



Environmental Statement Addendum

Station Hill, Reading

June 2020

Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited

Pickfords Wharf, Clink Street, London, SE1 9DG
www.watermangroup.com

Environmental Statement Addendum

Station Hill, Reading

Client Name: SH Reading Master LLP
Document Reference: WIE14788-100-R-31.2.1-ES Addendum
Project Number: WIB14788

Quality Assurance – Approval Status

This document has been prepared and checked in accordance with Waterman Group's IMS (BS EN ISO 9001: 2008, BS EN ISO 14001: 2004 and BS OHSAS 18001:2007)

Issue	Date	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
First	June 2020	Various	Stephen Brindle Associate Director	Joanna Bagley Senior Associate Director 

Our Markets



Property & Buildings



Transport & Infrastructure



Energy & Utilities



Environment

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited, with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the client, incorporation of our General Terms and Condition of Business and taking account of the resources devoted to us by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at its own risk.

Contents

Non Technical Summary of the ES Addendum

ES Addendum (Main Text)

1. Introduction	1
Project Team	1
ES Availability and Comments	2
2. The May 2020 Amendments	3
Changes to the Height and Massing of Plot G	3
Internal Alterations to Plot G	3
Changes to the Parameter Plans and Design Code for Phase 3	3
Changes to the Podium and Public Realm	3
Change in Floor Space Area	4
Updated Plans and Drawings Defining the Proposed Development	6
3. Consultee Comments Relevant to the 2019 ES	10
4. Assessment of the Effect of the May 2020 amendments and Consultee Comments of the Findings of the 2019 ES	12
5. Socio Economics & Health	15
Introduction	15
Likely Significant Effects	15
Mitigation Measures and likely Residual Effects	18
Health Impact Assessment	18
Summary and Conclusion	18
6. Townscape & Visual	19
Introduction	19
Baseline Conditions	19
Likely Significant Effects	20
Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects	28
Summary and Conclusions	28
7. Historic Environment	29
Introduction	29
Likely Significant Effects	29
Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects	34
Summary and Conclusions	34
8. Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution	35
Introduction	35
Likely Significant Effects	37
Interim, Comparison with the 2016 Consented scheme and Cumulative Scenario	57

Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects.....	57
Summary and Conclusions.....	57
9. Summary of Mitigation, Monitoring and Enhancement Measures	58

Volume 2 - Updated and New Figures

Figure 1.2	Updated Phasing Boundaries
Updated Figure 5	Updated Parameter Plans and Drawings:
Updated Figure 8.5	Updated Viewpoint Location Plan
Updated Figures 8.6 to 8.32	Updated Accurate Visual Representations
Figure 8.33	Accurate Visual Representation for New Viewpoint 32

Appendices

Appendix A	Updated Chapter 13: Wind (to correct typographical errors and inconsistencies)
Appendix B	Wind Statement of Conformity Prepared by RWDI

Updated Technical Appendices

Technical Appendix 14.1: Updated drawings of the Proposed Development (as amended by the Plot G Amendments)

Technical Appendix 14.2: Updated Daylight and Sunlight Results (Existing vs Proposed) and Comparison of Effects on Plots E and F between the 2019 ES and with the Plot G Amendments.

Non-Technical Summary of the ES Addendum

Introduction

In December 2019, a hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of land to the north of Garrard Street and south of Station Hill, was submitted by SH Reading Master LLP (the Applicant). The application was for the demolition of all the existing buildings and structures within the site, and the construction of a commercial and residential led development in five building plots, Plots A, B, C, D (Phase 3) and G (Phase 2). The application is hereafter referred to as the 2019 Planning Application. The 2019 Planning Application forms part of a wider Station Hill Development. Plots E and F (Phase 1) have already been granted outline planning consent.

Since submission of the 2019 Planning Application, some changes have been made to as a result of the on-going detailed design process, and to respond to comments received from consultees in relation to the 2019 Planning Application. These are hereafter referred to as the May 2020 Amendments.

The 2019 Planning Application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) which described the likely significant environmental effects of the whole of the Station Hill Development. This is hereafter referred to as the 2019 ES. Because of the changes to Plot A and Plot G, and as a result of comments received from consultees, further environmental impact assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the significance of the environmental effects presented in the 2019 ES would change. To describe that process, this document ('the ES Addendum') has been prepared.

This Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the ES Addendum provides a summary of the ES Addendum in non-technical terms. Together the 2019 ES and this ES Addendum, and their respective NTSs, form the required Environmental Statement for the purposes of the 2019 Planning Application (as amended).

Summary of the May 2020 Amendments

The May 2020 Amendments comprise:

- Minor changes to the height and massing of Plot G – the height will be reduced by approximately 2m overall and part of the façade of the building will step out further than previously proposed;
- Internal alterations to Plot G to make more efficient use of the space;
- Changes to the podium and area that falls within Phase 2 and Phase 3, and confirmation of the building edges of Phase 3 along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road. These changes result in a corresponding alteration in the area of public space with an overall increase in public space across the whole Station Hill Development (of 879sqm) but the amount delivered in Plot G will be slightly less (7,295square metres rather than 7,400sqm previously proposed). However, the amount delivered around Plots A to D will be more (1,780sqm rather than 1,500sqm). Due to the changes in the building edges around Phase 3, there has also been an increase in public space along the pavements from 1,100sqm to 1,375sqm.
- The change in the line separating Phase 2 and Phase 3 also means that the number of car parking spaces delivered as part of Plot G will be 70 rather than 122 as previously proposed. However, the overall number of car parking spaces across the whole of the Station Hill Development would remain unchanged;
- A reduction in the maximum parameter height of Plot A by 5 storeys (15m);
- Amendment to Parameter Plans to include changes in height; and

- Amendment to Parameter Plans to ensure a minimum of 18m distance between buildings at podium and level one.

As a result of these changes, there will be a slight increase in office floor space area in Plot G (by 1,579sqm Gross External Area (GEA)) and a slight decrease in retail and leisure uses in Plot G (by 632sqm GEA).

Consultee Comments Relevant to the ES

The 2019 Planning Application was circulated by Reading Borough Council (RBC) to a wide range of consultees for comment. The comments received from Historic England, Reading Borough Council and the Building Research Establishment are relevant to the assessments presented in the 2019 ES.

Historic England requested an additional viewpoint be prepared, taken from the western end of Friar Street looking east. They also raised a number of comments in relation to the effect of the Development on the following key heritage assets: Greyfriars Church; St Mary's Church; and St Laurence's Church and their associated Conservation Areas.

Reading Borough Council were concerned about the height and massing of the Development and the Building Research Establishment identified some technical inconsistencies in the Wind ES Chapter submitted as part of the 2019 ES.

Further work has been undertaken to address these comments as identified below (both in this NTS and in the ES Addendum Main Text).

Assessment of the Effect of the May 2020 Amendments and Consultee Comments on the findings of the 2019 ES

The May 2020 Amendments and the consultee comments identified above were reviewed by the authors of each technical chapter of the 2019 ES to provide a professional opinion on the effect on the original findings of the 2019 ES, and to comment on whether the predicted environmental effects remain the same (or substantially in accordance with) those originally stated.

The result of this review found that there was potential for the May 2020 Amendments to affect the following chapters of the 2019 ES: Chapter 7: Socio Economics and Health; Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment; Chapter 9: Historic Environment; Chapter 13: Wind; and Chapter 14: Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution. None of the other chapters are considered to be affected by either the May 2020 Amendments or the consultee comments. In this respect, unless additional information is set out in the NTS, the findings remain as stated in the Non-Technical Summary of the 2019 ES.

A summary of the assessments for each of the technical chapters considered to be potentially affected by the May 2020 Amendments and consultee comments is set out below.

Socio Economics and Health (Chapter 7 of the 2019 ES)

As a result of the changes in floor space area brought about by the May 2020 Amendments, the employment and economy calculations have been updated. This shows that there is a slight increase in overall full time equivalent (FTE) jobs supported by the Proposed Development, under both the Interim and Completed Development Scenario. There is also an associated minor upward revision to the estimated spending generated by employees working on Site. However, neither of the increases change the significance of the effects presented in Chapter 7: Socio Economics and Health of the 2019 ES.

Similarly, whilst there has been a slight reduction in the area of public open space in the Interim Development Scenario and a slight increase in the area of public open space in the Completed Development Scenario, the changes are not sufficient to alter the significance of the effects.

The Socio Economics and Health assessment presented in the 2019 ES and NTS therefore remains accurate and valid.

Townscape and Visual (Chapter 8 of the 2019 ES)

The May 2020 Amendments relevant to the townscape and visual impact assessment presented in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual of the 2019 ES, is the reduction in the height of Plot A. The other amendments are not considered to alter the significance of the effects. In addition, a new viewpoint (VP32) has been prepared to respond to Historic England's consultation response, and this has been assessed in accordance with the methodology set out in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual Impacts of the 2019 ES.

The reduction in height of Plot A, whilst considered to improve the stepped profile of the cluster of buildings making up the Proposed Development, is not considered to alter the significance of effects set out in the 2019 ES.

The new viewpoint, VP32 is taken from the western end of Friar Street at the island in the centre of the pedestrian crossing. Behind the viewing position is a busy roundabout on the A329 Caversham Road dual carriageway. Due to the presence of the Grade I listed Greyfriars Church in the view / foreground, the sensitivity of the view is considered to be high. Demolition and construction activities on the Site would be visible from this view resulting in a temporary local adverse effect of major significance.

During the Interim Development Scenario, the higher elements of Plots E and G would be visible in the left side of the view. However, the Church in the foreground would still form the focal point of the view. Overall the effect is considered to be local, adverse and of moderate significance.

On completion of the proposed Development, at maximum parameters, Plots A, B, C and D would be seen in the left of the view rising above the existing skyline. The Church would form the main feature in the foreground with the proposed buildings visible in the background. The effect is considered to be permanent, local, adverse and of major significance. At minimum parameters, the outline elements of the Completed Development Scenario would be largely imperceptible and the effects would therefore be similar to those of the Interim Development Scenario, that is local, adverse and of moderate significance.

The significance of the effects identified for VP32 remain within the ranges presented in the 2019 ES and, therefore, the overall significance of the proposed Development on Townscape and Visual receptors remains as set out in the 2019 ES.

Historic Environment (Chapter 9 of the 2019 ES)

As a result of the changes to Plot A and comments received from Historic England, further assessment has been undertaken on the following heritage assets:

- Grade I listed Greyfriars Church;
- Grade I listed Church of St Mary;
- St Mary's Butts and Castle Street Conservation Area;
- Grade I listed Church of St Laurence;
- Grade II* listed Town Council Chamber and Offices with Clock Tower; and

- London Street/Market Place Conservation Area.

The assessment found that the Proposed Development (as amended) is likely to result in a minor adverse effect on the heritage assets. This is consistent with the findings of the 2019 ES. The effect would be unlikely to be greater due to the presence of other features which affect the heritage assets such as street furniture and modern buildings, and as a result of the location of the Proposed Development in relation to those aspects of the heritage assets that contribute towards their significance.

Wind (Chapter 13 of the 2019 ES)

The changes to the massing of Plot A and Plot G, and alterations to the landscape within the public spaces in Phase 2 proposals were reviewed by RWDI, who prepared Chapter 13: Wind of the 2019 ES. RWDI's professional opinion is that the changes to the massing and internal layout of the building within Plot G would not affect the significance of effects presented within Chapter 13: Wind of the 2019 ES. With regard to the public realm proposals, some alterations have been made to replace two trees with wind screens. However, these are anticipated to provide wind mitigation which is as effective as that tested for the 2019 ES. With regard to the changes to Phase 3, the reduction in the height of Plot A is anticipated to improve wind conditions at ground level, although physical wind tunnel testing is recommended when Phase 3 is brought forward in detail. The comments received by the Building Research Establishment on behalf of Reading Borough Council do not result in any changes to the significance of effects described in the 2019 ES. However, due to some technical inconsistencies identified, an updated version of Chapter 13: Wind has been appended to the ES Addendum, which replaces the corresponding chapter of the 2019 ES.

Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution (Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES)

As a result of the change in the massing of Plot G, the daylight and sunlight aspects of Chapter 14: Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution, have been reviewed. This found that whilst there were isolated changes in the daylight levels within a small number of buildings, these would not materially change the overall magnitude of effects.

With regard to the changes to Phase 3, the proposed amendments would sit within the submitted Phase 3 maximum parameters which represents a worst-case scenario, therefore the magnitude of effects would be the same as or slightly improved compared to those of the 2019 ES.

