime;
- Represent river systems and drainage features;
- Simulate recharge and abstraction;
- Assess construction dewatering impacts;
- Evaluate embedded mitigation measures in relation to groundwater receptors;
- Assess potential operational impacts;
- Support sensitivity analysis and uncertainty assessment.

4.2 Model Design

4.2.1 Broadly the MODFLOW model will incorporate the following with the specific details to be defined during the model development stages:

Geological Framework

- River Terrace Deposits;
- Alluvial deposits, where relevant;
- London Clay Formation;
- Lambeth Group;
- Thanet Formation;
- Upper Chalk sequence.

Spatial Extent

4.2.2 Currently, it is proposed that the model domain mainly covers the extent of the Thames Gravel Groundwater Body in order to cover the major groundwater flow systems and receptors and minimise edge effects. However, this will be reviewed during the model development to ensure that it remains appropriate as the Site boundary is confirmed.

Boundary Conditions and Grid Design

4.2.3 Typically, the model will incorporate the following as appropriate depending on the level of detail available at the time of model development:

- Recharge boundaries;
- River boundaries;
- Drain boundaries where required;
- Abstraction boundaries;
- Lateral hydraulic boundaries informed by regional datasets.

4.2.4 The model grid design will be implemented accordingly for optimum output of the results. The grids will consider the following

- Major infrastructure;
- Sensitive receptors;
- Watercourses;
- Groundwater abstractions;
- Areas of proposed temporary dewatering.

4.3 Model Calibration

4.3.1 The initial steady state calibration will focus on reproducing:

- Regional groundwater levels;
- Groundwater gradients;
- Vertical hydraulic relationships;
- Groundwater-surface water interactions.

4.3.2 If appropriate, this will be followed by transient calibration using available data such as:

- Groundwater hydrographs;
- River levels (if available); and
- Recharge variations.

4.4 Impact Assessment and Scenario Testing

4.4.1 It is considered that the model simulations will assess the effects of the following activities based on the project design detail available.

Construction Phase effects on groundwater receptors

- Dewatering activities;
- Temporary groundwater barriers;
- Effects of large excavations and potential tunnels where identified;
- Piling and retaining structures;
- Watercourse realignment works.

Operational Phase effects on groundwater receptors

- Permanent structures;

- Drainage systems;
- Modified recharge conditions;
- Watercourse realignments;
- Groundwater flooding risks.

4.4.2 The likely effects on the groundwater receptors will be quantified in terms of changes in groundwater:

- Head from baseline conditions;
- Flows (inflows and outflows) to watercourses; and
- Flow paths.

Mitigation Assessment

4.4.3 Subject to proposed mitigation measures proposed by the project, the following potential mitigation measures that may be assessed include the effects of:

- Permeable structures;
- Groundwater underdrain systems;
- Recharge compensation measures; and
- Modified drainage designs.

Sensitivity and Uncertainty Assessment

4.4.4 Sensitivity analysis will be undertaken to evaluate uncertainty associated with some of the key model input parameters. This may include the following subject to further consideration and agreement with the EA.

- Hydraulic conductivity;
- Storage properties;
- Recharge rates;
- Riverbed conductance;
- Geological interpretations; and
- Boundary condition assumptions.

4.4.5 Model confidence will be demonstrated through assessment of parameter uncertainty and evaluation of the robustness of predicted effects across a range of plausible hydrogeological conditions.

Appendix 24.1

Cumulative Long List

Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report

Appendix 24.1 – Proposed Long List of Cumulative Schemes

Contents

Appendix 24.1 – Proposed Long List of Cumulative Schemes **1**

24.1 Tier 1 Cumulative Schemes 1

24.2 Tier 2 Cumulative Schemes 44

24.3 Tier 3 Cumulative Schemes 48

Tables

Table 24-1: Tier 1 Cumulative Schemes 1
Table 24-2: Tier 2 Cumulative Schemes 44
Table 24-3: Tier 3 Cumulative Schemes 48

Appendix 24.1 – Proposed Long List of Cumulative Schemes

24.1 Tier 1 Cumulative Schemes

- Under construction;
- Permitted applications under the Planning Act or other regimes but not yet implemented;
- Submitted applications under the Planning Acting or other regimes but not yet determined;
- All refusals subject to appeal procedures not yet determined.

24.1.1 The following Tier 1 Cumulative Schemes are presented within **Figure 24-1**.

Table 24-1: Tier 1 Cumulative Schemes

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
BHAMS15882	PL/26/06178/OA	4.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-07-31 Pending Decision	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for principal means of vehicular access to the highway) for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 450 dwellings, including affordable housing, public open space and associated infrastructure.
BHAMS15881	PL/26/05438/OA	0.1 km	Submitted 2026-08-04 Validated 2026-09-04	Outline planning application for up to 200 dwellings, including affordable housing, car parking, landscaped open space incorporating sustainable drainage features, and associated

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Pending Decision	infrastructure (matter to be considered at this stage: access).
BHAMS15782	PL/26/06177/OA	4.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-07-31 Pending Decision	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for principal means of vehicular access to the highway) for the erection of up to 230 dwellings, including affordable housing, public open space and associated infrastructure.
BHAMS12423	PL/26/04941/OA	0.8 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-06-17 Pending Decision	Outline planning application for removal of existing structures and erection of phased mixed-use development comprising up to 610 residential dwellings (including affordable housing and self/custom-build housing), Class C2 care home up to 3,230 sqm and 75 beds, Class E(e) medical centre up to 1,400 sqm, flexible Class E/F2 uses up to 350 sqm, network of new roads, cycle and car parking, landscaping, public open space, drainage features and other associated works and infrastructure (matter to be considered at this stage: access).
BHAMS5992	PL/22/2678/OA	0.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-07-26 Refused/Dismissed	Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing residential and equestrian buildings to facilitate for the construction of up to 30 dwellings to include 40% affordable housing provision with

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			2023-05-16	First Homes, up to 2 self-build plots, public open space and associated infrastructure and landscaping. All matters to be reserved except for the creation of new site access
BHAMS10947	PL/26/00258/OA	0.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-03-23 Pending Decision	Outline planning application for up to 550 dwellings (Use Class C3); public open space; landscaping; service infrastructure; and demolition of existing structures; with all matters reserved except detailed access from Langley Park Road and Thorney Lane North, and the reconfigured access arrangements to Shredding Green Farm.
BHAMS12425	PL/25/5553/OA	1.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-02-24 Pending Decision	Outline application with all matters reserved for development for up to 39 dwellings including demolition of 244 Swallow Street to facilitate access
BHAMS10405	PL/25/0864/OA	1.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-03-21 Pending Decision	Outline application (with all matters reserved) for erection of residential dwellings including affordable housing (Class C3), new vehicular access points off Church Road and Slough Road and associated infrastructure.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
BHAMS9793	PL/25/0167/OA	1.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-01-22 Pending Decision	Outline planning application for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of up to 43 dwellings and associated infrastructure and landscaping (matter to be considered at this stage: access)
BHAMS8429	PL/24/2253/OA	4.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-07-30 Pending Decision	Outline planning application for a residential development of up to 46 dwellings (all matters reserved except access).
BHAMS11045	PL/25/2712/OA	4.8 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-09-18 Pending Decision	Outline application, with all matters reserved except principal means of access to the highway, for the erection of up to 76 dwellings, including affordable housing, together with the provision of open space, hard and soft landscaping, and associated infrastructure
BHAMS5988	PL/22/2657/FA	2.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-07-29 Granted 2023-07-28	A hybrid application to comprise: Part A - A full application for the change in use of 25.6 ha of land at Alderbourne Farm to a nature reserve. Part B - Outline application - with all matters reserved (except for principal points of access) for land at Alderbourne Farm to comprise backlots and up to 35,000 sqft (3,252 sqm) of associated film production buildings (workshops)

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				together with access roads and parking; Part C - Outline application for 32.6 ha of land at Pinewood South with all matters reserved (except for three principal points of access) to comprise up to 1,365,000sqft (126,817sqm) of film production buildings (to include sound stages, workshops, offices and ancillary uses), education and business hubs with associated ancillary structures together with backlot, multi storey car parks, accesses and green and blue infrastructure.
BHAMS5864	PL/22/1292/FA	2.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-09 Granted 2022-07-20	Construction of detached workshop and substation buildings
ELNG3774	262744FUL	3.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-07-10 Refused 2026-07-10	Conversion of the existing office building (Use class E(g)(i) to residential use (C3), including replacement glazing and cladding, roof alterations, external terraces, fire safety works, landscaping, cycle and refuse storage, parking reconfiguration and associated works.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
ELNG1315	233076FUL	2.5 km	Submitted 2023-08-04 Validated 2023-08-07 Granted 2025-05-27	Demolition of existing buildings and structures and the phased erection of buildings for mixed-use scheme, including new homes; a replacement food store; Flexible Commercial Space; alterations to the existing access road; associated improvements to streets, open spaces, landscaping and public realm; and provision of car and bicycle parking spaces and servicing spaces and other works incidental to the proposed development.
ELNG475	250448REM	4.7 km	Submitted 2025-02-04 Validated 2025-04-2025 Granted 2026-04-02	Application for the approval of Reserved Matters of the hard and soft landscaping works that comprise reserved matters to be undertaken in Phase 1 (as required by condition 1 & 8 set out above) of outline planning permission ref: 244038VAR dated for the: Minor Material Amendment (S.73) to Outline Planning Permission 214662OUT dated 27/10/2022 for 'The erection of four residential blocks ranging in height from 4 to 9 storeys to provide 149 homes; alterations to existing vehicular access and new pedestrian access from Wood End Gardens with basement level car parking, car club, cycle parking, refuse storage, service areas and associated communal amenity space and