Conclusions of this ES Addendum

Following the review carried out for the purposes of this ES Addendum, it is concluded that:

- **Socio Economics and Health assessment (Chapter 7 of the 2019 ES)** – the May 2020 Amendments and the additional assessment work undertaken have not altered the significance of environmental effects presented in the 2019 ES;
- **Townscape and Visual assessment (Chapter 8 of the 2019 ES)** – the May 2020 Amendments and the additional assessment work undertaken have not altered the significance of environmental effects presented in the 2019 ES;
- **Historic Environment assessment (Chapter 9 of the 2019 ES)** – the May 2020 Amendments and additional assessment work undertaken have not altered the significance of environmental effects presented in the 2019 ES;

- **Wind assessment (Chapter 13 of the 2019 ES)** – as set out in the 2019 ES, it is recommended that a wind tunnel test is undertaken at the detailed design stage of Phase 3 in order to ensure that appropriate mitigation is incorporated to achieve suitable wind conditions;
- **Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution (Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES)** – whilst the amendments to Phase 3 are likely to have resulted in a slight improvement in daylight, sunlight and wind conditions at sensitive receptors, the significance of effect is not considered to have materially altered.



ES Addendum (Main Text)

1. Introduction

- 1.1. In December 2019, a hybrid planning application for the redevelopment of land to the north of Garrard Street and south of Station Hill, was submitted by SH Reading Master LLP (the Applicant) (Planning Reference: 192032). The planning application was for the demolition of all the existing buildings and structures within the site, and the construction of a commercial and residential led development in five building plots, Plots A, B, C, D and G. This is hereafter referred to as the '2019 Planning Application'. Plot G is intended to be Phase 2 of the proposed development whilst Plots A, B, C and D, form Phase 3 of the proposed development. The application for Plot G was submitted in detail and was for an office building with retail and leisure uses at ground floor level, basement parking and public realm. The application for Plots A, B, C and D was submitted in outline and was for predominantly commercial and residential uses with ground floor retail and leisure uses, a basement car park and surrounding public realm.
- 1.2. Phases 2 and 3 form part of a wider development proposal known as the Station Hill Development. Phase 1 (comprising Plots E and F) which is located to the south of Garrard Street, has already received planning consent for a predominantly residential use with basement car parking and public realm areas (Planning Refs: 190441 and 190442). The land encompassed by the Station Hill Development is hereafter referred to as the 'Site' and the development within Phases 1, 2 and 3 is collectively referred to as the 'Station Hill Development' or the 'Proposed Development'.
- 1.3. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the whole of the Station Hill Development (Phases 1, 2 and 3) was undertaken and the findings set out in an Environmental Statement (ES) prepared to accompany the hybrid planning application. This is hereafter referred to as the 2019 ES.
- 1.4. Since submission of the hybrid planning application, some changes have been made to Phases 2 and 3 of the Station Hill Development as a result of the on-going detailed design process and to respond to comments received from consultees in relation to the 2019 Planning Application. In addition, some further information has been prepared to assist consultees in their understanding of the Proposed Development, some of which is of relevance to the EIA. This ES Addendum has therefore been prepared to describe the changes to the design of the Proposed Development that may impact upon the findings of the EIA (hereafter referred to as the 'May 2020 Amendments'), set out additional information that is of relevance to the EIA and undertake an assessment of whether the May 2020 Amendments or the additional information is likely to have altered the significance of effects presented in the 2019 ES. Together this ES Addendum and the 2019 form the ES for the purposes of the 2019 Planning Application (as amended).
- 1.5. Throughout this Addendum, Figure references remain the same as those used in the ES Addendum to aid cross referencing.

Project Team

- 1.6. The ES Addendum has been compiled by Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited (Waterman IE), in conjunction with the Applicant and a team of specialist consultants. These consultants are the same as those who prepared the 2019 Planning Application and are detailed in Table 1.1 along with their respective disciplines and contributions to the EIA.

Table 1.1: EIA and Design Team

Organisation	Expertise/EIA Input
Station Hill Master LLP	Applicant
Cast Real Estate and Construction Consultancy	Development Project Managers
CRTKL	Masterplan Architect
Cityscape	Visualisations
DP9	Planning consultants
Gensler	Plot G Architect
GIA	Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessors
Hatch Regeneris	Socio economics and health consultants
Hoare Lea and Partners	Building services engineer and energy and sustainability consultants
Peter Brett Associates (PBA)	Traffic and transportation consultants
Ramboll	Structural and Civil Engineers
RWDI	Wind microclimate consultants
Waterman	EIA co-ordinators, air quality, noise and vibration, ecology, archaeology, land quality, flood risk and townscape and visual consultants

ES Availability and Comments

- 1.7. Electronic copies of this ES Addendum, the 2019 ES and Non-Technical Summaries are available on Reading Borough Council's planning portal (<http://planning.reading.gov.uk/>) under the planning application reference 192032.
- 1.8. Due to restrictions associated with COVID 19, hard copies of the documents are currently not normally available. If you experience difficulties in accessing the electronic copies online as stated above at paragraph 1.7, please contact either:

Reading Borough Council
Civic Offices
Bridge Street
Reading
RG1 2LU
Phone: 0118 937 3787
Email: Planning.Administration@reading.gov.uk

Or:

Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Limited
Pickfords Wharf
Clink Street
London
SE1 9DG
Phone: 0207 928 7888
Email: ie@watermangroup.com

- 1.9. Any comments on the application or in response to the ES Addendum should be submitted to Reading Borough Council using the contact details as above at paragraph 1.8.

2. The May 2020 Amendments

- 2.1. A number of drawings and documents forming part of the 2019 Planning Application have been substituted following design amendments made to Phases 2 and 3 of the Proposed Development. This section summarises those changes. Drawings of the Proposed Development that were included within the 2019 ES have been replaced as Figures 5 of this ES Addendum.

Changes to the Height and Massing of Plot G

- 2.2. Due to the ongoing detailed design process, Plot G has reduced slightly in height by approximately 2m from 123m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) (127m AOD with the building management unit (BMU)) to 120.9m AOD (125 with the BMU). The plant screen has also reduced in height from 121m AOD to 117.6m AOD.
- 2.3. In addition, the southern façade of the building from level 8 and above has moved southwards by 1,500mm (1.5m) and the 250mm set back of the southern façade at lower ground floor level has been removed.
- 2.4. The external vertical fins on Plot G have also reduced in depth from 250mm to approximately 100mm.

Internal Alterations to Plot G

- 2.5. Internal alterations have also been made to Plot G to maximise the usability of the space. This has resulted in a doorway into the cycle stores from Garrard Street being removed (with alternative provision being made available from the podium) and an reduction in amenity space at level 15.

Changes to the Parameter Plans and Design Code for Phase 3

- 2.6. The changes to the Parameter Plans and Design Code for Phase 3 comprise:
- A reduction in the maximum parameter height of Plot A by 5 storeys from 151.5m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) to 136.5m AOD;
 - Amendment to the Parameter Plans and information in the Design Code to describe the approach to stepping in height. Where stepping in height is proposed, buildings should step down from north to south and from Plot C toward Greyfriars Road;
 - Amendment to the Parameter Plans to ensure a minimum of 18m distance between buildings at podium and level one; and
 - Further definition of the building edges of Phase 3 along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road.

Changes to the Podium and Public Realm

- 2.7. In order to ensure that the permanent structure of Phase 2 does not compromise the ability to bring forward Phase 3, the phasing line between phases 2 and 3 has been moved eastwards by 2.8m. The revised phasing line is shown on updated ES **Figure 1.2**. This has resulted in the reduction of the area of podium being brought forward as part of Phase 2 with associated reductions in amenity space at Plaza level and car parking within the podium. Car parking provided as part of Phase 2 has reduced by 52 from 122 to 70 with 2 motorcycle spaces rather than 3 as previously proposed. However, the total number of spaces provided across the Proposed Development is unchanged at 1,000 spaces.

- 2.8. The bridge link across Garrard Street from Phase 1 to Phase 2 has also reduced in width to between 8m and 12m wide (compared with 10m and 16 m previously). Finally, the line of the podium edge between Thames Tower and Plot G has changed slightly such that the area of the Rest has been reduced from 430sqm to 242sqm.
- 2.9. These changes have resulted in a reduction in public realm area in Phase 2 from 7,400sqm to 7,295sqm. However, as a result of an increase in public open space in Phase 3, brought about by the increase in space between the buildings and the transfer of public open space from Phase 2 to Phase 3 as a result of moving the phasing line, the total amount of public realm provided across the Phase 2 and 3 has increased from 10,000sqm to 10,879sqm. Of the public realm area in Phases 2 and 3, 4,270sqm replaces existing areas of public realm meaning that there is an uplift of 6,609sqm. An additional 2,270sqm public realm is provided in Phase 1.

Change in Floor Space Area

- 2.10. The Floor Space Areas assessed as part of the EIA during the Interim Development Scenario and Completed Development Scenario are described in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 of the 2019 ES. As a result of the May 2020 Amendments, the floor space areas for both the Interim and Completed Development Scenarios have changed. The floorspace areas proposed as part of the 2019 Planning Application and those with the May 2020 Amendments are presented in Tables 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. Text in bold shows those floor space areas that have changed as a result of the May 2020 Amendments.

Table 2.1: Total Floorspace by Land Use during the Interim Development Scenario (update to Table 5.1 of the 2019 ES)

Land Use Class	Gross Internal Area (sq m GIA)		Gross External Area (sq m GEA)	
	2019 Planning Application	With May 2020 Amendments	2019 Planning Application	With May 2020 Amendments
Retail and Leisure plus Plaza / ground floor level office in Plot G (Class A1-A5, B1, D1-D2)	3,852	3,210	4,043	3,411
	43,085	43,085	44,805	44,805
Residential (Class C3)		(538 units in accordance with the reserved matters submissions)		
Offices (Class B1)	33,189	34,736	33,424	35,003
Back of House Facilities	1,131	1,131	2,044	2,044
Podium (Plot G)	6,500	5,941	7,200	6,139
Car Parking (South Site)	6,616	6,616	6,616	6,616

Land Use Class	Gross Internal Area (sq m GIA)		Gross External Area (sq m GEA)	
	2019 Planning Application	With May 2020 Amendments	2019 Planning Application	With May 2020 Amendments
	(165 car parking spaces plus 6 motorcycle parking spaces within Phase 1 and 122 car parking spaces plus 3 motorcycle parking spaces within Phase 2)	165 car parking spaces plus 6 motorcycle parking spaces within Phase 1 and 70 car parking spaces plus 2 motorcycle parking spaces within Phase 2.		
Total	94,373	94,719	98,132	98,018

Table 2.2: Minimum Floorspace by Land Use during the Completed Development Scenario (update of Table 5.2 of the 2019 ES)

Land Use Class	2019 Planning Application		With May 2020 Amendments	
	GIA (sq. m)	GEA (sq. m)	GIA (sq. m)	GEA (sq. m)
Retail and Leisure plus Plaza / ground floor level office in Plot G (Class A1-A5, B1, D1-D2)*	4,302	4,543	3,660	3,911
Residential (Class C3)*	43,085 (538 units)	44,805	43,085 (538 units)	44,805
Residential Institutions (Class C2)	0 (0 rooms)	0	0 (0 rooms)	0
Hotel (Class C1)	0 (0 keys)	0	0 (0 keys)	0
Offices (Class B1)	58,189	61,424	58,736	63,003
Back of House Facilities*	1,590	2,303	1,590	2,303
Podium and Basement (North Site)	19,500	21,200	18,941	20,139
Car Parking (South Site)		6,616		6,616
Car Parking Spaces (whole Site)	Up to 1,000 spaces		Up to 1,000 spaces	
Total	133,282	140,891	133,468	140,777
Notes				
*Areas exclude basement floorspace on the South Site except D2 leisure.				

Table 2.3 Proposed Total Maximum Floorspace by Land Use during the Completed Development Scenario (Update of Table 5.2 of the 2019 ES)

Land Use Class	2019 Planning Application		With May 2020 Amendments	
	GIA (sq. m)	GEA (sq. m)	GIA (sq. m)	GEA (sq. m)
Retail and Leisure plus Plaza / ground floor level office in Plot G (Class A1-A5, B1, D1-D2)*	7,352	8,543	6,710	7,911
Residential (Class C3)*	106,585 (1,300 units)	109,805 (1,300 units)	106,585 (1,300 units)	109,805 (1,300 units)
Residential Institutions (Class C2)	23,500 (250 rooms)	26,000 (250 rooms)	23,500 (250 rooms)	26,000 (250 rooms)
Hotel (Class C1)	23,500 (450 keys)	26,000 (450 keys)	23,500 (450 keys)	26,000 (450 keys)
Offices (Class B1)	118,789	119,924	120,336	121,503
Back of House Facilities*	1,590	2,303	1,590	2,303
Podium and Basement (North Site)	29,000	30,200	28,441	29,139
Car Parking (South Site)		6,616		6,616
Car Parking Spaces (whole Site)		Up to 1,000 spaces		
Total	213,868	228,662[#]	212,719	226,018[#]
Notes				
*Areas exclude basement floorspace on the South Site except D2 leisure.				
[#] The maximum total is based on the maximum area of development on the North Site of 170,356m² GEA / 159,851m² GIA plus the approved area of development on the South Site (55,662m ² GEA / 52,868m ² GIA). This maximum area of development on the North Site is less than the sum of the floor space areas of the individual uses listed above and is to control the maximum amount of development permitted.				

Updated Plans and Drawings Defining the Proposed Development

- 2.11. As described in the 2019 ES, the detailed elements of the Proposed Development are based on drawings which set out the footprint and height of the proposed buildings, the elevations and sections of each building, the internal arrangement of the buildings at each level and the landscape design. The outline elements of the planning application are governed by a series of parameters. These parameters are defined by the Parameter Plans, Development Specification and Design Code.
- 2.12. The plans have been updated to reflect the latest scheme design and to respond to comments received. Details of the updated plans defining the proposed Development for the purposes of the EIA are listed in Table 5.3 below and are included as Figures 5 to this document.

Table 2.4: Plans Defining the Proposed Development for the Purposes of the EIA (Update of Table 5.3 of the 2019 ES)

Plan Reference Number	Title	Description	Changes Incorporated
Consolidated Parameter Plans (Site Wide)			
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0250	EIA Boundary	Site boundary for the purposes of the EIA.	No change

Plan Reference Number	Title	Description	Changes Incorporated
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0252	Demolition Plan	Plan of buildings to be demolished across the Site	No change
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0254 (rev P01)	Building Plots	Phase 1 and Phase 2: Building heights and layout. Phase 3: Proposed building plots, each building plot's maximum and minimum heights and each building plot's maximum footprint including limits of deviation for Phase 3.	Revision to the maximum height of Plot A from 151.5m AOD to 136.5m AOD. Addition of notes to confirm that for Plots C and A, where the building heights within these Plots steps, the maximum height of Plot C should be in the east and step down to the west and for Plot A the maximum height should be in the north and step down to the south. The area of pavement along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road has now been marked to confirm that the buildings would not be built up to the edge of the roadway but would retain pavements.
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0256 (Rev P01)	Public Realm and Pedestrian Access	Proposed location of public realm and amenity for Phase 3.	Changed such that this relates to Plaza and Plaza +1 levels only. Revision to the minimum width of public realm between Plots A, B, D and C of 18m rather than 12m as originally proposed.
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-263	Minimum distance between Buildings. Plaza +2 and Above Mixed Use Scheme	NEW PLAN: Shows the minimum distance between the building plots at Plaza + 2 and above where the buildings are occupied by a mix of uses.	New parameter plan to demonstrate that at Plaza level +2 in a mixed use scheme, the minimum distance between Plots C and D and Plots C and A can be reduced to 12m (ie creating a covered walkway area at Plaza Level).
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-264	Minimum distance between Buildings. Plaza +2 and Above Full Commercial Scheme	NEW PLAN: Shows the minimum distance between the building plots at Plaza + 2 and above where the buildings are predominantly commercial.	New parameter plan to demonstrate that at Plaza level +2 in a predominantly commercial scheme, the minimum distance between Plots C and D and Plots C and A can be reduced to 9m at the entrances to the public realm area and 12m in the central areas of the public realm area.
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0258 (Rev P01)	Vehicular Access and Servicing Routes	Proposed access points to the car parks and servicing	No change except that the area of pavement along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road has now been marked to confirm that the buildings would not be built up to the edge of the roadway but would retain pavements.

Plan Reference Number	Title	Description	Changes Incorporated
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0260 (Rev P01)	Land Uses – Street and Podium (Plaza)	Proposed land uses at street and plaza level.	No change other than to show the area of pavement along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road to confirm that the buildings would not be built up to the edge of the roadway but would retain pavements.
SHRN-CRL -SW-ZZ-PL-A-0261 (Rev P01)	Land Uses – Upper Floors	Proposed land uses at upper floor levels.	No change other than to show the area of pavement along Garrard Street and Greyfriars Road to confirm that the buildings would not be built up to the edge of the roadway but would retain pavements.
SHRN-CRL -SW-ZZ-PL-A-0262	Basement Parameters	Proposed outline of basement.	No change
SHRN-CRL -SW-ZZ-PL-A-0726 (Rev P01)	Phase 3: Outline Planning Application – Parameter Section	Proposed cross sections of Phase 3.	Revised to show the reduction in the maximum height of Plot A.
Detailed Plans and Elevations for Phase 1			
SHR-LDA-SB-GF-DR-L-110-102	Plots E and F Ground Floor General Arrangement – Friars Walk and Courtyard		No change
SHR-CRL-SB-ZZ-PL-A-300-003-P10	Plot E and F Section DD and Section EE		No change
SHR-CRL-SB-ZZ-PL-A-200-002-P10	Friar Street Elevation		No change
Detailed Plans and Elevations for Phase 2			
SHRN-LDA-NP-ZZ-PL-L-400-101 Rev P01	General Arrangement Plan		Revised to accommodate the eastern end of Station Hill and the area to the north and south of this road. Addition of four trees outside Reading Train Station and removal of one tree to the north of Thames Tower. Modification to the landscaping on the Plaza to accommodate the revised phasing line.
SHRN-LDA-NP-ZZ-PL-L-400-103 Rev P01	Phase 2 Section C		Revised to show the amendments in height and massing resulting from the design changes.
SHRN-GEN-BG-ZZ-PL-A-1400 (Rev P01)	Phase 2 Site Section A-A		Amendments to height, massing and internal arrangement.
Development Options for Phase 3			

Plan Reference Number	Title	Description	Changes Incorporated
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-142-C (Rev P01)	Development Option 1	Plan to show the layout of the Site in Development Option 1.	Increase in distance between Plots A and C and Plots D and C at the entrances to the public realm areas to 18m minimum rather than 12m as previously proposed. Minor amendments in height of Plot A (reduction from 128.8 to 128.5m AOD) and minor increase in height of Plot D (from 106 to 106.5m AOD)
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-143 (Rev P01)	Development Option 2		Increase in distance between Plots A and C and Plots D and C at the entrances to the public realm areas to 18m rather than 12m as previously proposed. Reduction in height of Plot A from 147.5 to 136.5m AOD.
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-144 (Rev P01)	Development Option 3		Increase in the distance between Plots A and C and Plots D and C at the entrances to the public realm areas to 18m rather than 12m as previously proposed. Introduction of a step in height on Plot C with the lower level on the western side being 102.7m AOD and the eastern height being 147.7m AOD rather than 140m AOD as previously proposed.

3. Consultee Comments Relevant to the 2019 ES

- 3.1. The 2019 Planning Application was circulated by RBC to a wide range of consultees for comment. A number of comments have been received, some of which are relevant to the assessments presented in the 2019 ES. Further information is also being submitted to help consultees understand the way in which certain aspects of the Proposed Development would be delivered. The comments of relevance to the EIA are described in the following paragraphs.

Reading Borough Council Comments

- 3.2. RBC noted that the floor space areas proposed exceed those of the previously consented scheme for the Site (known as the 2016 Consented Scheme – refer to paragraphs 1.2 to 1.5 of the 2019 ES for full details of planning applications making up the 2016 Consented Scheme). They also raised particular concerns regarding the height and massing of the outline elements of the 2019 Planning Application, along with the associated area of public realm. RBC also commented that the Parameter Plans and Design Code needed to provide a set of clear and precise rules, with more detail on the arrangement of streets spaces and buildings. Extending the buildings to the surrounding highway on all sides, as represented on the Parameter Plans, was also noted by RBC as being unlikely to be acceptable on Greyfriars Road or Garrard Street. RBC also wanted to see increased soft landscaping.
- 3.3. As a result of these comments, a number of changes have been made to the design as identified in Section 2.

Historic England Comments

- 3.4. Historic England noted that Plots A and C were taller than the 2016 Consented Scheme, and that this would impact upon a series of heritage assets including Reading Minster (listed under the name of Church of St Mary), Greyfriars Church, St Mary's Butt/Castle Street Conservation Area, Town Hall, Church of St Lawrence and the Market Place/ London Street conservation area.
- 3.5. Historic England also requested that visibility of the Development from Friar's Street (particularly with reference to Greyfriars Church) was assessed further. It was noted that the Church was constructed at a key historic entrance point to Reading city centre and remains an important feature.
- 3.6. As a result of these comments, an additional viewpoint (VP32) showing Greyfriars Church in the context of the Proposed Development has been prepared. Further assessment work has also been undertaken to consider the key elements of historic significance of the assets identified, and the impact of the Proposed Development on these key elements.

Building Research Establishment Comments (on behalf of Reading Borough Council)

- 3.7. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) undertook a detailed review of Chapter 13: Wind of the 2019 ES and identified a number of typographical errors and inconsistencies. They also raised concerns about wind conditions resulting from construction of Phase 2 in isolation without Phase 3 but overall, did not identify any reason why the Proposed Development should be refused as a result of wind conditions.

- 3.8. RWDI, who undertook the wind assessment as part of the 2019 ES, has updated Chapter 13: Wind and the Wind section of the NTS. The replacement Chapter is included with tracked changes, as **Appendix A** of this ES Addendum.
- 3.9. In terms of the concerns relating to wind conditions around Phase 2 in isolation, RWDI undertook iterative wind tunnel testing for Phase 2 with a cleared Phase 3 Site. The resultant wind conditions for this scenario (which would remain valid should Phase 3 not come forward) have, therefore, been determined through wind tunnel testing as suitable for the intended use with no reported instances of strong winds. No further assessment of this issues is therefore considered to be required.

4. Assessment of the Effects of the May 2020 amendments and Consultee Comments of the Findings of the 2019 ES

- 4.1. The May 2020 Amendments, described in Section 2 of this ES Addendum and the consultee comments described in Section 3, have been reviewed by the authors of each technical chapter of the 2019 ES to provide a professional opinion on the effects on the original findings of the 2019 ES, and to comment on whether the predicted environmental effects remain the same (or substantially in accordance with) those originally stated. This review has been undertaken with reference to the same levels of effect or 'significance' as expressed within the 2019 ES (that is Adverse, Beneficial, Negligible, Minor, Moderate, Substantial). Table 4.1 below summarises the result of the review process.

Table 4.1 Review of Changes

Chapter		Assessment Proposed in the EIA Scoping Letter
7	Socio Economics & Health	Due to the changes to floorspace areas, a review of the Socio-Economics assessment has been undertaken. This review is presented in Section 5 of this ES Addendum.
8	Townscape & Visual	The changes to the height and massing of Plot G are very small and would be difficult to perceive in the visualisations. However, the changes to Plot A would be perceptible and updated Accurate Visual Representations have therefore been prepared to show the revised Plot A and Plot G massing. These are included as Figures 8.5 to 8.32 of this ES Addendum and supersede Figures 8.5 to 8.32 of the 2019 ES. An updated assessment of the visual impact at these views has also been undertaken and as presented in Section 6 of this ES Addendum. In addition, a new viewpoint (VP32) has been prepared to respond to Historic England's consultation responses. This is presented as Figure 8.33 and an assessment of this viewpoint in relation to Townscape and Visual effects is provided in Section 6 of this ES Addendum.
9	Historic Environment	The changes to the height and massing of Plot G are very small and are not considered to alter the significance of the effects described in Chapter 9 of the 2019 ES. However, the changes to Plot A do have the potential to alter the significance of the effects described in Chapter 9 of the 2019 ES. In addition, a new viewpoint (VP32) has been prepared and further assessment work undertaken in relation to the historic assets referred to by Historic England in their consultation responses, in particular the historic significance of the location of these assets, and consideration of the impact of change of setting through development of the Site. This is presented in Section 7 of this ES Addendum.
10	Air Quality	On the basis that the traffic flow data, used in the air quality assessment presented in the 2019 ES, represents a worst-case scenario even with the May 2020 Amendments, the findings of Chapter 10 of the 2019 ES will remain unchanged and no further assessment is considered to be required.
11	Noise	On the basis that the traffic flow data used in the assessment presented in Chapter 11 of the 2019 ES, represents a worst-case scenario even with the design changes proposed, the findings of the noise chapter will remain unchanged and no further assessment is considered to be required.
12	Ground Conditions	The May 2020 Amendments to the 2019 Planning Application are not considered to alter the significance of effects on Ground Conditions and Contamination as set out in Chapter 12 the 2019 ES. No further assessment of ground conditions and contamination is therefore considered to be required.