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				landscaping (All details of access, appearance, layout, scale considered and landscaping matters reserved). Amendment seeks to amend the wording of conditions 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, 35, and 36, and to vary the relevant sections in the S106 legal agreement relating to this development in order to enable a phased implementation of the development; and the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan for proposed phase 1'.
ELNG3474	252540FUL	3.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-06-30 Granted 2026-02-19	Phased redevelopment of an existing residential estate to provide new homes (Use Class C3), including associated cycle and vehicle parking, landscaping and amenity space
ELNG433	260215FUL	1.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-01-21 Pending Decision	Construction of a mixed-use development comprising residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial and/or community floorspace (Use Classes E and/or F2), together with associated landscaping and vehicle parking.The proposal represents a departure from the Development Plan, as it is not in accordance with the policies in force for the area. The site is designated as a Locally Significant

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				Industrial Site (LSIS), and the scheme constitutes Major Development.For Public Consultation Purposes Only (not forming part of the statutory Description of Development): The proposal includes 287 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and 254 sqm of flexible commercial and/or community floorspace (Use Classes E and/or F), with buildings ranging from 10 to 15 storeys in height.
ELNG19	232010FUL	0.4 km	Submitted 2023-05-11 Validated 2023-06-02 Pending Decision	Hybrid planning application (part detailed, part outline) for the phased redevelopment of the site, comprising a maximum of 39,628sqm (GIA) of floorspace. Full details are submitted for Phase 1 comprising 31,555sqm (GIA) of flexible B2 (General Industrial), B8 (Storage and distribution), E(g)(i) (Offices), E(g)(ii) (Research and development) and E(g)(iii) (industrial processes), all ground floor hard and soft landscaping including a retail kiosk (51sqm GEA), parking and servicing and other works incidental to the proposals, including a programme of interim works (in connection with access to the adjacent site to the west), and Phase 2 2,908sqm (GIA) of B2/B8 floorspace. Outline permission for Phase 3 (with layout,

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				scale, appearance and landscaping at upper levels being reserved) is sought for up to 5,165sqm (GIA) E(g)(i) office use at upper levels of Blocks 1E-1G, within maximum heights of up to 20.943m (AOD) An Environmental Statement has been submitted with the application under the Town & Country (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, as amended. (Revised site address and revised drawings).
ELNG997	224817FUL	3.3 km	Submitted 2022-11-15 Validated 2022-11-18 Pending Decision	Development to provide a total of 106 self-contained residential units comprising construction of three blocks of flats (ranging from five to nine stories) and a three-storey terrace of dwellinghouses (following demolition of garages and clearance of four land parcels); hard and soft landscaping with play space and landscape improvements to Mandeville Parkway; provision of hardstanding parking areas; and associated ancillary; and enabling works. (Regulation 3 Application by London Borough of Ealing).
ELNG2108	234110OUT	0.04 km	Submitted 2023-10-10	Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and structures on the site, comprehensive phased redevelopment to provide new buildings to accommodate new homes (Use

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Validated 2023-10-19 Granted 2025-11-12	Class C3), flexible commercial uses (Use Classes E and F1 and Sui Generis drinking establishment), education uses (Use Class F1(a), new sports hall (Class E), basement, energy centre, associated cycle and vehicle parking, landscaping, public realm open space and children's play space and site preparation works. All matters reserved.
ELNG475	214662OUT	4.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-07-09 Granted 2022-10-27	Outline planning application for the erection of four residential blocks ranging in height from 4 to 9 storeys to provide 149 homes; alterations to existing vehicular access and new pedestrian access from Wood End Gardens with basement level car parking, car club, cycle parking, refuse storage, service areas and associated communal amenity space and landscaping (All details of access, appearance, layout, scale considered and landscaping matters reserved).
ELNG3128	244156FUL	3.0 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-10-30 Granted 2025-06-09	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 27no. two storey terraced dwellinghouses and 14no. flats within apartment building with accommodation at ground, first floor and within a mansard roof above (total of 41no. residential

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				homes), with car parking, cycle storage, amenity space, landscaping and associated works.
ELNG796	241706OUTR3	3.1 km	Submitted 2024-04-26 Validated 2024-05-16 Granted 2025-03-21	Hybrid planning application for comprehensive phased development incorporating the redevelopment of all existing buildings and structures and construction of new buildings comprising: "Full planning permission for the construction of a replacement leisure centre (Use Class F2(d)), including new car / coach / cycle parking and vehicular / pedestrian access arrangements, associated highways works, new and replacement play space, public realm, landscaping and flood management to existing public open space. Outline planning permission (means of access not reserved) for about 300 affordable and market housing enabling residential development (Use Class C3), public realm, play and amenity space and open space improvements". (Regulation 3 Application by London Borough of Ealing) (Revised red line boundary)The proposals represent a Departure from the Development Plan that is not in accordance with the development plan in force in the area, being a Major Development on land

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				designated as Metropolitan Open Land and comprising public open space.
ELNG698	223090FUL	2.5 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-06030 Granted 2024-09-06	Redevelopment of the site including the demolition of the existing building and construction of 2 buildings ranging in height from 6 to 14 storeys to provide 185 self-contained residential units (Class C3) together with hard and soft landscaping, car parking, cycle storage and other associated works.
ELNG1942	231604FUL	2.1 km	Submitted 2023-04-12 Validated 2023-05-02 Granted 2024-05-31	Construction of 7 residential buildings (4-7 storeys in height) to provide 220 residential units; conversion of existing farmhouse and barns to provide a cafe/commercial unit (Class E); and improved public access between Northala Fields and Marnham Fields with associated enhanced landscaping, parking and refuse storage.
ELNG25	223774FUL	3.8 km	Submitted 2022-08-26 Validated 2022-09-13 Granted 2024-02-14	Partial demolition, refurbishment and development to provide between 2 and 21 storey office-led mixed use scheme with flexible retail, restaurant and cafe uses, a music venue and leisure use at lower levels, with a new area of landscaped public realm and pedestrian route and other associated works (revised proposal).

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
ELNG728	220657FUL	2.0 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-02-17 Granted 2022-05-23	Extension to create a cafe for leisure use seating, refreshment areas and restroom facilities.
ELNG560	215058FULR3	0.1 km	Submitted 2021-07-23 Validated 2021-07-26 Granted 2022-09-09	Demolition and mixed-use redevelopment (phased) to provide 3 urban blocks comprising residential units (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, employment and community floorspace (Use Classes E, F1 and F2), private and public car parking, servicing bays, public realm and associated landscaping, play and amenity space, plant and refuse areas, and access arrangements (Regulation 3 Application by Peabody Developments Limited and the London Borough of Ealing).The proposals comprise a Major Development that may be likely to affect the character or setting of a listed building or a Conservation Area.
ELNG474	224785REM	0.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-11-03 Granted 2023-11-09	Application for the Approval of Reserved Matters for the construction of a residential-led mixed use development comprising residential (Class C3), hotel (Class C1) and commercial uses (Classes A1-A5, now Class E(a), (b), (c), sui generis

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				drinking establishment/hot food takeaway), the internal road network including Healum Avenue, and all associated infrastructure, plant, parking, and hard and soft landscaping, for Development Plots A and B of Planning Permission ref. 183673OUT dated 29 November 2019 submitted pursuant to Conditions 1 (Statutory Time Limits) and 2 (Reserved Matters Approvals - Layout, Access, Scale, Appearance and Landscaping); and the partial discharge of Conditions 7 (Reserved Matters Details), 10 (a-c) (Open Spaces Design), 46 (Overheating & Cooling), and 47 (a) (Energy Strategy), in so far as they relate to Development Plots A and B.
ELNG490	223093HYBRID	2.3 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-07-01 Granted 2024-11-20	Hybrid planning application for the demolition of existing floorspace and the provision of 396 new residential dwellings (Class C3) and 775sqm of community floorspace (Class Ef/F1f/F2b) along with associated access, landscaping, amenity space, car and cycle parking. Full details are submitted for the access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of Block C and Blocks D2 / D3 / D4 comprising 5 to 16 storeys for residential and / or community use on the ground floor and residential use on the upper

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				floors. All matters are reserved in respect of land to the west of Romsey Road comprising community floorspace.
ELNG984	224067FUL	0.04 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-09-21 Granted 2023-03-15	Change of use of the land from car parking (Use Class Sui Generis) to community space (Use Class F2) and ancillary commercial/business/service use (Flexible Use Class E).
ELNG986	224066FUL	0.04 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-09-21 Granted 2023-03-16	Change of use of part ground floor, from residents facilities (Use Class Sui Generis) to shop/restaurant/cafe/financial and professional services (Mixed Use Class E(a)/E(b)/E(c)).
ELNG708	216991FULR3	0.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-12-10 Granted 2023-03-02	Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of 5 blocks of between 5 and 25 storeys to provide affordable and market Class C3 dwellings and flexible Classes E and F2 floorspace, public realm, landscaping, amenity/play space, alterations to vehicle and pedestrian access, car and cycle parking and refuse storage, associated works including roof level plant. Phased Development. (Amended description and plans concerning phasing, dwelling numbers and mix, commercial space,).

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				(Regulation 3 Application by Paragon Asra Housing involving land owned by London Borough of Ealing. The proposals comprise a Major Development that may be likely to affect the character, appearance or setting of a listed building and/or a Conservation Area).
ELNG725	220545FULR3	1.1 km	Submitted 2022-02-09 Validated 2022-02-10 Granted 2023-05-23	Development of 92 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated vehicular and pedestrian access across three buildings ranging from two to five storeys in height, children play space, residential amenity space, public realm and landscaping works, a new public open space, vehicle and cycle parking and other associated works. (Following demolition of the existing community centre, school building, playground, MUGA and associated structures) [Regulation 3 Application by London Borough of Ealing].
ELM562	2025/3183	4.3 km	Validated 2025-12-03 Granted 2026-07-16	Development of part three, part four-storey buildings to create 78 extra care apartments (C2 use) with ancillary communal facilities, parking and landscaping.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
ELM1303	2022/3525	4.6 km	Submitted 2022-11-18 Validated 2022-11-29 Pending Decision	Development comprising 3 detached buildings containing 74 residential units with underground and surface level car and cycle parking, mechanical plant, soft and hard landscaping and associated diversion of Thames Water pipe following demolition of existing buildings.
HLLN248	58758/APP/2024/2764	0.07 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-10-16 Granted 2024-12-12	Alterations to the existing building facades, comprising overcladding of brickwork, the restoration of existing cladding, louvres and windows, the installation of new sectional loading and pedestrian access doors with canopies and toughened glass, roof lights, photovoltaic panel arrays, and the electric vehicle charging points, resurfacing, substation and ancillary works.
HLLN1051	74423/APP/2024/1908	0.06 km	Submitted 2024-07-15 Validated 2024-11-12 Pending Decision	Erection of a residential building together with associated landscaping and car parking, and including the reconfiguration of the Vista Court, Atlantico House and Peninsula House residential car parks on Nobel Drive.
HLLN1872	6648/APP/2026/120	0.02 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-01-15	Subdivision of The Dower House to provide 3 residential homes (Use Class C3) along with restorative works. Partial demolition of the

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Pending Decision	forecourt wall to The Dower House to enable rear site access. Erection of 18 residential homes (Use Class C3) at the rear of the site. Associated landscaping works.
HLLN1762	585/APP/2026/580	1.7 km	Submitted 2026-03-05 Validated 2026-03-12 Pending Decision	Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site to provide 333 dwellings, together with associated access, parking, landscaping and other ancillary works.
HLLN436	76550/APP/2021/4499	0.09 km	Submitted 2021-12-10 Validated 2021-12-17 Granted 2022-03-29	Hybrid planning application seeking OUTLINE permission (with all matters reserved) for residential floorspace (Class C3) including demolition of all existing buildings and structures; erection of new buildings; provision of a community centre (up to 140sq.m of Use Class F2(b) floorspace); new pedestrian and vehicular access; associated amenity space, open space, landscaping; car and cycle parking spaces; plant, refuse storage, servicing area and other works incidental to the proposed development; and FULL planning permission for Blocks A and B comprising 80 residential units (Class C3); new pedestrian and vehicular access; associated

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				amenity space and landscaping; car and cycle parking; refuse storage, servicing area, and other associated infrastructure to include temporary highways and landscaping works.
HLLN437	76551/APP/2021/4502	0.05 km	Submitted 2021-12-10 Validated 2021-12-17 Granted 2022-03-29	Hybrid planning application seeking OUTLINE permission (with all matters reserved) for residential floorspace (Class C3) including demolition of all existing buildings and structures; erection of new buildings; new pedestrian and vehicular accesses; associated amenity space, open space, landscaping; car and cycle parking spaces; plant, refuse storage, servicing area and other works incidental to the proposed development; and FULL planning permission for Block A comprising 30 residential units (Class C3); new pedestrian access; associated amenity space and landscaping; cycle parking, refuse storage, and other associated infrastructure.
HLLN1866	144/APP/2026/88	3.5 k	Submitted 2026-01-13 Validated 2026-02-03 Pending Decision	Partial demolition of existing buildings and erection of three buildings comprising residential apartments, plus extension to existing hotel, along with access, car parking, servicing, landscaping, and other associated works.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
HLLN1826	12853/APP/2025/2844	2.4 km	Submitted 2025-11-07 Validated 2025-11-24 Pending Decision	Partial demolition and redevelopment of the existing multi-storey car park to provide new homes (Use Class C3), landscaping, car and cycle parking, and other associated work.
HLLN1542	78837/APP/2024/1557	0.08 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-06-11 Pending Decision	Erection of a storage building on existing hardstanding.
HLLN1561	585/APP/2024/1879	1.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-07-11 Pending Decision	Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for residential development and commercial uses, to be occupied flexibly within Use Classes E(a), E(b), E(c), E(e), E(g)(i), E(g)(ii) and a convenience store (Use Class E(a)); plus car parking, hard and soft landscaping, and all other associated works; Plus, full planning permission for reinstatement of gym use (Use Class E(d)) and change of use to provide a cafe (Use Class E(b)) within the former cinema building; and external alterations; and associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping and all other associated works.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
HLLN157	2370/APP/2023/1727	0.03 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-06-15 Pending Decision	Phased demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site for a replacement foodstore (Class E), 158 residential units (Class C3), car parking, servicing and access arrangements and associated works.
HLLN68	585/APP/2024/1558	1.1 km	Submitted 2024-06-11 Validated 2024-06-12 Granted 2024-10-09	Change of use of site containing 72 assisted living units (Use Class C2) with ancillary communal facilities, parking, and landscaped areas, to residential accommodation for primary occupiers aged over 55 (Use Class C3)
HLLN429	76795/APP/2023/2503	0.2 km	Submitted 2023-08-23 Validated 2023-09-14 Granted 2024-09-02	Formal Description: Demolition of existing Yiewsley Library Building and the erection of a new residential building on the Yiewsley Library site (Falling Lane) and the erection of a new mixed use building on the former Yiewsley Swimming Pool site (Otterfield Road), with a replacement library at ground floor level, residential uses above and new pedestrian access off of the High Street. Detailed Description: Demolition of existing Yiewsley Library Building and the erection of a 5-storey residential building, comprising 50 dwellings, with

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				28 undercroft parking spaces (13 for residential and 15 for use by Rabbsfarm Primary School). The Otterfield Road site proposes the erection of a 5-storey building, comprising 45 dwellings, with 25 car parking spaces (23 for residential and 2 for library users).
HLLN1097	60891/APP/2024/343	0.03 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-02-12 Granted 2024-04-08	Consultation under Class F of Part 8 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (Class F of the GPDO 2015) to redevelop the Eastern Business Park to provide new industrial and logistics facilities.
HLLN1240	2543/APP/2023/2972	2.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-10-12 Granted 2024-01-19	Installation of 526 photovoltaic panels to the roof of the building. Installation of 4 no. ASHP evaporator units on raised frame, 1 no. thermal store, 1 no. ASHP compressor unit to the south of the site with associated landscaping including increased height of grassed mound by 1m and 2.4m high green Paladin security fencing. Installation of 1 no. ASHP unit and thermal store adjacent to the Idris track club building, surrounded by 2.4m high green Paladin security fencing.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
HLLN919	42966/APP/2023/70	1.5 km	Submitted 2022-12-15 Validated 2022-12-21 Granted 2023-11-02	Application to modify the Section 106 agreement associated with planning permission ref. 42966AH/96/1862 granted 11-11-1997 relating to the Chimes Shopping Centre, High Street, Uxbridge (for the introduction of Class E Commercial, Business and Service use and associated revocation of Class A1 Retail use).
HLLN635	4058/APP/2022/1788	0.6 km	Submitted 2022-06-06 Validated 2022-06-14 Granted 2023-01-18	Hybrid planning application for: FULL application seeking planning permission for demolition of existing buildings (excluding the Tudor Centre and the Old Creche) and redevelopment of the site to provide the new Hillingdon Hospital (Use Class C2), multi-storey car park and mobility hub, vehicle access, highways works, associated plant, generators, substation, new internal roads, landscaping and public open space, utilities, servicing area, surface car park/ expansion space, and other works incidental to the proposed development; and OUTLINE planning application (all matters reserved, except for access) for the demolition of buildings and structures on the remaining site (excluding the Grade II Listed Furze) for a mixed-use development comprising residential (Class C3) and supporting Commercial, Business and

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				Service uses (Class E), new pedestrian and vehicular access; public realm, amenity space, car and cycling parking.
HNSL1649	P/2026/1971	3.3 km	Submitted 2026-07-03 Validated 2026-08-06 Pending Decision	Extension of the existing rooftop plant areas at the 12th and 18th floors of Great West House, including new terrace areas enclosed by glazed balustrades.
HNSL3006	P/2026/1648	0.02 km	Submitted 2026-06-03 Validated 2026-07-01 Pending Decision	Change of use from 20 residential apartments (14 x one-bedroom and 6 x two-bedroom) to serviced accommodation across three floors 2,3 and 4 of the building.
HNSL1604	P/2023/2705	0.01 km	Submitted 2023-08-22 Validated 2023-11-10 Pending Decision	Erection of two apartment blocks of 3-5 storeys and 4-6 storeys to create 40 flats and a terrace of 13 townhouses with associated landscaping, cycle storage, blue badge parking, access road improvements and servicing following the demolition of the existing gymnasium amended plans received