Chapter	Assessment Proposed in the EIA Scoping Letter
13 Wind	RWDI has reviewed the May 2020 Amendments (refer to Appendix B). The changes to the building massing and internal building layout within Plot G are considered negligible in the context of the wind assessment and are, therefore, not considered to alter the significance of effects or recommended mitigation set out in the 2019 ES. With regard to changes in the landscaping at Plaza level, RWDI has input into the evolving landscape design to ensure that, where trees or screens were placed to provide wind shelter, these are still appropriately provided for. The Phase 2 landscaping scheme is, therefore, expected to provide wind mitigation which is comparable to the mitigation that was tested to support the 2019 ES and the May 2020 Amendments are considered negligible in wind terms. No further assessment is considered to be required. The reduction in building height within Plot A is expected to improve wind conditions at ground level but is unlikely to materially alter the significance of effects or recommended mitigation measures presented in the 2019 ES. No further assessment has therefore been undertaken in relation to wind, however, it remains RWDI's recommendation, as set out within the 2019 ES, that physical wind tunnel testing is undertaken when Phase 3 is brought forwards in detail to ensure that suitable mitigation is incorporated to create suitable wind conditions on and around the Site.
14 Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing	Due to the changes in the design of Plot G, an assessment of the effect of the changes on the findings of the Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution (DSOSGLP) assessment included in Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES has been undertaken. This is presented in Section 8 of this ES Addendum. The reduction in height of Plot A is expected to result in a slight improvement in daylight and sunlight levels to surrounding properties. However, as all the proposed amendments within Phase 3 would sit within the maximum parameters of the 2019 Planning Application, the 2019 Planning Application represents a worst-case scenario and the magnitude of effects would be the same as or slightly improved compared to those of the 2019 ES. No further assessment has therefore been undertaken in relation to the changes in Phase 3.
15 Cumulative Effects	Since submission of the 2019 ES, an application has been submitted for a development at Alexander Turner Close, located approximately 1.4km east of the Proposed Development (planning reference: 190627). The application is for the demolition of existing buildings and Gas Holder and the erection of new buildings ranging between 2 and 9 storeys in height, providing 130 residential units (Class C3) with associated access, car parking, landscaping and open space. Given the relatively modest height of the proposals and the distance from the Proposed Development, an assessment of cumulative effects is not considered to be required. The cumulative effects therefore remain as presented in Chapter 15 of the 2019 ES.

- 4.2. On the basis of the above review, further information and / or assessment has been provided in relation to Socio Economics, Townscape and Visual Impact, Historic Environment and DSOSGLP. These have been included within Sections 5 to 8 of this ES Addendum
- 4.3. As there has been no change to the assessment of effects in relation to Air Quality (Chapter 10), Noise and Vibration (Chapter 11), Ground Conditions and Contamination (Chapter 12), Wind (Chapter 13) or Cumulative Effects (Chapter 15), these chapters of the 2019 ES remain valid and have not been considered further in this ES Addendum. However, Chapter 13: Wind of the 2019 ES and the associated section of the NTS has been updated to correct typographical errors and

inconsistencies identified by the BRE. This updated version (incorporating track changes) is presented as **Appendix A** of this ES Addendum. A separate statement of conformity, which reviews the changes with respect to wind conditions and demonstrates how the revised landscape design has incorporated relevant wind mitigation, is included as **Appendix B**.

5. Socio Economics & Health

Introduction

- 5.1. This section has been prepared by Hatch Regeneris and considers the potential for changes to the significance of effects identified in Chapter 7: Socio Economics and Health of the 2019 ES as a result of the May 2020 Amendments.
- 5.2. The key changes to the Proposed Development that are of relevance to the socio-economic and health assessment are as follows:
- An increase in the B1 (office) floorspace of Plot G from 33,189 sqm GIA to 34,763 sqm;
 - A decrease in the flexible retail and leisure floorspace of Plot G from 1,816 sqm GIA to 1,174 sqm GIA, resulting in an overall decrease for the Interim scenario of 3,852 sqm GIA to 3,210 sqm GIA in flexible retail and leisure space;
 - Alterations to the provision of amenity space and public realm from 7,550sq m new public realm across the Station Hill Development to 8,429sq m new public realm across the Station Hill Development. The total public realm area has increased from 12,270sqm to 13,149sqm (of which 2,270sqm is in Phase 1 of the Proposed Development) but existing public realm such as the Temporary Events Space occupies 4,720sqm so this has been deducted from the total provision to give the new public realm area.
- 5.3. Unless otherwise stated, for the purposes of this ES Addendum, it is assumed the baseline position as set out in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES and the appended Health Impact Assessment (HIA) remain unchanged.
- 5.4. The methodology used in assessing the impacts of the Proposed Development also remains the same as that used in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES and appended HIA.; All impacts of the Proposed Development have been assessed in terms of the sensitivity of receptor and magnitude of change. Where relevant, any differences in the scale or type of impact as a result of the May 2020 Amendments have been identified. Where impacts remain unchanged, this has also been stated.
- 5.5. This Addendum Chapter should be read in conjunction with Chapter 7: Socio Economics and Health of the 2019 ES.

Likely Significant Effects

Demolition and Construction

- 5.6. There have been no changes to the estimated construction costs and timeframe. As such, there is no change to the generation of temporary employment. The likely residual effects on temporary employment at the regional level during the demolition and construction phase remain as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES, that is **negligible**

Interim Development Scenario

Population

- 5.7. The May 2020 Amendments will not result in any changes to the number or mix of residential units

under the Interim Development Scenario. As such, the estimated population of the Proposed Development (1,070) and the significance of effect remains as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES, that is:

- Minor beneficial in the long term at the local level; and
- Negligible at the district level.

Housing Supply

- 5.8. The May 2020 Amendments will not result in any changes to the number or mix of residential units under the Interim Development Scenario. As such, the estimated housing supply of the revised Development (538 build to rent units) and the significance of effects remains as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES, that is:

- Moderate beneficial in the long term at the local level;
- Minor beneficial in the long term at the district level.

Employment

- 5.9. The changes in commercial floorspace as a result of the May 2020 Amendments as set out at paragraph 5.2 of the 2019 ES, result in an upward revision of 93 FTE jobs to the overall FTE jobs supported by the Proposed Development under the Interim Development Scenario. This results in the Proposed Development supporting up to 2,646 FTE jobs in addition to a small number of jobs (up to 10) created from car-parking and residential uses through management and maintenance roles.

Table 5.1: Proposed Employment generating floorspace and job creation (Update of Table 7.11 of the 2019 ES)

Use Class	GIA	Jobs (FTEs)
Retail & leisure (A1-A5 and D1-D2, B1)	3,210	
Assume 50% leisure (D1-D2)	1,605	23
Assume 50% retail (A1-A5)	1,605	78
Offices (B1)	34,736	2,545
Total	37,946	2,646

Source: Hatch Regeneris

- 5.10. Despite this slight increase in FTE jobs supported by the Proposed Development in the Interim Development Scenario, there is no material change in the impact assessment as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES and the significance of effects of the Proposed Development remain:
- Minor beneficial in the long term at the district level.

Local Economy

- 5.11. The changes in the number of FTEs as a result of the May 2020 Amendments will result in a minor upward revision to the estimated spending generated by employees working on Site from £7.2 million per year to £7.5 million per year under the Interim Development Scenario. There will be no changes to the estimated household spending resulting from the Proposed Development (as amended).

- 5.12. There are no material changes to the impact assessment stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES and the significance of effects of the revised Development remain:

- Minor beneficial in the long term at the district level.

GP Capacity

The May 2020 Amendments will not result in any changes to the number of residents seeking GP services under the Interim Development Scenario. As such, the significance of effects remain as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES, that is:

- Moderate adverse in the long term at the local level.

Education

The May 2020 Amendments will not result in any changes to the child yield and therefore there is no material change to the assessment of the significance of effects for early years, primary and secondary education under the Interim Development Scenario. As such, the significance of effects remains as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES, that is:

- **Early Years:** Moderate adverse in the long term at the local level;
- **Primary School:** Minor adverse in the long term at the local level;
- **Secondary School:** Negligible.

Open Space

- 5.13. The changes to the provision of amenity and public realm as a result of the May 2020 Amendments result in a slight downward provision of space in the Interim Scenario from 6,380m² to 6,275m². This is as a result of the revised phasing line between Phase 2 and Phase 3 such that a greater area of public open space is now provided in Phase 3. These changes do not result in any material changes to the assessment of impact in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES and each apartment would still have access to a shared amenity space and / or private balcony. A minimum of 6m² of private or shared amenity space would be provided per residential unit. As such the significance of effects remains as:

- Minor beneficial in the long term at the local level.

Completed Development Scenario

- 5.14. The May 2020 Amendments have resulted in minor changes to the minimum and maximum commercial floorspace scenarios assessed within Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES as well as changes to the provision of amenity space and public realm. This has resulted in:

- **Employment:** an increase in the number of FTE jobs supported under the minimum Completed Development Scenario from 4,399 to 4,492;
- **Employment:** an increase in the number of FTE jobs supported under maximum completed Development Scenario from 9,085 to 9,179;
- **Spending:** an increase in employee spending generated from On-site employees from £12.4 million under the minimum Completed Development Scenario to £12.7 million;

- **Spending:** an increase in employee spending generated from on-site employees from £25.6 million under the maximum Completed Development Scenario to £25.9 million;
 - **Open Space:** an increase in the provision of new public realm from 7,550sq m to 8,429sq m.
- 5.15. As a result of these changes, there has been no material change to the assessment of any effects under the Completed Development Scenario and all significance of effects remain as stated in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES.

Mitigation Measures and likely Residual Effects

- 5.16. All mitigation measures and likely residual effects of the Interim and Completed Development Scenarios remain as stated in the submitted Socio-economics and Health ES Chapter.

Health Impact Assessment

The May 2020 Amendments do not result in any material changes which would affect the assessment of health impacts set out in Appendix 7.1 Health Impact Assessment of the 2019 ES. As such, all impacts remain as stated in the submitted document.

Summary and Conclusion

- 5.17. A review of the May 2020 Amendments and an assessment of the Socio-economic and Health impacts of the Proposed Development (as amended) has been undertaken. In conclusion, the May 2020 Amendments to the Proposed Development have not resulted in a material change to the significance of the effects presented in Chapter 7: Socio-economics and Health of the 2019 ES. The May 2020 amendments have also not resulted in any material change to the Health Impact Assessment set out in Appendix 7.1 of the 2019 ES.

6. Townscape and Visual

Introduction

- 6.1. There has been no change to the assessment methodology, significance criteria or baseline conditions reported in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual of the 2019 ES. The assessment of the impact of the proposed Development on Townscape Character or Views reported in the 2019 has been reviewed as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A and is described below. The changes to Plot G are considered too small to affect the significance of the effects on townscape and views presented in the 2019 ES. This has therefore not been considered further in this Addendum chapter.
- 6.2. In addition, since preparation of the 2019 ES, a new view has been added; Viewpoint 32 (VP32) which is taken from the western end of Friar Street. An assessment of the baseline conditions, potential and residual effects on this additional viewpoint has been carried out.
- 6.3. This chapter therefore provides:
- A description of the baseline conditions at the new Viewpoint 32 and an assessment of effect of the Proposed Development on this new Viewpoint; and
 - a commentary on the reduction in height of Plot A and an assessment of whether these changes are likely to alter the significance of the effects presented in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual of the 2019 ES; and
- 6.4. This chapter should be read in conjunction with Chapter 8 of the 2019 ES.

Baseline Conditions

Viewpoint 32

- 6.5. The following table includes a description of the composition of VP32. The viewpoint location is illustrated on updated **Figure 8.5** with the baseline view shown in **Figure 8.33**.

Table 6.1: Description of Representative Views and Identification of Receptors and Sensitivity to Change (addition to Table 8.5 of the 2019 ES)

Viewpoint	Visual Receptor	Sensitivity to Change	Description of View
VP32. Friar Street Western End	Visitors to Greyfriars Church	High	This view is taken from the western end of Friar Street at the island in the centre of the pedestrian crossing. Behind the viewing position is a busy roundabout on the Caversham Road, A329 dual carriageway. The view looks east along Friar Street, which is one of the principal retail streets in central Reading. Development along this street is mixed, on the south side (to the right) this is varied in scale, age and quality compared to the north side which is made up of more recent post-war blocks. At the far end the bulky stepped curtain walling of the Novotel hotel is visible. In the foreground to the left, and the principal building in the frame, is Greyfriars Church which is Grade I listed. The Franciscan-style Church was completed in the 14th century and restored in the mid-19th century. The mature trees in the Church grounds screen the clear reading of the Church's silhouette even from this close position. The significance of the Church lies in its age and it being the most complete surviving example of Franciscan architecture in England. The modern setting of the Church, dominated by the road infrastructure to the north and west and post-war commercial and office buildings to the north-east, contributes little to its significance.

Likely Significant Effects

Demolition & Construction – Viewpoint 32

- 6.6. As described in Chapter 8 of the 2019 ES, likely visual effects associated with the demolition and construction works would include the use of vehicles and machinery, the appearance of buildings at various stages of being demolished and constructed as well as cranes, notably tower cranes. The effect of demolition and construction on Viewpoint 32 is presented in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: Likely Effects on Views and Visual Amenity during demolition and construction (addition to Table 8.7 of the 2019 ES)

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description of Effect	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP32. Friar Street Western End High Sensitivity	Demolition and construction activities would be visible from this view. They would appear in the background of the view. Cranes and construction activities associated with Plots E, F and G. would be visible in the backdrop of the Church. The construction of Plots A, B, C and D would be visible.	Moderate	Temporary, local, adverse effect of major significance

Interim Development Scenario – Viewpoint 32

- 6.7. The Interim Development Scenario comprises the completed Plots E, F and G together with provision of new public realm linking Reading mainline station with Friar Street and Reading town centre beyond. The effect of the Interim Development Scenario on Viewpoint 32 is presented in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4: Likely Effects on Views and Visual Amenity from the Interim Development (addition to Table 8.9 of the 2019 ES)

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description of Effect	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP32. Friar Street Western End High Sensitivity	The higher elements of Plots E and G would be visible in the left side of the view. The Church in the foreground would still form the focal point of the view. Plots E and G would sit below the existing skyline. Plot E building steps up and out towards Friar Street at its easterly end. This would allow glimpsed views looking along Friar Street.	Minor	Permanent, local, adverse effect of moderate significance.