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
HNSL980	P/2023/3208	3.8 km	Submitted 2023-10-10 Validated 2023-11-20 Granted 2026-06-12	Redevelopment of the site comprising of demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use scheme comprising 856 homes, Use Class C3 commercial and retail use, Use Class E/B2/B8 plus associated highway and public realm works, landscaping, car and cycle parking, infrastructure and other associated works, including the relocation of Brentford Fountain and listed building consent P/2024/4346
HNSL166	P/2021/4144	0.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-10-19 Refused/Dismissed 2022-10-07	Erection of a mixed use development comprising of a part two and three storey building for a Social, Emotional & Mental Health school for 90 pupils and three blocks ranging from three to five storeys in height comprising of 124 residential units with associated works, access, landscaping, refuse stores, car and cycle parking.
HNSL2072	P/2024/1065	0.06 km	Submitted 2024-04-02 Validated 2024-05-13 Pending Decision	Erection of a three to five storey block of flats containing 66 self-contained units (Class C3) (mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 beds) with associated undercroft surfaced level car and bicycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, with all necessary ancillary and enabling works following the

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				demolition of seven single storey vacant buildings (Sui Generis)
HNSL2880	P/2026/0028	0.01 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-01-07 Pending Decision	Erection of a two storey building and a single storey building comprising of 21 dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated car parking, vehicular access, boundary treatment, amenity space, landscaping, refuse and cycle storage following the demolition of the existing buildings, structures and hardstanding
HNSL1618	P/2023/3177	0.9 km	Submitted 2023-10-06 Validated 2023-11-28 Granted 2026-01-27	Redevelopment of the site to erect three, four storey residential blocks to provide 56 residential units with car parking, cycle parking and refuse stores incorporating the formation of a new pedestrian entrances, hard and soft landscaping and amendments to the access road
HNSL979	P/2022/1090	0.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-03-31 Pending Decision	Hybrid application for a phased estate regeneration development of the site comprising a maximum of 102,375 sqm (GIA) of floorspace; up to 89,875 sqm (GIA) as an outline permission (the Outline Component) and full planning permission for Phase A comprising 12,500 sqm (GIA) of residential development (the Detailed

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				Component). The Detailed Component proposes erection of a building up to 13 storeys in height to provide 117 new homes (Use Class C3), together with access, servicing, car parking, cycle parking, cycle storage, plant, play and open space and landscaping. The Outline Component (all matters reserved) for: demolition of all buildings and structures, up to 1280 sqm (GIA) of flexible Commercial / Community Floorspace (Use Class E / F2), up to 80,785 sqm (GIA) of Residential Floorspace (Use Class C3) comprising up to 850 homes, up to 2,550 sqm (GIA) of Plant, up to 5,260 sqm (GIA) of Podium Car Parking, open spaces, landscaping, public realm and other associated and ancillary work.
HNSL2110	P/2024/2843	2.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-08-14 Pending Decision	Demolition of Old Mould shop, Caxton Building, Vanmatic Building, rear/north wing of Campbells Building and associated outbuildings. Refurbishment and extension of the Gillette Building, IPF Building, Natwest Building and front/south wing of Campbells Building to update the spaces associated with the existing film studios use and provide a public café. Erection of new buildings serving as studios for virtual production, film and digital content creation,

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				comprising sound stages, offices and workshops (Use Class E(g)). Formation of associated access, cycle and car parking, waste storage, renewable energy infrastructure and landscaping arrangements and listed building consent P/2024/2755 (amended drawings)
HNSL2791	SRN/2025/1392	0.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-04-17 Granted 2025-05-16	Screening opinion for the demolition of all existing buildings and structures on the site and redevelopment to provide approximately 260 homes within four blocks ranging in height from five to six storeys, open space and new public realm to tie into site wide hard and soft landscaping, and associated highways works alongside rationalised car and cycle parking
HNSL984	P/2022/1431	0.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-04 Granted 2024-11-29	Hybrid planning application comprising a full application for the restoration, conversion and extension of Hanworth Park House with a change of use to community, one residential home for caretaker purposes and office uses with associated highway improvements; and an outline application with all matters reserved except access for up to 300 residential homes, car and cycle parking, landscaping, restoration

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				and enhancement of adjacent woodland for public use and associated works
HNSL1057	P/2022/3013	0.01 km	Submitted 2022-09-22 Validated 2022-09-23 Granted 2025-08-22	Retention of the Grade II Listed station building fronting Bath Road, with demolition of ancillary space to the rear. Station improvements to include provision of improved walkways to the platforms. Redevelopment of the existing station car park to provide four new build blocks, comprising class C3 dwellinghouses and non-residential uses comprising flexible E or F class (retail, restaurant/cafe use, and/or community use). Creation of new public realm, landscape works and improvements to the SINC. Provision of associated car parking, cycle parking, access and servicing. Relocation of bus stops and taxi rank and Listed Building Consent is sought for the alterations (internal and external), refurbishment and extension of the Grade II Listed Station building to provide new and improved station access (P/2022/3014)
HNSL1064	P/2023/0069	0.01 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-01-06	Erection of a phased development part two, part three storey Class C3 block to form 31 residential units and associated works including

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Granted 2025-06-16	landscaping, private and communal amenity space, alteration to pedestrian access and provision of car and cycle parking refuse storage and plant. Alterations to link connecting to existing building and demolition of ancillary block
HNSL982	P/2022/1637	2.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-19 Granted 2022-06-24	Replacement of roof tiles and installation of Solar PV Panels to Units A1 to A4, A7, S2 to S4, S3, S5 to S15, S10 and S17-27 along Shield Drive and Amalgamated Drive
RMTH189	23/3259/FUL	2.2 km	Submitted 2023-12-19 Validated 2024-01-19 Pending Decision	Conversion and extension of the site including internal and external works to Ruston and Karslake Buildings and works at basement level to provide 36 no. residential units (Use Class C3) and 310sqm flexible business space (Use Class E(g)), associated car parking, landscaping, playspace and highway works including the repositioning of site boundary brick wall and railings to facilitate widening of pedestrian footpath on Upper Sunbury Road. (Amended development description)
RMTH50	22/2204/FUL	1,2 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-07-12	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 1no. mixed use building between three and five storeys plus basement in height, comprising

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Pending Decision	86no. residential flats (Class C3) and 1,311.2sq.m of commercial floorspace (Class E); 1no.two storey building comprising 595sq.m of commercial floorspace (Class E); 14no. residential houses (Class C3); and, associated access, external landscaping and car parking.
RMTH48	22/2556/FUL	2.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-08-15 Granted 2024-06-14	Demolition of existing buildings (with retention of a single dwelling) and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 116 residential units and 175 sqm commercial floorspace (Use Class E(g)) with associated hard and soft landscaping, car parking and highways works and other associated works.
RMTH253	22/1442/FUL	3.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-04 Granted 2023-03-22	Demolition of existing buildings on-site and change of use of land within Ham Close, the Woodville Day Centre and St Richards Church of England Primary School and the existing recycling and parking area to the east of Ham Village Green for a phased mixed-use redevelopment comprising: a. 452 residential homes (Class C3) up to 6 storeys (with plant above) b. Community/Leisure Facility (Class F2) of up to 3 storeys in height (with plant above) c. Maker labs (sui generis) of up to 2 storeys d.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				Basement car park e. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking f. Provision of amenity space and playspace g. Site wide landscaping and alterations to Ham Village Green, and h. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes and associated highways works
RMTH187	21/3136/FUL	2.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-09-03 Granted 2023-02-28	Demolition of existing college buildings, removal of hard-surfacing, site clearance and groundworks together with the redevelopment of the site to provide new residential units; together with associated parking, cycle parking, open space and landscaping.
RMTH184	21/2758/FUL	3.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-08-04 Granted 2022-12-21	Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site comprising 45 residential units (Use Class C3), ground floor commercial/retail/cafe (Use Class E), public house (Sui Generis), boathouse locker storage, floating pontoon and floating ecosystems with associated landscaping, reprovision of Diamond Jubilee Gardens, alterations to highway layout and parking provision and other relevant works.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
RUN1325	RU.26/0274	1.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2026-03-09 Pending Decision	Outline Application, with all matters reserved apart from Access and Layout, for the demolition of existing structures and erection of 27 affordable dwellings with associated driveways and landscaping
RUN1233	RU.23/0698	0.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-05-24 Pending Decision	Full planning application for a residential development of 35 units (18 apartments and 17 dwellings) and no. 2 traveller pitches with associated landscaping and open space; new access and associated works to facilitate the development
RUN1700	RU.25/1759	1.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2025-12-23 Pending Decision	Demolition of all existing buildings and erection of 96 residential dwellings with associated infrastructure, landscaping and formation of new access from Thorpe Lea Road.
RUN221	RU.22/1364	2.3 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-09-29 Pending Decision	Alterations and change of use of offices to form 53 extra care apartments and communal facilities, and erection of 23 extra care apartments (76 in total) together with access and parking provisions to form a continuing care retirement community (Class C2) (Amendments to RU.18/0704)

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
RUN1295	RU.24/0150	3.5 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-02-20 Pending Decision	Relocation of Virginia Water Community Football Club in conjunction with the erection of 30no. dwellings
RUN463	RU.21/1324	0.9 km	Submitted/Validated 2021-08-12 Granted 2025-01-30	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment for residential use (Class C3) for up to 75 new dwellings, together with relocation of vehicular access and the provision of a single traveller pitch and access, landscaping, public open space and associated works. Outline application with access for consideration (matters reserved - scale, appearance, landscaping and layout).
RUN222	RU.22/1168	1.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-07-29 Granted 2023-01-11	Application seeking approval of reserved matters for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for a new Drone Research Facility under outline planning application RU.14/0099 for the university's masterplan for development up to 2031 comprising the demolition of selected existing buildings and the construction of an additional 55,000sqm (net) academic and operational buildings, an additional 71,128sqm (net) student accommodation (c.2,650 bedspaces), alterations to Egham Hill to provide

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				a new vehicular access, alterations to Highfield Road/Harvest Road/Egham Hill junctions to provide amended vehicular access, new car parks, sports facilities and associated hard and soft landscaping (additional supporting information received on the 29/09/22 providing further details of the external materials and an additional drawing providing updated site sections)
RUN458	RU.21/2188	2.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-11 Granted 2023-04-19	Change of use of building from single residential dwelling (C3 Use Class) and two storey extension to provide 8 dwellings comprising 4 x 2 bed and 4 x 3 bed (C3 Use Class), new access, associated car parking and plant, bin, and cycle storage.
RUN1285	RU.24/0071	1.4 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-01-17 Granted 2024-10-15	Outline application for the erection of a part single storey, part 3 storey building (with additional basement) for extra care accommodation, comprising self-contained apartments, staff and communal facilities and associated parking, including new vehicle access from Barley Mow Road. Appearance and landscaping reserved.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
RUN208	RU.22/0682	2.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-05-04 Granted 2024-05-29	Full Planning Permission for the comprehensive redevelopment to provide residential use (Class C3) for 24 units, with landscaping, car parking and associated works
RUN510	RU.23/1162	0.7 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-09-06 Granted 2024-05-10	Erection of 52 dwellings (Use Class C3) and associated landscaping and access following the demolition of existing buildings.
RUN1279	RU.23/1747	4.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-12-22 Granted 2024-02-02	Replacement dwelling with detached garage, outdoor swimming pool and replacement entrance gates following the demolition of the existing dwelling.
RUN770	RU.22/1569	4,2 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-10-12 Granted 2023-08-14	Erection of 69 dwellings including demolition of existing buildings, associated parking, landscaping, open space and infrastructure works at Grange Farm, Chertsey.
SLGH896	P/00699/024	2.5 km	Submitted 2026-07-01	Demolition of existing multi storey car park, and the erection of an eight storey building delivering 88no. dwellings, including car parking, landscaping and other associated works.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Validated 2026-07-09 Pending Decision	
SLGH857	P/03766/047	3.1 km	Submitted 2026-04-22 Validated 2026-05-29 Pending Decision	Hybrid planning application for the construction of buildings and associated works for residential dwellings (Class C3); commercial space and children's nursery (Class E); ancillary car parking, including multi-storey car park, and cycle parking; amenity space; public realm; soft and hard landscaping; and associated highways works (Outline with all matters reserved except for access) and construction of buildings and associated works for residential dwellings (Class C3); co-living (Sui Generis); commercial (Class E); associated plant; ancillary car parking and cycle parking; amenity space; hard and soft landscaping; infrastructure; and associated highways works (Detailed with no matters reserved). The application comprises EIA Development and is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
SLGH194	P/07584/012	3.7 km	Submitted 2025-10-24 Validated 2025-11-06 Pending Decision	Demolition of the existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment of the site to deliver 170 residential dwellings, comprising 2, 3 and part 4-storey houses and 3 and 4-storey apartment buildings, with associated pedestrian and vehicular access, parking, public realm, and landscaping, in addition to enhanced landscaping and new play and recreation facilities within the retained open space at Bowyer Playing Field.
SLGH259	P/19689/000	2.7 km	Submitted 2021-10-28 Validated 2021-11-01 Granted 2025-08-18	Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of buildings and the phased redevelopment of the Site to provide a mixed-use scheme comprising residential floorspace (C3 use and provision for C2 use); flexible town centre uses floor space (Use Class E and Use Class F), provision for office floorspace (Use Class E (g) (i)), supporting Sui Generis town centre uses (including a range of the following uses: pubs, wine bars, hot food takeaway), Sui Generis leisure uses (provision for a cinema or live music venue); provision for the creation of basements, car and cycle parking (including provision for a Multi-Storey Car Park); site wide landscaping, new public realm including provision of a new town square and public spaces and

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				associated servicing, associated infrastructure, energy generation requirements and highways works [Revised Parameter Plans, Reports, Documents and Environmental Statement Amendments submitted 15th June 2022](Revised Plans and Documents have been submitted).
SLGH195	P/01615/007	1.1km	Submitted 2023-11-17 Validated 2023-12-01 Granted 2024-04-10	Redevelopment of the site to provide 53no residential dwellings (Use Class C3) comprising self-contained flats and houses along with associated car parking, access, landscaping, and other associated infrastructure
SLGH480	23/30007/SMI	0.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2023-05-09 Granted 2023-05-16	Demolition of the existing buildings (Valerie House and Jupiter House) and the development of a commercial building with flexible general industrial and storage and distribution employment floor space, with associated service yards, car parking and landscaping.
SPE305	22/00483/OUT	2.7 km	Submitted 2022-04-01	Outline permission for residential development of up to 30 residential units (with all matters reserved for future consideration except for means of access) as shown on drawings

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
			Validated 2022-06-06 Refused/Dismissed 2022-10-31	numbered Site location plan no. 211103 L002 Rev A, Constraints plan no. 211103 SK1.1Concept plan no. 211103 SK1.3 received on 01/04/2022, Elevational drawings existing 2268, PL 030, 031 and 032 all rev 00Land use plan no. 21103 L004 received on 17/05/2022, and Sketch elevational plan no. 21103SK2.0 received on 06/06/2022
SPE849	23/00070/FUL	3.7 km	Validated 2023-01-19 Refused/Dismissed 2023-11-01	Planning application for residential development comprising 67 units with the provision of landscaping, access, parking and associated works.
SPE187	24/01452/OUT	3.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-12-06 Granted 2026-05-29	Outline application with approval sought for partial approval of access (highway access and primary estate road), with details of access (secondary estate roads), scale, layout, appearance and landscaping reserved, for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and the redevelopment of the site for up to 80 residential units and the provision of open space and a play area, plus associated works for landscaping, parking areas, pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
SPE1740	26/00121/OUT	2.9 km	Submitted 2026-02-06 Validated 2026-02-27 Pending Decision	Outline Application (with all matters reserved except access) for the development of up to 40 dwellings on Land South of Nursery Road, Sunbury-on-Thames.
SPE187	24/00443/RMA	3.2 km	Submitted/Validated 2024-04-08 Granted 2024-07-23	Reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and discharge of condition 7 (Vehicular access and visibility zones) pursuant to Outline Planning Permission ref. 20/00123/OUT comprising 31 residential units, car parking, cycle storage, landscaping, open space and other associated works.
SPE712	22/00346/FUL	2.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-03-08 Granted 2022-07-19	Erection of a single storey pre-fabricated modular building with access ramp and solar roof panels to form workshop.
WAM1577	22/02893/FULL	2.1 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-10-26 Granted 2026-07-31	Partial redevelopment of site, including limited demolition, to provide a mix of town centre uses:The Southern Development Site will provide a building comprising offices, aparthotel and town centre uses. The Central Development Site

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				provides new access cores and an additional residential unit. The Eastern Development Site includes a cinema and 8 no. residential units. The Travelodge Site provides one additional floor of guest rooms and a new entrance foyer. The Car Park Site - two additional half levels of parking will be added along with the reconfiguration of the lower levels to provide plant accommodation and other services. Public realm soft and hard landscape improvements are proposed to Goswell Hill and Bridgewater Way, along with green roofs.
WAM2135	25/03260/OUT	0.1 km	Submitted 2025-12-10 Validated 2026-01-12 Pending Decision	Outline application for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale only to be considered at this stage with all other matters to be reserved for the erection of a mix of 33no. dwellings with associated bins and cycle provision and access.
WAM878	24/01594/FULL	2.6km	Submitted/Validated 2024-07-01 Pending Decision	Demolition and redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of new buildings to provide 118 units of extra care housing (Class C2) and 197 residential dwellings (Class C3) along with new basement to provide car parking, plant and associated ancillary accommodation,

Ref	Application Reference	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project Description
				new public realm works, provision of amenity space and other works associated and ancillary to the proposed development.
WAM1519	22/00514/FULL	3.6 km	Submitted/Validated 2022-02-24 Granted 2026-09-16	Two storey sixth form building with linked covered walkway and new external doors to the existing school building, heat source pump within enclosure , 2no. fenced sports courts and 1no. fenced all weather pitch.
WAM1873	23/01090/FULL	4.1 km	Submitted 2023-05-02 Validated 2023-05-04 Granted 2024-08-30	Redevelopment of the site including the demolition of existing buildings, erection of x 413 dwellings (Use Class C3), community space (Use Class F2), cycle hub (Use Class F2), formation of new access from Smiths Lane, comprehensive hard and soft landscaping, car parking; drainage and flooding mitigation works, and associated infrastructure.
WAM1137	22/02737/FULL	0.01 km	Submitted 2022-10-07 Validated 2022-10-11 Granted 2024-05-23	The construction of 80 dwellings with associated access, open space, landscaping and other infrastructure.