Completed Development Scenario

- 6.8. The Completed Development Scenario comprises the Interim Development Scenario together with Phase 3 which would provide four buildings rising up from a podium. Phase 3 would provide office and potentially residential / hotel floor space with some ground floor retail and leisure uses.

Assessment of the Effect of the Reduction in Height of Plot A

- 6.9. Table 6.5 provides a commentary of the reduction in height of Plot A. Updated views showing the Proposed Development with the reduced Plot A height, are included in **Figures 8.6 to 8.32** of this ES Addendum. These replace Figures 8.6 to 8.32 of the 2019 ES.

Table 6.5: Commentary of Plot A height reduction on Views and Visual Amenity of the Completed Development

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP3. Visitors to St Peter's Church and Church Yard High Sensitivity	The reduction in height of Plot A would create an improved stepped profile with Plot A being partially hidden behind the tree in the foreground. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of major significance.
VP4 Balmore Walk Visitors / users of Balmore Park High Sensitivity	The reduction in height of Plot would create a better stepped profile for the overall development with Plot C becoming the focal point. The cluster would sit alongside other tall buildings in the skyline. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of major significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP 5 Road users traveling south on Westfield Road Street and Peppard Road Low Sensitivity	As a result of the reduction in the height of Plot A this will now be mostly hidden from view behind the residential properties. The top of Plot A will now align to the chimney stacks of the residential properties in the midground. The reduction in height will create an improved stepped profile. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 5. Pedestrians on Westfield Road Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 6 Road users on Southampton Street Low Sensitivity	The reduction of Plot A will provide an improved stepped profile in relation the terraced buildings in the foreground and midground. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP6. Pedestrians on Southampton Street Low/Medium Sensitivity			
VP8 Users of the footpath off Dunsden Way High Sensitivity	The reduction of Plot A would provide an improved stepped profile down from Plot C to the tree line in this view. Plot C would be easily identifiable as the focal point for the cluster. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of major significance.
VP9 Road users of Chatham Street Low Sensitivity	The reduction in the height of Plot A would result in improved massing between all the Plots further enhancing their appearance as a tight cluster. This would result in Plot C having more prominence in the background, creating a better stepped profile from the foreground to the background whilst also reducing the prominence of Plot A in the left-hand side of the view. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP9 Pedestrians on Chatham Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP10 Road users of Weldale Street Low Sensitivity	As a result of the reduction in height of Plot A the stepping of the Plots within the cluster would be improved from front to back. Plot C would provide the prominent feature with the	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP10, Pedestrians on Weldale Street Low Sensitivity	remaining Plots stepping down either side to the existing built form. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.		Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP12 Shoppers/pedestrians on Friar Street Low Sensitivity	Plot A not visible in this view	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP12. Road users on Friar Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP13 Pedestrians on Friar Street and Greyfriars Road Low Sensitivity	The reduction in the height of Plot A would bring the top floors in line with the top of the offices of Greyfriars House. This would provide a better relationship with the surrounding built form meaning Plot A is less prominent in this view. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP13. Road users on Friar Street and Greyfriars Road Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP15 Pedestrians on Stanshawe Street Low Sensitivity	No changes in this view as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A	As per 2019 ES Major	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP 15 Road Users on Stanshawe Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP16 Pedestrians on Tudor Road Low Sensitivity	No changes in this view as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A	As per 2019 ES Major	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP16, Road users on Tudor Road Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP17 Pedestrians on Caversham Road Low Sensitivity	The reduction in height of Plot A would further enhance the stepped profile of the cluster in relation to the surrounding built form. Plot C would be easily identifiable as the focal point in this view. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 17, Road users on Caversham Road Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP18 Pedestrians on Caversham Bridge High Sensitivity	The reduction in the height of Plot A reduces the prominence of the cluster in this view. The top of Plot A would sit below the treeline in the right-hand side of the view and have a better relationship with the built form that can be seen in the background through the trees. The reduction in height would also provide an improved stepped profile creating Plot C as the focal point of the cluster, stepping down either side. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of major significance.
VP18, Road Users on Caversham Bridge Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of minor significance.
VP19 Pedestrians and users of the Park High Sensitivity	The reduction in Plot A would provide a more significant step down from Plot C in this view. The cluster would still remain prominent however an improved relationship with the surrounding elements would occur. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of major significance.
VP20 Pedestrians on George Street crossing Reading Bridge Low/Medium Sensitivity	Plot A forms the step down from the cluster to the existing buildings in the foreground. The reduction in height of Plot A would provide an improved relationship with the existing built form and with Plots C and G enhancing their appearance as a tight cluster which sits within in its context. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor to moderate significance.
VP 20 Road users on George Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP22 Pedestrians and users of the park High Sensitivity	Plot A is not prominent in this view. The reduction in height provides an improved step down between Plot C and existing trees within the right-hand side of the view. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP23 Pedestrians on Forbury Road and Kenavon Drive Low Sensitivity	Plot A is barely visible in this view. The reduced height would mean the top of Plot A rises just above Plot G.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 23. Road users on Forbury Road and Kenavon Drive Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP24 Pedestrians / shoppers in Market Place Medium Sensitivity	The reduction in the height of Plot A would result in only the very top being visible above Plot E. Plot A would still provide a step down from Plot C to existing buildings and ensure the development would still appear as a tight cluster.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP25 Pedestrians / shoppers on Friar Street Low Sensitivity	Plot A not visible in this view.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP25 Road users on Friar Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP26 Pedestrians / shoppers on Friar Street Low Sensitivity	Plot A not visible in this view.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 26 Road users on Friar Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP28 Pedestrians on Castle Street and St Mary's Butts Medium Sensitivity	The reduced height of Plot A provides an improved step down from Plot C. Plot A is now only visible up to the top of the tree in the midground. The development reads as a tighter cluster with the three plots; A, C and E working well in proportion with each other. However, the overall significance of the effect is not considered to change.	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of moderate significance
VP28 Road Users on Castle Street and St Mary's Butts Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, adverse effect of minor significance
VP29 Pedestrians on Station Hill Low Sensitivity	No changes in this view as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A	As per 2019 ES Major	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP29 Road users on Station Hill Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP30 Pedestrians on Garrard Street Low Sensitivity	Plot A not visible in this view.	As per 2019 ES Major	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP30 Road Users on Road users on Garrard Street Low Sensitivity			Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP31 Pedestrians on Garrard Street Low Sensitivity	Plot A not visible in this view.	As per 2019 ES Major	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP 31 Road Users on Garrard Street Low Sensitivity			As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of moderate significance.
VP33 Pedestrians on Kings Meadow Road Low Sensitivity	The reduction in height of Plot A would be seen in this view. Plot A is only partially visible but the reduction in height would provide an improved step down to the surrounding elements. However, the overall	As per 2019 ES Moderate	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP 33 Road users on Kings Meadow Road Low Sensitivity	significance of the effect is not considered to change.		As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP34 Pedestrians on Pitts Lane Low Sensitivity	No changes in this view as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A.	As per 2019 ES Minor	As per 2019 ES Permanent, local, beneficial effect of minor significance.
VP 34 Road Users on Pitts Lane			As per 2019 ES Negligible
VP35 Pedestrians on Kings Bridge as using the Kennet Side Path Medium Sensitivity	No changes in this view as a result of the reduction in height of Plot A.	As per 2019 ES Negligible	As per 2019 ES Negligible
VP35 Road users on Kings Bridge Low Sensitivity			Negligible

Assessment of the Effect of the Completed Development Scenario on New Viewpoint 32

Table 6.5: Likely Effects on Views and Visual Amenity from the Completed Development (addition to Table 8.11 of the 2019 ES)

Viewpoint No and Visual Receptor	Description of Effect	Magnitude of Change	Significance of Effect
VP32. Friar Street Western End High Sensitivity	Built out to maximum parameters plots, A, B, C and D would be seen in the left of the view rising above the existing skyline. The Church would form the main feature in the foreground with the proposed buildings visible in the background. Plots B and D which are located at the front of the cluster would sit below the west end gable of the Church. The different heights of building stepping away from the Church breaks up the massing ensuring the taller elements are in the background. Glimpsed views of the front of Plot E would be visible along Friar Street.	Moderate	Permanent, local, adverse effect of major significance.
	At minimum parameters the outline elements would be largely imperceptible, and the effects would therefore be similar to the Interim Development Scenario.	Minor	Permanent, local, adverse effect of moderate significance.

Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects

Demolition & Construction

- 6.10. Mitigation measures in relation to demolition and construction would remain the same as those described in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual of the 2019 ES; namely, good site management, maintenance and housekeeping and careful siting of construction machinery implemented via the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

Interim Development and Completed Development

- 6.11. As described in the 2019 ES, all mitigation measures are inherent within the Proposed Development design. Consequently, all residual effects would remain the same as those identified within the assessment of likely effects summarised within Tables 8.9 and 8.11 of the 2019 ES.

Summary and Conclusions

- 6.12. Based on the above assessment, the residual effects of the Proposed Development on townscape and visual receptors remains the same as presented in Chapter 8: Townscape and Visual of the 2019 ES.

7. Historic Environment

Introduction

- 7.1. There has been no change to the assessment methodology, significance criteria or baseline conditions reported in Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES. In addition, as described in Section 4 of this ES Addendum, the minor changes to the height and massing of Plot G are considered unlikely to alter the significance of the effects on the Historic Environment and this is not considered further in this Addendum Chapter. An assessment has been undertaken to determine whether the reduction in the height of Plot A would alter the significance of the effects presented in Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES. In addition, following Historic England's response to the 2019 ES, further assessment of the designated heritage assets referred to in their response has been undertaken. These comprise:
- Grade I listed Greyfriars Church [1321952];
 - Grade I listed Church of St Mary [1113573];
 - St Mary's Butts and Castle Street Conservation Area;
 - Grade I listed Church of St Laurence [1113532];
 - Grade II* listed Town Council Chamber and Offices with Clock Tower [1113400]; and
 - London Street/Market Place Conservation Area.
- 7.2. An additional viewpoint (VP32) has been prepared to show the Proposed Development in the context of Greyfriars Church. This viewpoint, which is taken from the western end of Friar Street towards the Grade I listed Greyfriars Church is included in this ES Addendum as **Figure 8.33**.
- 7.3. St Marys Church was the focal point of VP28 (which also includes the St Mary's Butts and Castle Street Conservation Area) whilst VP24 was taken from outside the Grade I Listed Church of St Laurence, within the London Street / Market Place Conservation Area looking towards the Site with the Town Council Chamber in the right of the view. These Viewpoints were originally included in the 2019 ES and have been updated for the purpose of this ES Addendum to illustrate the changes to Plot A (and Plot G) and to further consider the likely impacts to the above heritage assets. This chapter should be read in conjunction with Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES.

Likely Significant Effects

Completed Development Scenario

- 7.4. Further assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the designated assets identified in Historic England's consultation response to the 2019 ES has been undertaken and is described below. A summary of the likely effects of the Proposed Development (as amended by the May 2020 Amendments) on these heritage assets is provided in **Table 7.1** (which updates Table 9.5 of the 2019 ES).

Greyfriars Church

Current Location

- 7.5. Greyfriars Church is located at the western extent of Friar Street at the junction with Greyfriars Road. It is a prominent building when approached from West Street and is visible along West Street and St Mary's Butts until St Mary's Church. When approaching the building from West Street the focus is drawn towards its large Gothic window (southern elevation) and the belfry which was added in the 19th century by the Borough Surveyor, Woodman. While modern development surrounding the church has somewhat diminished its prominence along the western extent of Friar Street (particularly when looking east to west along Friar Street), the approach from West Street still forms a key view contributing to the wider understanding of its setting, especially in regard to how the building was originally experienced.

Historic Location

- 7.6. John Speed's 1610 Map of Reading shows that Greyfriars Church was historically sited along the most north-western outskirts of the town. The church appears more extensive on the map, visible as the first building that is approached when entering the town from the north.
- 7.7. The alignments of Friar Street and West Street were already in existence by the time of the map, though the extent to which it can be relied upon for definitive interpretation is variable, especially as they are not named as such. Friar Street is not illustrated greatly westwards beyond the church indicating that it terminated in a location just beyond the modern roundabout at the end of Friar Street.
- 7.8. The church therefore, was a feature of one of the main entrances into the town (at least in the early post-medieval period), and would have been prominent at the time. If the road locations are accurate, it would have been experienced as a prominent roadside structure/focal point by those entering Reading with views from the north (e.g. looking south towards the church from the northern town entrance along Caversham Road) and from the south (e.g. looking north towards the church from the southern entrance at the River Kennet) being the most significant.
- 7.9. The area that would have formed part of the northern entrance route into Reading has long changed the approach towards Greyfriars due to extensive modern developments which have completely obscured its visibility when traversing along Caversham Road. Due to the loss of other late medieval and early post-medieval buildings surrounding Greyfriars, and the loss of the majority of its associated buildings, it no longer forms a dominant feature when entering town from the north and is no longer experienced in such a setting. As such, the main historic views which are retained today are from the southern approach into the town, i.e. via West Street.

Viewpoint Assessment

- 7.10. VP32 shows the approach towards Friar Street from the roundabout at the western extent of Friar Street. The VP illustrates that the skyline to the north-east of the church will be impacted by the Proposed Development, particularly due to the heights of the tallest buildings within Plots A and B, although it must be noted that the height of Plot A has noticeably been reduced since the 2019 ES.
- 7.11. However, the view towards Greyfriars Church from VP32 is also already visually disrupted by the amount of modern street furniture and signage. In addition, surrounding development, including post-medieval to modern development immediately opposite the church and further along Friar Street, challenge the prominence of the building. Notwithstanding this, the church, due to its

architectural style, retains its position as a key architectural feature set within mixed date and form architecture, which can be shown to have evolved over time.

- 7.12. Historically, Friar Street terminated in a location just beyond the modern roundabout at the end of Friar Street. As a result, the view from VP32 would arguably not have been as significant as those views from the northern and southern approaches. As such, while the effects of the Proposed Development in regard to setting might be greater from this location, even with the reduction in height to Plot A which allows more skyline to be retained behind the church, it would not have been particularly relevant in regard to the original experience of the church.
- 7.13. In addition, whilst the church's distinct architectural style relative to the surrounding buildings makes it a key architectural feature at the western extent of Friar Street, this prominence is lost when progressing further east along Friar Street and looking back (westwards) towards the church. From just beyond the junction of Friar Street and Greyfriars Road, looking westwards along Friar Street, views towards the church are blocked by post-medieval and modern developments which instead direct views towards modern high rises beyond the roundabout at the western end of Friar Street.
- 7.14. Moreover, while the previously open skyline views appear more crowded due the Development, even though the reduction of Plot A creates a more pleasing staggered view between the buildings and appears less intrusive on the skyline, the view towards Friar Street from this VP has not dramatically depreciated views towards the belfry, retaining open skyline space to the east of the church.
- 7.15. While it is likely that the Proposed Development will be visible from where West Street meets St Mary's Butts, the views at the end of West Street will still be drawn towards Greyfriars, especially as the Proposed Development will be located further to the north-east of the church. Therefore, attention will still be drawn towards the Gothic window, even from long distance views.

Church of St Mary and St Mary's Butts/Castle Street Conservation Area

Current Location

- 7.16. The church is located within the north-eastern extent of St Mary's Butts/Castle Street Conservation Area between St Mary's Butts and Bridge Street and forms a key open space and landmark within its boundary.
- 7.17. Only a few modern buildings are located around the church, the most notable being the John Lewis store to the east of the church along Gun Street. While the post-medieval character is largely retained along Castle Street, Gun Street and St Mary's Butts, surrounding urban areas represent a mix of late post-medieval and modern developments.
- 7.18. Although there have been extensive modern developments along Bridge Street, primarily The Oracle shopping centre, the tower of St Marys Church is visible from the point where Bridge Street crosses the River Kennet towering over the other buildings. Contrastingly, the church tower is not visible from the junction of West Street and Broad Street further to the north of the church.

Historic Location

- 7.19. The church historically faced a market and originally occupied a corner of a cross roads which has since then been covered by the graveyard to the south of the church¹. While the focus of medieval Reading would have originally been at the Abbey to the north-east of the church, its construction led to a focus shift towards this area instead.

¹ Reading Borough Council. 2008. *St Mary's Butts/Castle Street Conservation Area Appraisal*, p. 9

- 7.20. John Speed's 1610 map of Reading shows that the church was located along the road creating a north to south thoroughfare through Reading. It is placed within an almost triangular shape surrounded by buildings.

Viewpoint Assessment

- 7.21. VP28 was taken from the junction of Castle Street and St Mary's Butts looking towards the church. It shows that the church forms of dominant feature within the area by virtue of it exceeding the height of surrounding buildings as well as the open space to the front of the church creating a much more open feel.
- 7.22. The church is also set apart due to its distinctive materials and blockwork pattern which forms a chequer work of quarry and quaternary flint². The skyline behind the church's tower is shown as being open.
- 7.23. The VP shows how the skyline behind the church will change due to the Development. While the church still forms the central architectural feature of the area, primarily due to its unique design and pattern which still sets it apart, the formerly open skyline immediately behind the tower has now been partially filled in by the Proposed Development, which, due to the varying building heights, adds a staggered view similar to that visible on VP32 looking at Greyfriars Church.
- 7.24. It could be argued that due to the almost 'staggered stairs' view of the Development from this VP, the visual intrusion is somewhat reduced in severity, for example, a simple tower block approach with one height across the entire Site would have arguably been more intrusive. Instead the staggered effect, which has become more pronounced with the reduction of height in Plot A, leads to a gradient in height which almost appears to meet the heights of the existing buildings in the background of the church.
- 7.25. While the church tower will still be visible from Bridge Street, it is likely that the Proposed Development will form part of the backdrop of such views, although it is possible that the deciduous trees along St Mary's Butts would provide some level of screening, albeit this would be seasonal. However, the architectural distinctiveness of the church would still elevate the visibility of the church.

Town Council Chambers, St Laurence Church and London Street/Market Place Conservation Area

Current Location

- 7.26. The Town Council Chambers and St Laurence Church are located within the northern extent of London Street/Market Place Conservation Area at the junction between Friar Street and Blagrove Street. St Laurence Church is slightly set back from Blagrove Street with only limited views along Friar Street.
- 7.27. The entrances to the Town Council Chambers and the church both face Friar Street indicating that they were placed in these locations in response to the existing road network. The clock tower of the Town Council Chambers is visible along Friar Street up until just after the junction between Friar Street and Union Street to the south-east of the Site. Due to the gentle bend in the road, the church tower is not visible from the same location.

Historic Location

- 7.28. John Speed's map of 1610 shows that St Laurence occupied a prominent position within the north-eastern extent of the town adjacent to the abbey. It is located at the junction between Friar Street and Market Place, a road heading southwards towards the River Kennet. The Town Council

² Historic England, list entry for St Marys Church, accessible via <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1113573>

Chambers were built in 1874. The 1883 Ordnance Survey map illustrates that the majority of the built environment immediately surrounding the building has not been altered into the present, with the exception of modern office buildings immediately to the north and east of the Town Council Chambers.

Viewpoint Assessment

- 7.29. VP24 shows that views from the corner of Blagrove Street immediately outside of the Town Council Chambers extend along Friar Street and comprise a mixture of post-medieval and modern developments. While the buildings adjacent to the Listed Building are of post-medieval appearance (though some are of later date), modern buildings, such as those of the Ibis and Novotel hotels, are visible. The mix of architecture reflects the commercial growth of the area since the post-medieval period. Furthermore, the viewpoint shows that views of the Proposed Development will also be possible from outside of St Laurence Church (facing the corner of Blagrove Street and Friar Street).
- 7.30. While the varying heights of the Proposed Development will exceed that of the aforementioned hotels, and therefore likely add further height to an already changed skyline, as the tallest buildings are not set immediately along the street frontage on Friar Street, they will unlikely lead to the loss of the open views of the skyline which can still be seen from Town Council Chambers. Furthermore, the existing hotels would partially shield views of the Development (when looking along Friar Street directly opposite the Town Council Chambers).
- 7.31. St Laurence was built to serve the population that grew surrounding the abbey to the east of the church and became the focus of a market which eventually spread southwards towards King Street. Development consequently spread further along the River Kennet, showing that the main setting of the church is associated with the abbey (to the east) and Market Place (to the south). Moreover, considering that St Laurence is slightly set back from Friar Street and that it originally formed part of the outer abbey gate, its primary setting is insular and related to its position within the north-eastern corner of the medieval to early post-medieval town encompassed by the Conservation Area. As such, it is considered that its setting would not experience substantial harm due to the Proposed Development, even though the Proposed Development would be visible from the square outside the church between it and the Town Council Chambers.

Table 7.1: Summary of Viewpoints (Update to Table 9.5 of the 2019 ES)

Viewpoint	Listed Building	Likely Impact
VP32	Greyfriars Church	Minor impact on the setting of the church as the Proposed Development will remove some of the open skyline views to the north-east of the church.
VP28	St Marys Church	No change to assessment presented in Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES - minor impacts to the setting of the church due to the removal of some of the open skyline space behind the church, challenging the dominance of the church from Bridge Street.
VP24	Town Council Chambers and St Laurence Church within the London Street / Market Place Conservation Area	No change to assessment presented in Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES - minor adverse impact to the setting of the Town Council Chambers due to skyline changes along Friar Street. Minor adverse impact on the wider background setting of St Laurence Church.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects

- 7.32. Neither the Interim Development Scenario or the Completed Development Scenario are considered to lead to effects greater than minor adverse significance on Listed Buildings, therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Summary and Conclusions

- 7.33. A review of the May 2020 Amendments and further assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development (as amended) on a number of heritage assets, identified by Historic England, has been undertaken. In conclusion, the May 2020 Amendments to the Proposed Development and the additional assessment work have not altered the significance of the effects presented in Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES. Chapter 9: Historic Environment of the 2019 ES is therefore considered to remain accurate and valid.

8. Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Solar Glare and Light Pollution

Introduction

- 8.1. Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES included a detailed daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, solar glare and light pollution (DSOSGLP) assessment based on 3D modelling undertaken by GIA (the consultants referred to at Table 1.1). The following scenarios were tested within the 2019 ES in terms of DSOSGLP:
- Baseline Scenario;
 - Demolition and Construction Scenario – qualitative assessment;
 - Interim Development Scenario (Phases 1 and 2 of the Proposed Development) – qualitative assessment;
 - Complete and Operational Development Scenario (Phases 1, 2 and 3);
 - Comparison with the 2016 Consented Scheme; and
 - Cumulative Scenario (presented in Chapter 15).
- 8.2. For reference, the following assessments in terms of DSOSGLP were presented within the 2019 ES:
- Daylight:
 - Vertical Sky Component (VSC);
 - No Sky Line (NSL); and
 - Average Daylight Factor (ADF) for future receptors only.
 - Sunlight:
 - Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (Annual PSH); and
 - Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (Winter PSH).
 - Overshadowing:
 - Transient Overshadowing; and
 - Sun Hours on Ground.
 - Solar Glare.
 - Light Pollution.
- 8.3. There has been no change to the assessment methodology, significance criteria or baseline conditions reported Chapter 14: DSOSGLP of the 2019 ES. However, the May 2020 Amendments propose the following which have the potential to alter the significance of effects described in Chapter 14: DSOSGLP:
- A reduction in the height of the plant screen of Plot G, which would have a potentially positive impact on DSOSGLP; and
 - The southern façade of Plot G between Levels 08 and 15 has extended an additional 1.5 metres to towards the south which would have a potentially negative impact on DSOSGLP given that the parameters of Phase 2 would be outside those assessed within the 2019 ES.