24.2 Tier 2 Cumulative Schemes

24.2.1 Projects on the Planning Inspectorate's programme of projects.

24.2.2 The following Tier 2 Cumulative Schemes are presented within **Figure 24-2**.

Table 24-2: Tier 2 Cumulative Schemes

Ref	Application Reference	Name of Application	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project description
T2-01	EN010129	Slough Multifuel Extension Project	5.3 km	Submitted 28/11/2023 Granted	The extension of a multifuel combined heat and power (CHP) electricity generating station from up to 50 megawatts (MW) gross output to up to 60 MW gross output, comprising the following engineering operations: installation of primary and secondary air preheating systems to the boilers to increase the thermal efficiency of the generating station, including heat exchanger bundles, pipework, valves, pipe supports, thermal insulation, instrumentation, cabling and containment; mechanical modifications to the steam turbine inlet control valve to increase the steam capacity and to the turbine control system and distributed control system software to allow for an increase in the gross output of the generating station; and associated development.
T2-02	EN0110030	SDC M40 Campus	7.9 km	Pre-application	The overall scheme comprises a data centre campus of up to three units (including server halls and cooling

Ref	Application Reference	Name of Application	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project description
				The application is anticipated in January 2027	infrastructure, designed for an IT load of up to c.300MW across the three buildings (c.100 MW each), together with an integrated on-site energy generation centre and associated development. The energy centre will generate electricity from gas to provide resilient and reliable power supply to the data centre campus, mitigating pressure on local infrastructure and enabling the demand for data centre development to be met efficiently. It will demonstrate a viable pathway to become decarbonisation-ready. The gas connection to the energy centre is up to c.900 megawatts and, depending on the technology adopted, the maximum generating capacity of the energy centre is approximately 250-350 megawatts.
T2-03	WA010006	Teddington Direct River Abstraction (TDRA)	0.8 km	Pre-application The application is anticipated in March 2027	A Tertiary Treatment Facility with a peak output of 75Ml/d of recycled water; a recycled water drop shaft and approximately 4.5km pipeline with intermediate shafts located between Mogden Sewage Treatment Works and the River Thames upstream of Teddington Weir terminating in an outfall structure in or adjacent to the River Thames; a river water intake structure sized to abstract a maximum of 75Ml/d, located upstream of the

Ref	Application Reference	Name of Application	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project description
					outfall structure, a drop shaft, raw water pipeline and connection shaft to the Thames Lee Tunnel.
T2-04	TR010030	M25 junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange improvement	10.7 km	Submitted 16/07/2026 Granted	In December 2014 the Department for Transport (DfT) published the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) for 2015-2020. The RIS sets out the list of schemes that are to be delivered by Highways England over the period covered by the RIS (2015 – 2020). The RIS identifies improvements to M25 J10/A3 Wisley Interchange as one of the key investments in the SRN for the London and South East region. The proposed improvements being as follows: “improvement of the Wisley interchange to allow free-flowing movement in all directions, together with improvements to the neighbouring Painshill interchange on the A3 to improve safety and congestion across the two sites”.
T2-05	TR020003	Expansion of Heathrow Airport (Third Runway)	0 km	Pre-application The application is anticipated in	Expansion of Heathrow Airport to enable at least 740,000 air traffic movements per annum and including a new runway to the north-west of the existing airport; supporting airfield, terminal and transport infrastructure; works to the M25, local roads and rivers; temporary

Ref	Application Reference	Name of Application	Distance from the Scoping Boundary	Status	Project description
				December 2027	construction works, mitigation works and other associated development.
T2-06	TR010019	M4 Junctions 3 to 12 Smart Motorway	0 km	Submitted 02/09/2026 Granted	Works to upgrade the M4 Motorway to a Smart Motorway between Junctions 3 to 12.

24.3 Tier 3 Cumulative Schemes

- Projects on the Planning Inspectorates programme of projects where a scoping report has not been submitted;
- Proposals identified in the relevant Development Plans and emerging Development Plans;
- Proposals identified in other plans and programmes, as appropriate, which set the framework for future development consents or approvals, where such development is reasonably likely to come forward.

24.3.1 The Tier 3 schemes identified are associated with the LPAs that intersect the Scoping Boundary, the relevant LPA boundaries are provided within **Figure 1-1**.

Table 24-3: Tier 3 Cumulative Schemes

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 –Site Allocations and Designations (Adopted January 2020)		
New Homes		
SA 1	Enterprise House	Redevelopment of former office building for residential use (96 units).
SA 2	The Old Vinyl Factory and Gatefold Building	Residential-led mixed-use redevelopment of former industrial/office buildings (694 units).
SA 3	Eastern End of Blyth Road	Residential redevelopment of former industrial land, part of IBA (273 units).
SA 3A	Crown Trading Estate	Redevelopment of industrial estate for residential/mixed use (197 units).
SA 4	Fairview Business Centre	Canal-side redevelopment for residential use (260 units).

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA 5	Land to the South of the Railway, including Nestlé Site	Large residential-led redevelopment of former factory land (1,800 units).
SA 6	Golden Cross Public House	Redevelopment of former public house for residential use (23 units – completed).
SA 7	Union House	Redevelopment of office building for residential use (46 units – completed).
SA 8	Olympic House, 1a Grove Lane	Redevelopment of office building for residential use (9 units).
SA 9	Audit House and Bellway House	Redevelopment of office buildings for residential use (47 units).
SA 11	Charles Wilson Engineers, Uxbridge Road	Redevelopment of industrial site for residential use (34–43 units).
SA 12	Former Allotments and Melrose Close Car Park, Burns Close	Residential development (83 units).
SA 14	Master Brewer and Hillingdon Circus	Residential-led mixed-use redevelopment of former hotel/leisure site (390 units).
SA 20	Bourne Court	Residential development (69 units).

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA 22	Chailey Industrial Estate, Pump Lane	Residential redevelopment of industrial estate (198 units + additional capacity on Site B TBC).
SA 23	Silverdale Road/Western View	Residential development, part of Hayes Housing Zone (363 units).
SA 24	Benlow Works, Silverdale Road	Conversion of Grade II Listed building to mixed use incl. residential (capacity TBC).
SA 25	297–299 Long Lane	Residential development (33 units).
SA 26	High Street/Bakers Road	Town-centre residential/mixed-use development (capacity TBC).
SA 27	St Andrew's Park – Annington Homes Site	Residential development, former RAF Uxbridge land (330 units).
SA 28	St Andrew's Park	Major residential-led mixed-use development, former RAF Uxbridge, incl. office space and hotel (1,340 units).
SA 29	Cape Boards Site, Iver Lane	Residential redevelopment of former industrial site (315 units).
SA 30	Grand Union Park, Packet Boat Lane	Canal-side residential development (251 units – under construction).
SA 31	Fassnidge Memorial Hall	Residential/mixed-use redevelopment (80 units – under construction).
SA 32A	Waterloo Wharf	Canal-side residential-led mixed-use development (52 units).

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA 32B	Randalls Building	Residential/mixed-use redevelopment (58 units).
SA 32	Former NATS Site, Porter's Way	Residential redevelopment of former offices (775 units – under construction).
SA 33	Kitchener House	Residential-led mixed-use redevelopment of office building (23 units – completed).
SA 34	The Blues Bar	Residential development (38 units – under construction).
SA 34A	Former West Drayton Police Station	Residential redevelopment (53 units – under construction).
SA 34B	Former British Royal Legion Building, Station Road	Residential redevelopment (13 units – under construction).
SA 35	Former Vehicle Testing Station, Cygnet Way	Residential redevelopment (84–92 units).
SA 36	Hayes Bridge, Uxbridge Road	Canal-side residential/mixed-use development (40 units).
SA 37	Former Coal Depot, Tavistock Road	Residential redevelopment of former depot (168-189 units).
SA 38	Padcroft Works and COMAG, Tavistock Road	Residential redevelopment of industrial site (415 units).
SA 39	Trout Road	Residential redevelopment of employment land (217 units).