- 8.4. Whilst amendments have also been made to the outline maximum parameters that may have a slight positive effect on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing, all proposed amendments would sit within the submitted Phase 3 maximum parameters. As such, the submitted Phase 3 maximum parameter envelope represents a worst-case scenario and the magnitude of effects would be the same as or slightly improved compared to those of the 2019 ES. It is therefore not considered necessary to revise the technical analysis to reflect the May 2020 Amendments related to Phase 3.
- 8.5. GIA have undertaken a review of the May 2020 Amendments and associated drawings (refer to Figure 5) and conclude the following:
- It is considered that the Demolition and Construction scenario previously assessed within the 2019 ES would not change, and therefore, these scenarios are not discussed further within this ES Addendum and the conclusions within the 2019 ES would remain valid.
 - In terms of overshadowing, in consideration of the small-scale reduction in height and the location of the façade amendment in proximity to the sensitive receptors, GIA consider that the May 2020 Amendments would result in no change to the overshadowing effects presented within the 2019 ES, and therefore, overshadowing is not considered further within this ES Addendum.
 - In terms of solar glare, in consideration of the location of the sensitive receptors being to the north of the Site, only amendments to the northern, eastern and western facades would have the potential to alter the effects. As the May 2020 Amendments have been made to the southern façade only, no changes to the assessment of effects are considered likely. In addition, given that the height of Plot G reduces slightly, GIA consider that the 2019 ES portrays a worst-case scenario and that the May 2020 Amendments would result in no change to the solar glare effects presented within the 2019 ES. Solar Glare is not considered further within this ES Addendum.
 - In terms of light pollution, GIA have reviewed the May 2020 Amendments and in consideration of the façade shift being located on the upper floors between Levels 08 and 15, and the relative heights of the sensitive receptors, isolated increases in light pollution may occur to windows on the upper floors. However, the overall magnitude of effect is not expected to differ from the 2019 ES and the proposed mitigation measures remain unchanged. Therefore, the residual effects presented within the 2019 ES would be unchanged and light pollution is not considered further within this ES Addendum.
 - It is considered that whilst the May 2020 Amendments include a reduction in height for Plot G, given that the southern façade has shifted closer to sensitive receptors to the south of the Site, the May 2020 Amendments may have implications on the Interim Development, Complete and Operational Development, Comparison with 2016 Consented Scheme and Cumulative scenarios. GIA have undertaken further modelling of sensitive receptors considered in the 2019 ES in terms daylight and sunlight. The future receptor at 52-55 Friar Street & 12 Greyfriars Road is considered too far from Plot G to experience any changes as a result of the small-scale amendments and has therefore not be modelled further. The results of the additional testing are outlined in the following paragraphs.
- 8.6. Following the 2019 Planning Application, as part of the detailed development of the facades, further technical assessments have been undertaken in relation to solar glare from the facades of Plot G. The technical assessments are more detailed than those undertaken for the EIA, accounting for the solar intensity and the glazing properties to understand the intensity of potential reflections, and whether they would give rise to concern to train drivers on the adjacent Network Rail trainlines. These assessments have established that owing to the time of day when the reflections occur and

their location from the train driver's direct line of sight, the reflections are low intensity and the external fins, which were identified as mitigation in the 2019 ES, are not necessary to mitigate instances of solar glare. As such, the residual effects would remain unchanged from the 2019 ES irrespective of the presence or depth of the external vertical fins.

- 8.7. The ES Addendum chapter is supported by the following Technical Appendices:
- **Technical Appendix 14.1** – Updated drawings of the Proposed Development (as amended by the May 2020 Amendments)
 - **Technical Appendix 14.2:** Daylight and Sunlight Results to surrounding sensitive receptors including a comparison of the effects on Plots E and F in the 2019 ES and with the May 2020 Amendments.
- 8.8. Technical Appendix 14.1 replaces the Drawings of the Proposed Development section of this Technical Appendix of the 2019 ES. The Daylight and Sunlight Results to surrounding sensitive receptors replaces this section of Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES. The comparison of the effects of Plots E and F in the 2019 ES and with the May 2020 Amendments is additional to Technical Appendix 14.2. The other Technical Appendices to Chapter 14: DSOSGLP of the 2019 ES remain unchanged.
- 8.9. This Addendum chapter should be read in conjunction with Chapter 14: DSOSGLP of the 2019 ES.

Likely Significant Effects

Completed Development Scenario

Daylight

- 8.10. A table summarising the effects to VSC and NSL to surrounding sensitive receptors is presented in Table 8.1, along with a comparison with overall significance of effects of effects reported within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES and any changes in effects resulting from the May 2020 Amendments. **Technical Appendix 14.2** presents the full revised detailed results in terms of daylight for all existing sensitive receptors as well as those for the future receptor Plots E and F of the Proposed Development.

Table 8.1: Effects to VSC and NSL to Surrounding Sensitive Receptors and Comparison with Table 14.11 of the 2019 ES

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
1-15 Tanfields	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	18	18	0	0	0	0	10	6	2	0	2	4	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
Reada Court	Negligible	14	14	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
1 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	0	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
3 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	7	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	1	1	0	2	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
5 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	0	0	4	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
7 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	1	1	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
9 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	0	2	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
11 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	0	2	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
13 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	1	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
15 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	2	0	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
17 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	5	5	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
19 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	7	6	1	0	0	1	4	1	3	0	0	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
21 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	0	2	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
23 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	1	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
25 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	6	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	0	0	1	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
27 Sackville Street	Negligible	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
29 Sackville Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	1	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
5-21 Tudor Road (Friary Court)	Negligible	52	52	0	0	0	0	39	38	1	0	0	1	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
Montrose House	Permanent, local and of	20	15	5	0	0	5	20	20	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)					Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
	minor adverse significance.															minor adverse significance.
125 Friar Street	Negligible	28	28	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change*	Negligible
127 Friar Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	6	6	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	2	No Change	In terms of VSC levels there is no change* from those reported within the 2019 ES however two of the five rooms experience a slight improvement in their retained levels one from 85.9% to 88.2% and the other from 66.6% to 67.8%. The first room remains compliant with the BRE criteria and the second retains an NSL considered acceptable of the context of its urban location. Therefore, the slight changes are not considered material and do not alter the overall magnitude of effect	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total					
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction						
																compared to the 2019 ES.		
1-29 Projection East	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	94	19	16	35	24	75	66	36	20	6	4	30	One window has reduced from a major adverse effect to a moderate adverse effect, and two windows have reduced from a moderate adverse effect to minor adverse effect. The absolute change in VSC of these windows is 0.1% and is considered a technical change and not perceptible. For NSL, one room has	In terms of VSC levels three of the 94 windows experience an improvement of 0.2% in their retained levels, the retained VSC level for these windows remains between 17% and 23%. In terms of NSL, there is no change* from the levels reported within the 2019 ES. Therefore the slight changes are not considered material and do not alter the overall magnitude of effect compared to the 2019 ES.	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)					Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
														reduced from a minor adverse effect to negligible, however the absolute NSL change is 0.2% which is considered a technical change and not perceptible.		
13 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
136-137 Friar Street	Negligible	9	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change*	Negligible
1-41 Icon House	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	54	35	10	5	4	19	38	26	6	3	3	12	One window has reduced from a moderate adverse effect to minor adverse effect. The absolute change in VSC of this	In terms of VSC levels one of the 54 windows experiences an improvement of 0.2% in its retained level, the retained VSC level for this window is 15.1% which is now considered acceptable for the	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total					
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction						
														windows is 0.1% and is considered a technical change and not perceptible. For NSL, one room has reduced from a moderate adverse effect to a minor adverse effect, the improvement in NSL in absolute terms to this rooms is 3.1%.	context of its urban location. In terms of NSL, three of the 38 rooms experience a slight improvement in their retained levels one from 38.7% to 40.8%, one from 44.3% to 48.0% and the final from 60.6% to 61.6%. The slight changes are not considered material and do not alter the overall magnitude of effect compared to the 2019 ES.			
144 Friar Street	Negligible	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
1-45 Projection West	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.	138	66	11	17	44	72	110	64	10	12	24	46	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.		

windows is 0.1% and is considered a technical change and not perceptible. For NSL, one room has reduced from a moderate adverse effect to a minor adverse effect, the improvement in NSL in absolute terms to this rooms is 3.1%.

context of its urban location. In terms of NSL, three of the 38 rooms experience a slight improvement in their retained levels one from 38.7% to 40.8%, one from 44.3% to 48.0% and the final from 60.6% to 61.6%. The slight changes are not considered material and do not alter the overall magnitude of effect compared to the 2019 ES.

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
7-11 Station Road	Negligible	57	57	0	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change*	Negligible		
8 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
10 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	5	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
12 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
14 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
15 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
16 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		
17 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)					Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
18 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	6	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
19 Stanshaw e Road	Negligible	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
30 Garrard Street	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.	246	36	14	19	177	210	160	79	18	5	58	81	One window has increased from a negligible effect to a minor adverse effect, and one window has increased from a minor adverse effect to moderate adverse effect. The absolute change in VSC of these windows is 0.1% and is considered a technical change and not perceptible.	In terms of VSC levels four of the 246 windows experiences a reduction of 0.2% in their retained level, all four windows are within obstructed locations where they experience low existing and retained levels. In terms of NSL, four of the 160 rooms experience a slight reduction in their retained levels and six experience a slight improvement in their retained levels. The four rooms experience an absolute reduction in NSL is between 1% and 3.6% whilst the	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
															For NSL, one room has reduced from minor adverse to negligible, however the absolute NSL change is 0.4% which is considered a technical change and not perceptible.	rooms that experience an improvement do so by 1.1% to 3.3% NSL. The slight changes are not considered material and do not alter the overall magnitude of effect compared to the 2019 ES.		
32 Friar Street	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	7	5	2	0	0	2	5	3	0	2	0	2	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		
33 Friar Street	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	4	0	3	1	0	4	4	1	0	0	3	3	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.		
34 Friar Street	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	4	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	2	3	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)						NSL (May 2020 Amendments)						Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
49-51 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.	33	0	0	0	33	33	24	0	0	0	24	24	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.
5 Vachel Road	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	5	1	4	0	0	4	5	2	1	2	0	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.
7 Vachel Road	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	6	4	2	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.
9 Vachel Road	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	4	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.
11 Vachel Road	Negligible	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
13 Vachel Road	Negligible	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
15 Vachel Road	Negligible	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
17 Vachel Road	Negligible	10	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)						NSL (May 2020 Amendments)						Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
19 Vachel Road	Negligible	10	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
20-24 Vachel Road	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	16	8	8	0	0	8	12	12	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.
21-23 Vachel Road	Negligible	8	8	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
25 Vachel Road	Negligible	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
27-31 Vachel Road	Negligible	12	12	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
53 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.	13	6	0	1	6	7	9	4	0	0	5	5	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.
9-11 Stanshaw e Road	Permanent, local and of minor to moderate adverse significance.	9	5	0	0	4	4	8	5	1	1	1	3	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor to moderate adverse significance.

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)							NSL (May 2020 Amendments)							Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines				Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines								
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total					
Alexia Court-3 Tudor Road	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	31	19	2	0	10	12	12	10	0	0	2	2	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.		
Bridlewell & Samuel House - Student Housing	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	67	28	11	21	7	39	57	38	3	4	12	19	No Change	No Change*	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.		
Building to Rear Of 136-137 Friar Street	Negligible	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change*	Negligible		
The Gateway Public House - 31 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.	11	1	2	0	8	10	7	2	0	0	5	5	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate to major adverse significance.		
Belmont Court	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	21	20	1	0	0	1	21	21	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.		

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	VSC (May 2020 Amendments)						NSL (May 2020 Amendments)						Comparison with Table 14.11 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained daylight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Daylight following May 2020 Amendments
		Total No. of Windows	No. Windows that meet BRE criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet the 0.8 times former value criteria	Below BRE Guidelines			Total			
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction				
Malcom Place	Permanent, local and of minor to moderate adverse significance.	39	30	9	0	0	9	39	24	9	4	2	15	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor to moderate adverse significance.
18-29 Regent Court	Negligible	24	24	0	0	0	0	24	24	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
Total		1208	688	104	99	317	520	869	580	93	48	148	289			

* A change is considered a difference of 0.2% VSC or greater and 1% NSL or greater. At some windows and rooms a small change, less than 0.2% VSC and less than 1% NSL, can be seen however these are technical changes such as rounding and cannot be attributed specifically to the design changes. Changes of this magnitude would not be perceptible.

- 8.11. Table 8.1 shows that 26 of the 63 existing surrounding buildings considered in the 2019 ES were assessed to be potentially affected by the May 2020 Amendments in terms of VSC and NSL in this scenario. 22 buildings would see no change from the results presented in the 2019 ES as a result of the May 2020 Amendments. The remaining four buildings would experience isolated changes in their retained levels with three experiencing an improvement in daylight levels owing to the May 2020 Amendments, and one experiencing both small reductions and improvements in daylight levels. The magnitude of the changes when compared to those of the Proposed Development (as submitted in 2019) are not considered material and as the significance of effects are considered in the round, the overall effects to daylight would remain as per the 2019 ES. Therefore, the conclusions presented within the 2019 ES in terms of daylight in the Completed Development Scenario remain valid.
- 8.12. The future receptors within Plots E and F Proposed Development were assessed in terms of ADF and NSL in this scenario. 886 rooms were assessed within Plot E and 384 were assessed within Plot F. This is the same number of rooms as assessed in the 2019 ES. 1152 of the rooms would see no change from the results presented in the 2019 ES. For all 46 that experience a change in ADF, the change is by 0.1% which is not considered a noticeable change in daylight however does lead to three additional rooms meeting the BRE Guidelines. For NSL, 15 would see a change of 1% NSL which is not considered noticeable and the remaining three would see an improvement of 2% NSL. The changes in NSL are not considered material. Therefore, the conclusions presented within the 2019 ES in terms of daylight within these future receptors in the Completed Development Scenario remain valid and unchanged.

Sunlight

- 8.13. Table 8.2 summarises the effects to Annual and Winter PSH to surrounding sensitive receptors, along with a comparison with overall significance of effects of effects reported within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES and any changes in effects resulting from the May 2020 Amendments. **Technical Appendix 14.2** presents the full revised detailed results in terms of sunlight for all existing sensitive receptors.
- 8.14. 26 buildings were assessed as sensitive receptors in terms of Annual PSH and Winter PSH in the 2019 ES. All buildings would see no change with the May 2020 Amendments from the results presented in the 2019 ES. Therefore, the conclusions presented within the 2019 ES in terms of sunlight in the Completed Development Scenario remain valid and unchanged.