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA 39A	Land to the rear of 2–24 Horton Road	Residential development (86 units).
SA 40	26–36 Horton Road	Residential development (50 units).
SA 41	21 High Street	Town-centre residential/mixed-use development (51 units).
Employment Land		
SEA 1	Hayes Industrial Area (Parts 1–6)	Strategic Industrial Location – Preferred Industrial Location (PIL); safeguarded reservoir of industrial land (general/light industrial, storage & distribution, waste, recycling).
SEA 1	Uxbridge Industrial Estate	Strategic Industrial Location – Preferred Industrial Location (PIL); safeguarded industrial/warehousing land.
SEA 1	Victoria Road / Stonefield Way Industrial Business Area	Strategic Industrial Location – Preferred Industrial Location (PIL); safeguarded industrial land.
SEA 1	North Uxbridge Industrial Estate	Strategic Industrial Location – Industrial Business Park (IBP); higher-quality industrial, R&D and light industrial (office component to be absorbed into Uxbridge town centre).
LSEL	Stockley Park	Locally Significant Employment Location; premier out-of-town business park – office/B1 uses; potential to contribute to Heathrow Opportunity Area jobs.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
LSEL	Summerhouse Lane / Salamander Quay	Locally Significant Employment Location; office/business uses safeguarded from release.
LSEL	Odyssey Business Park	Locally Significant Employment Location (new designation); business/employment uses.
LSEL	Prologis Park	Locally Significant Employment Location (new designation); logistics/distribution employment.
LSIS	Packet Boat Lane Industrial Area	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing (B1c/B2/B8).
LSIS	Trout Road Industrial Area	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Braintree Road Industrial Area	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Tavistock Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Horton Road Industrial Area	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Warwick Road / Kingston Lane	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Stockley Close	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Nestlé Avenue / Bull's Bridge	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
LSIS	Blyth Road / Clayton Road / Printing House Lane / Dawley Road East	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Rigby Lane / Swallowfield Way / Betam Road / Dawley Road West	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Millington Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Springfield Road Industrial Area	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Pump Lane	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing.
LSIS	Bath Road	Locally Significant Industrial Site; industrial/warehousing (airport-related).
SEA 2	Uxbridge Town Centre	Hotel & Office Growth Location.
SEA 2	Stockley Park	Hotel & Office Growth Location.
SEA 2	Hayes Town Centre	Hotel & Office Growth Location.
Key Transport Interchanges		
	Uxbridge Town Centre	Improved Public Transport Interchange.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
	Hayes and Harlington	Improved Public Transport Interchange.
	West Drayton Station	Improved Public Transport Interchange.
	Heathrow Bus Interchange	Improved Public Transport Interchange.
Hounslow Local Plan Volume 2 (Adopted September 2015)		
6	BSkyB	Employment.
7	Gillette	Retention and reuse of the existing Listed building and associated redevelopment to provide high quality flexible business space compatible with the site's designation as an Industrial Business Park where B1b, B1c and high value B2 activities will be encouraged.
15	Brentford Police Station	Education, residential and commercial.
18	Morrisons Supermarket and Car Park	Retail-led mixed town centre use including residential, with an appropriate level of provision for town centre car parking.
20	Alexandra House	Expansion of an existing primary school.
21	Brentford Bus Depot	Provision of school if bus depot can be reprovided on an appropriate site with the agreement of TfL.
22	69-77 Boston Manor Road	Residential and small scale offices/ further education.
23	632-652 London Road	Residential.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
24	Scout Hut at Star Road	Expansion of an existing school.
25	South West of Gillette Corner	Residential and commercial (Light Industrial B1b/c or B8 warehousing).
27	Europa House	Residential and office.
28	Swan Court	Residential, commercial and car parking.
30	Rugby Road	Light Industrial (B1b/c) and residential.
31	Former West Thames College	Residential.
32	Nazareth House	Residential with affordable extra care housing and supported living units.
33	Royal Mail Delivery Office	Residential.
34	Bath Road	Civic use, offices and potential for some residential.
35	Bell Road	Leisure, commercial and residential.
36	Central House	Offices, residential, leisure and community uses.
37	High Street Quarter	Leisure, commercial (retail) and residential with car parking.
38	Hounslow House	Residential and commercial.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
39	Kingsley Road	Education and community use.
40	Lampton Road	Residential and commercial.
41	London Road North	Retail and town centre uses with residential.
42	London Road South - Site A	Retail and residential.
43	London Road South - Site B	Primary School expansion, residential and open space.
44	Civic Centre	Residential.
45	Staines Road East	Residential and commercial (including flexible office space).
46	Staines Road West	Leisure, residential and commercial.
47	Vacant Site, Hanworth Road	Residential and education.
48	Bus Garage	Retention of the bus interchange, and bus garage or if relocation can be secured, residential use.
49	Upstage	Residential and light industrial.
50	Lampton House	Residential.
51	Pears Road	Residential.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
52	Cavalry Barracks	Residential.
53	Hounslow West Station	Residential, retail and appropriate car parking.
54	Bombardier Aerospace	Residential and commercial.
55	Staines Road	Residential.
56	Sutton Lane Indoor Bowls Club	Educational facility and educational open space.
57	Heston Leisure Centre	Reprovison of new leisure centre and improved park, together with necessary residential enabling development.
58	Rectory Farm	Minerals extraction and restored parkland.
59	Cranford Lane	Health facility, community centre and residential.
60	Master Robert Hotel	Hotel and residential.
61	Feltham Arenas	Area for enhanced sports and recreational facilities.
62	Feltham Ex-Servicemen's Club	Education.
63	Fern Grove	Residential.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
64	Ashmead Depot, Hounslow Homes	Residential.
65	Hanworth Library	Residential.
Spelthorne Local Plan (Adopted March 2026)		
AS2/006	Land East of Desford Way (Ashford)	Site to accommodate Travelling Showpeople (Sui Generis).
AT1/002	Land East of Ashford Sports Club, Woodthorpe Road (Ashford)	Residential (C3).
AT1/012	Ashford Community Centre, Woodthorpe Road (Ashford)	Local Community F2(b): 300 sqm community centre (approx.); Residential (C3): 32 units.
AT3/007	Ashford Multi-storey Car Park, Church Road (Ashford)	Residential (C3): 55 units (approx.); Retail/community: 400 sqm (approx.).
SN1/006	Land to West of Long Lane and South of Blackburn Trading Estate (Stanwell)	Residential (C3): 200 units; Open space provision.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
ST1/037	Thameside House, South Street (Staines)	Residential (C3): 140 units (approx.); Flexible Commercial (Class E): 3,200 sqm (approx.).
ST1/043	Land East of 355 London Road (Staines)	Gypsy and Traveller pitches: 3.
ST3/004	Oast House, Kingston Road (Staines)	Residential (C3): 180 units (approx.); Community/Healthcare use: 4,500 sqm.
AS1/003	Former Staines Fire Station, Town Lane (Stanwell)	Residential (C3): approximately 50 dwellings.
AE3/006	158-166 Feltham Road (Ashford)	Housing (C3).
AS1/001	Tesco Extra, Town Lane (Stanwell)	Retail: retention of the existing superstore on site; Residential (C3): 350 units (approx.).
SN1/012	Stanwell Bedsits, De Havilland Way (Stanwell)	Residential (C3): estate regeneration providing 175 net additional units (approx.), a total of 413 gross (approx.).
ST3/014	Land at Birch House/London Road, Fairfield Avenue (Staines)	Residential-led mixed use: up to 470 flats and some Class E floorspace.
ST4/004	96-104 Church Street (Staines)	Residential-led.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
ST4/019	Former Debenhams Site, High Street (Staines)	Mixed-use: residential and retail.
ST4/023	Two Rivers Retail Park Terrace, Mustard Mill Road (Staines)	Residential (C3): 750 units (approx.); Ground floor commercial/community use.
ST4/024	Frankie & Benny's/Travelodge, Two Rivers, Hale Street (Staines)	Residential (C3): 55 units (approx.).
AS2/001	Ashford Youth Club, Kenilworth Road (Ashford)	Local Community F2(b): 500 sqm youth centre (approx.); Residential (C3): 5 units (approx.).
AT3/016	23-31 (not 11-19) Woodthorpe Road (Ashford)	Residential (C3): 120 units (approx.); Ground floor office/retail (Class E): 1,300 sqm (approx.).
AT3/009	Ashford Telephone Exchange, Church Road (Ashford)	Residential (C3): 20 units (approx.).
SN1/005	Land at Northumberland Close (Stanwell)	Residential (C3): 80 units (approx.).
ST1/028	Leacroft Centre, Leacroft (Staines)	Residential (C3): 17 units (approx.); Ground floor community units or re-provision off site.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
ST1/031	Thameside Arts Centre, Wyatt Road (Staines)	Residential (C3): 19 units (approx.); Ground floor community units or re-provision off site.
ST2/006	Builders Yard, Gresham Road (Staines)	Residential (C3): 343 units (approx.).
ST3/012	Staines Telephone Exchange, Fairfield Avenue (Staines)	Residential (C3): redevelopment of existing telephone exchange to provide residential development.
ST4/009	Elmsleigh Centre and Adjoining Land, South Street (Staines)	Residential (C3): 850 units (approx.); Retail/commercial town centre uses (Class E).
ST4/025	Coppermill Road (Staines)	Residential (C3): 15 units (approx.).
ST4/026	Communications House, South Street (Staines)	Residential (C3): 120 units (approx.).
Slough Local Development Framework Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Adopted November 2010)		
SSA6	352-358 Farnham Road	Retail (extension to supermarket).
SSA9	Thames Valley Community Centre	Mixed use: community and education.
SSA10	Chalvey Millennium Green	Non-statutory informal nature reserve.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SSA11	Slough Town Hall	Mixed use: residential, community, education, commercial.
SSA12	Land south of Stranraer Gardens	Non-statutory informal nature reserve.
SSA13	Heart of Slough	Comprehensive regeneration for residential, offices, hotel, bus station, library, retail, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments, education, leisure, associated changes to the road network, improvements to the public realm and parking.
SSA14	Queensmere and Observatory Shopping Centres	Mixed use: retail, leisure, residential.
SSA15	Upton Hospital	Medical and Healthcare uses.
SSA16	Post Office Sorting Office, Wellington Street	Residential or mixed use: business and residential.
SSA17	Slough Canal Basin	Mixed Use: residential, hotel, retail, business, public open space.
SSA18	Former Arbour Vale School, West Wing, St. Joseph's playing field	Community, residential, playing fields.
SSA19	Play Area off Moray Drive	Residential and public open space including play area.
SSA20	Wexham Park Hospital	Medical and Healthcare uses.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SSA21	Halkingcroft Wood	Non-statutory informal nature reserve.
SSA22	BT Site and 297 Langley Road	Mixed use: residential and health centre.
SSA23	Part of Langley Business Centre, 11/49 Station Road	Retail (food).
SSA24	Land west of Hollow Hill Lane, Langley	Non-statutory informal nature reserve.
SSA25	Old Slade Lake, Orlits Lake and Colnbrook West, Lakeside Road	Non-statutory informal nature reserve.
The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Borough Local Plan (Adopted February 2022)		
AL21	Land west of Windsor, north and south of the A308, Windsor	Approximately 450 residential units, strategic public open space, formal pitch provision for football and rugby, multi-functional community hub (including a cafe and internal space for community meetings/activities) and a Special Educational Needs School (approximately 150 pupil capacity).
AL22	Squires Garden Centre, Maidenhead Road, Windsor	Approximately 39 residential units.
AL29	Minton Place, Victoria Street, Windsor	A mixed use scheme providing employment space, retail, leisure/tourism and approximately 100 residential units.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
AL30	Windsor and Eton Riverside Station Car Park	Approximately 30 residential units on previously developed land.
AL31	King Edward VII Hospital, Windsor	Approximately 47 residential units.
AL33	Broomhall Car Park, Sunningdale	Mixed use scheme including approximately 30 residential units, retail, employment and public car parking.
AL35	Sunningdale Park, Sunningdale	Approximately 230 residential units which may include specialist accommodation for older people.
AL39	Land at Riding Court Road and London Road, Datchet	Approximately 80 residential units on greenfield land.
AL40	Land east of Queen Mother Reservoir, Horton	Approximately 100 residential units.
AL40A	Land adjacent to Coppermill Road, Horton	Approximately 24 residential units on Green Belt land.
Richmond Upon Thames Local Plan 'The best of our Borough' (Adopted October 2025)		
SA1	Hampton Square, Hampton	Partial redevelopment / improvement for community, retail and local services, employment and residential uses.
SA2	Platts Eyot, Lower Sunbury Road, Hampton	Regeneration enhancing existing river-dependent and river-related uses or new business and industrial uses.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA3	Hampton Traffic Unit, 60-68 Station Road, Hampton	Business, employment generating and other commercial or social infrastructure uses, retaining BTM.
SA4	Car Park for Sainsburys, Uxbridge Road, Hampton	MOL release for 100% on-site affordable housing.
SA5	Hampton Telephone Exchange (Molesey Telephone Exchange), 34 High Street, Hampton	the site has potential for conversion or redevelopment to provide a mix of uses to include employment, commercial or community uses and residential in upper floors and to the rear.
SA6	Telephone Exchange, Teddington	Commercial/retail at ground floor and employment floorspace such as offices; mixed-use with residential above could be considered.
SA7	Teddington Delivery Office, Teddington	Commercial/retail at ground floor and employment floorspace such as offices; mixed-use with residential above could be considered.
SA8	Strathmore Centre, Strathmore Road, Teddington	Reprovision of childcare/nursery with affordable housing.
SA9	Teddington Police Station, Park Road, Teddington	Community/social infrastructure-led mixed use development with residential.
SA10	St Mary's University, Strawberry Hill	Retention and upgrading for university and associated teaching, sport and student residential accommodation.
SA11	Richmond upon Thames College, Twickenham	Redevelopment to provide a new replacement college, science/technology/engineering/maths centre, technical hub, new