Table 8.2: Effects to PSH to Surrounding Sensitive Receptors and Comparison with Table 14.12 of the 2019 ES

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet BRE criteria	Total APSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Winter PSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Comparison with Table 14.12 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained sunlight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Sunlight following May 2020 Amendments
				Below BRE Guidelines				Below BRE Guidelines						
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total	20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			
1-15 Tanfields	Negligible	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
Reada Court	Negligible	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
3 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
15 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
17 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
19 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
25 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
27 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
29 Sackville Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
5-21 Tudor Road (Friary Court)	Negligible	39	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet BRE criteria	Total APSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Winter PSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Comparison with Table 14.12 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained sunlight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Sunlight following May 2020 Amendments
				Below BRE Guidelines				Below BRE Guidelines						
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total	20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			
1-29 Projection East	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	15	7	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.
136-137 Friar Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
1-41 Icon House	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	16	7	1	4	2	7	0	0	9	9	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.
1-45 Projection West	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	83	76	1	4	2	7	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.
7-11 Station Road	Negligible	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
18 Stanshawe Road	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
30 Garrard Street	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.	58	32	1	5	20	26	0	0	8	8	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.
33 Friar Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet BRE criteria	Total APSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Winter PSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Comparison with Table 14.12 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained sunlight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Sunlight following May 2020 Amendments
				Below BRE Guidelines				Below BRE Guidelines						
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total	20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			
49-51 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.	22	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	22	22	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.
53 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.	6	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	6	6	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.
9-11 Stanshawe Road	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of moderate adverse significance.
Alexia Court-3 Tudor Road	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.	12	9	0	1	2	3	0	0	2	2	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of minor adverse significance.
Building to Rear Of 136-137 Friar Street	Negligible	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
The Gateway Public House - 31 Greyfriars Road	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	4	4	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of major adverse significance.
Malcom Place	Permanent, local and of	39	35	0	3	1	4	0	0	4	4	No Change	No Change	Permanent, local and of

Address	Overall significance of effect to Daylight reported within the Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Total No. of Rooms	No. Rooms that meet BRE criteria	Total APSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Winter PSH (May 2020 Amendments)				Comparison with Table 14.12 provided within Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES	Summary of changes in retained sunlight levels compared to those provided in Technical Appendix 14.2 of the 2019 ES	Overall significance of effect to Sunlight following May 2020 Amendments
				Below BRE Guidelines				Below BRE Guidelines						
				20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total	20-29.9% Reduction	30-39.9% Reduction	>40% Reduction	Total			
	minor adverse significance.													minor adverse significance.
18-29 Regent Court	Negligible	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No Change	No Change	Negligible
Total		368	278	3	17	68	88	0	0	55	55			

Interim, Comparison with the 2016 Consented scheme and Cumulative Scenario

- 8.15. The assessment of the Completed Development Scenario has established that the May 2020 Amendments to the Proposed Development would not give rise to any changes in the magnitude of effects presented in the 2019 ES. As such, the conclusions of the 2019 ES in terms of daylight and sunlight for the Interim Scenario, comparisons with the 2016 Consented Scheme and the Cumulative Scenario would remain unchanged and the conclusions presented within the 2019 ES in terms of daylight and sunlight remain valid and unchanged.

Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects

- 8.16. As set out in Chapter 14: DSOSGLP, mitigation is inherent in the design of Phases 1 and 2 and the massing details of Phase 3 will only be determined as part of future reserved matters applications for the Plots within this Phase. As a result, the residual daylight and sunlight effects remain as per the likely effects.

Summary and Conclusions

- 8.17. Whilst isolated changes in the daylight levels are seen within a small number of buildings, these would not materially change the overall magnitude of effects. Therefore, the May 2020 Amendments are not expected to alter the conclusions, as reported in Chapter 14 of the 2019 ES, in relation to DSOSGLP.

9. Summary of Mitigation, Monitoring and Enhancement Measures

- 9.1. The assessment of the May 2020 Amendments has found that in relation to the Socio Economics, Townscape and Visual and Historic Environment assessments, neither the May 2020 Amendments nor the additional assessment work undertaken has altered the significance of effects presented in the 2019 ES.

Whilst the amendments to Phase 3 are likely to have resulted in a slight improvement in daylight, sunlight and wind conditions at sensitive receptors, the significance of effect is not considered to have materially altered.

9.2. Given that the significance of the effects have not altered, the mitigation, monitoring and enhancement measures have also not changed since the 2019 ES. However, for clarity, Tables 16.1 and 16.2 of the 2019 ES, which provide a summary of the mitigation, monitoring or enhancement measures assumed to be implemented during construction and as part of the completed development have been reproduced as Tables 9.1 and 9.2 below. These tables do not summarise all the potential and residual effects, rather they identify what mitigation and monitoring should be implemented in order to achieve the residual effects identified within the preceding technical chapters.

9.3. The EIA was undertaken in parallel with the design process. As a consequence, many measures to mitigate likely significant adverse environmental effects have been incorporated into the scheme design. Such measures are inherent in the design and have therefore not been identified in the following tables - these measures form part of the Proposed Development that would be approved as part of a future planning approval. Similarly, assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development have assumed implementation of relevant legislation and therefore this has not been listed.

Table 9.1: Summary of Mitigation & Monitoring Measures During Demolition and Construction
(Repeat of Table 16.1 of the 2019 ES)

Mitigation, Monitoring or Enhancement Measure	Effect being mitigated, monitored or enhanced	Possible Method of Implementation
Construction Environmental Management Plan incorporating a Demolition Management Statement and Construction Management Statement	Adverse environmental effects during demolition and construction from: - Noise and Vibration – CEMP to include the requirement for adoption of quieter deconstruction methods where work is undertaken within 15m of a sensitive receptor and adoption of CFA piling and pressed sheet piling techniques (rather than driven or impact piles, where possible); - Air Quality / Dust; - Waste Generation; - Ecological Habitat loss; - Handling and storage of potentially hazardous liquids on-Site; - Drainage and Spill control; - Construction Traffic including provision of a Traffic Logistics Plan; - Temporary Visual intrusion; - Site Lighting and lighting within the proposed commercial buildings (during construction); and - Disturbance or losses of Archaeological Sources.	Planning Condition
Implementation of job brokerage schemes, apprenticeships and training schemes	Job creation during demolition and construction.	Section 106 agreement
Programme of archaeological investigation and recording	Adverse effects during demolition and construction on as yet unknown buried archaeological remains.	Planning Condition
Vibration monitoring	Adverse effects during demolition and construction piling. Should CFA piling be undertaken at a distance of less than 10m then it is recommended that monitoring is undertaken to ensure threshold levels agreed with RBC are not exceeded.	Planning Condition
Further ground investigation, and remediation (if necessary)	Adverse effects during demolition and construction from potential sources of contamination on soils and groundwater.	Planning Condition
Further ground gas monitoring and implementation of gas protection measures (if necessary)	To further characterise the concentrations of ground gas.	Planning Condition

Mitigation, Monitoring or Enhancement Measure	Effect being mitigated, monitored or enhanced	Possible Method of Implementation
Preparation and implementation of an Asbestos Risk Assessment, and Asbestos Discovery Plan)	Adverse effects during demolition and construction from the potential release of asbestos fibres during earth movements. Required prior to commencement of demolition work.	Planning Condition
Site Waste Management Plan	Adverse effect during demolition and construction from the disposal of contaminated spoil and demolition waste.	Planning Condition
Foundation Works Risk Assessment (FWRA)	Adverse effects during demolition and construction from the introduction of new pathways through piling.	Planning Condition
Provision of landscaping in accordance with the submitted landscape plan to mitigate wind conditions	Adverse effects on pedestrian comfort and safety arising from wind conditions	Planning Condition

Table 9.2: Summary of Mitigation & Monitoring Measures for the Proposed Development
(Repeat of Table 16.2 of the 2019 ES)

Mitigation, Monitoring or Enhancement Measure	Effect being mitigated, monitored or enhanced	Method of Implementation
Ecological Management Plan	Enhancement of biodiversity through provision of green roofs, landscaping and bird and bat boxes.	Planning Condition
Contributions towards primary health care facilities	Impact of additional residents on primary health care facilities	Financial contributions
Contributions towards early years, primary and secondary school provision	Impact of additional residents on early years, primary and secondary school provision.	Financial contributions
Provision of wheelchair accessible homes and accessibility and adaptability of homes	Housing needs	Section 106
Provision of an Estate Management Plan, Security Management Plan and Operational Waste Management Plan	Management and maintenance of public open space, control on the occupants of the food and beverage units to ensure that there is no over-concentration of hot food takeaways, provision of community uses, security management and waste management.	Section 106
Implementation of a Travel Plan	Reduce emissions to air through the implementation of a travel plan. A Travel Plan would be prepared to reduce the number of car trips associated with the Development, and encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport.	Planning Condition

Mitigation, Monitoring or Enhancement Measure	Effect being mitigated, monitored or enhanced	Method of Implementation
Provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points	Provision of electric vehicle charging points to encourage the switch to low emission vehicles to benefit air quality.	Planning Condition
Incorporation of mitigation to achieve suitable Plant Noise Limits	Adverse effects due to the generation of noise from fixed mechanical plant and building services.	Planning Condition
Implementing Servicing and Delivery controls such as agreement of servicing hours	Adverse effects due to generation of noise from servicing and delivery	Planning Condition
Implementing suitable acoustic design measures where sensitive residential uses (bedrooms / living rooms) are located above service yard / car park access points.	Adverse noise effects at the ingress / egress to service yards and car parks.	Planning Condition
Sound insulation (Non-Residential Uses)	Standard controls relating to opening hours of non-residential uses and use of outside space would also minimise potential noise effects on sensitive receptors. Detailed design to ensure adequate sound insulation is incorporated into the façade.	Planning Condition
Provision of appropriate ventilation/ extraction to ensure that no nuisance, disturbance or loss of amenity is caused by odour or fumes to nearby properties as a result of the commercial kitchen, as set out in the Defra Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems (January 2005).	Kitchen Extract Odour	Planning Condition
Storage of fuel tanks for backup generators and cleaning chemicals etc on hardstanding or within appropriately bunded areas. Provision of oil water interceptors on the drainage system as required. Management and maintenance of electricity substations.	Future ground conditions.	Planning conditions
Provision of landscaping in accordance with the submitted landscape plan to mitigate wind conditions	Adverse effects on pedestrian comfort and safety arising from wind conditions	Planning condition

Mitigation, Monitoring or Enhancement Measure	Effect being mitigated, monitored or enhanced	Method of Implementation
Wind tunnel testing (for Phase 3 only)	Pedestrian safety and amenity. Development massing and landscaping to be designed to mitigate wind safety issues and to ensure the wind conditions within and surrounding the Proposed Development are suitable for the intended use of the area.	Planning Condition
Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Assessment and consideration of setbacks and articulation as part of Phase 3 Detailed Design.	Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing conditions.	Planning Condition

VOLUME 2 UPDATED AND NEW FIGURES

Figure 1.2	Updated Phasing Boundaries
Updated Figure 5	Updated Parameter Plans and Drawings:
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0250	EIA Boundary (No change)
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0252	Demolition Plan (No change)
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0254	Building Plots
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0256	Public Realm and Pedestrian Access
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0263	NEW PLAN Minimum Distance Between Buildings – Plaza + 2 and Above. Phase 3 Mixed-Use Development
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0264	NEW PLAN Minimum Distance Between Buildings – Plaza + 2 and Above. Phase 3 Commercial Development
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0258	Vehicular Access and Servicing Routes
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0260	Land Uses – Street and Podium (Plaza)
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0261	Land Uses – Upper Floors
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0262	Basement Parameters (No change)
SHRN-CRL-SW-ZZ-PL-A-0726	Phase 3: Outline Planning Application – Parameter Section
SHRN-LDA-NP-ZZ-PL-L-100-101	General Arrangement Plan
SHRN-LDA-NP-ZZ-PL-L-400-103	Phase 2 Section C
SHRN-GEN-BG-ZZ-PL-A-1400	Phase 2 Site Section A-A
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-142-C	Development Option 1
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-143-C	Development Option 2
SHRN-CRL-PN-ZZ-SK-A-800-144-C	Development Option 3
Updated Figure 8.5	Updated Viewpoint Location Plan
Updated Figures 8.6 to 8.32	Updated Accurate Visual Representations
Figure 8.33	Accurate Visual Representation for New Viewpoint 32

APPENDIX A UPDATED WIND ES CHAPTER (TO CORRECT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS AND INCONSISTENCIES)

APPENDIX B WIND STATEMENT OF CONFORMITY

**TECHNICAL APPENDIX 14.1 UPDATED DRAWINGS OF THE
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (FOR DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT
ASSESSMENT)**

**TECHNICAL APPENDIX 14.2 UPDATED DAYLIGHT AND
SUNLIGHT RESULTS (EXISTING VS PROPOSED) AND COMPARISON
OF EFFECTS ON PLOT E AND F**

UK and Ireland Office Locations