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
		secondary and special education needs school, sports centre and residential, with protection and upgrading of playing pitch facilities.
SA12	The Stoop (Harlequins Rugby Football Club), Twickenham	Continued sports use, with additional facilities including indoor leisure, hotel or business uses, and residential, provided complementary to the main use of the site as a sports ground.
SA13	Twickenham Stadium, Twickenham	Continued use and improvement for sports use, with additional facilities including indoor leisure, hotel or business uses provided complementary to the main use of the site as a sports ground.
SA14	Mereway Day Centre, Mereway Road, Twickenham	Social and community infrastructure uses.
SA15	Station Yard, Twickenham	Residential, subject to re-provision of the bus stands.
SA16	Twickenham Telephone Exchange	Mixed use comprising employment, commercial or retail uses to enhance the cultural offering, with residential above.
SA17	Twickenham Riverside and Water Lane/King Street	Redevelopment/refurbishment of former pool site to include civic and open space, active frontages at ground floor, retail/leisure/community use with residential.
SA18	Homebase, Twickenham Road, Hanworth	Residential-led scheme with facilities including shops and offices.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SA19	Fulwell Bus Garage, Wellington Road, Twickenham	redevelopment of the site which protects the BTM bus garage and its setting; and retains the bus garage operation and social infrastructure use on site.
SA20	Telephone Exchange, Ashdale Close, Whitton	Employment and social infrastructure use, increasing permeability to the High Street.
SA21	Kneller Hall, Whitton	Mixed use quarter within protected landscape and heritage significance, opportunity to open up for community access.
SA22	Whitton Community Centre, Percy Road, Whitton	Opportunity to reprovide community facilities with affordable housing.
Ealing Development Sites (Adopted December 2013)		
SOU1	Southall Market, 44-92 High Street, UB1	Mixed use development appropriate to the town centre, including retention and refurbishment of the listed building and provision of a street market; residential on upper floors (and at ground level along Boyd Avenue) may be acceptable.
SOU2	Iceland, Quality Foods and 63-95 South Road, UB1	Mixed use development appropriate to the town centre, including provision of a range of retail/commercial unit sizes appropriate to a variety of occupier requirements.
SOU3	Beaconsfield Road / South Road, UB1	Residential-led redevelopment (former Southall College site).

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
SOU4	Southall Crossrail Station, UB1	Comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment associated with the transport interchange, including residential and commercial / community uses.
SOU5	Southall West, UB1	Residential-led mixed use development — new neighbourhood on former industrial land (Southall Waterside).
SOU6	Southall East, UB2	Residential-led mixed use development — new neighbourhood on former industrial land.
SOU7	Havelock Estate, UB2	Residential-led estate regeneration, including new community buildings and shops.
SOU8	The Green, UB2	Mixed use — high quality residential, retail and town centre uses, with retention and enhancement of St Anselm's Church and the Dominion Centre.
SOU9	St John's Church Hall and Bus Depot, UB2	Continued community use, with introduction of complementary mixed use development appropriate to the town centre including A1/A2/A3, flexible business space, residential and community open space.
SOU10	Johnson's Street, UB2	Mixed use development for residential and business use. Retention of community centre.
HAN1	64-88 Uxbridge Road, W7	Mixed use development appropriate to the town centre, including provision for community uses.
HAN2	144-164 Uxbridge Road and 1-3 Westminster Terrace, W7	Mixed use development for residential and business use.

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
HAN3	Wickes, W7	Improved and additional retail space with the introduction of residential use.
GRE1	Ravenor Park Farm, Oldfield Lane South, UB6	Mixed use development appropriate to the town centre, with retention of London Motorcycle Museum and Ealing Heritage Centre.
GRE2	Greenford Crossroads, 311-319 Ruislip Road East and 412-424 Greenford Road, UB6	Mixed use development appropriate to the town centre, including retail, office and residential (town centre uses at ground floor, residential on upper floors).
OIS8	St Bernard's Hospital, Uxbridge Road, UB1	Residential development, including conversion of the listed former hospital buildings and new build, with retained health uses.
Surrey Waste Local Plan (Adopted December 2020)		
SP02	Oakleaf Farm, Stanwell Moor	The site is an operational waste recovery and recycling operation with scope for a significant increase in capacity. The site is located to the south east of the settlement of Stanwell Moor and the west of the settlement of Stanwell, with the King George VI Reservoir to the immediate south. The site has potential to be affected by the expansion of Heathrow Airport.
RU02	Land adjacent to Trumps Farm, Kitsmead Lane, Longcross	The site is an area of rough grass and scrub with some woodland bounded to the north by the M3 motorway, to the south and east by a former landfill site. On the opposite side of Kitsmead Lane there is the former DERA tank testing track. To the south, beyond the former landfill are existing green waste recycling and food waste anaerobic digestion

Policy/Designation Ref	Name of Allocation/ Location	Description
		(AD) facilities. The former tank testing track is being promoted as a Garden Village by Runnymede Borough Council through its emerging Local Plan.