

Appendix 4.4

Consultee Comments

Consultee Comments

Table 1: Summary of Consultee Comments Relevant to the Environmental Statement

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
Historic Environment		
29 March 2018	Reading Borough Council (RBC) Scoping Opinion: The advice disagreed with the Scoping Report with regard to historic environment as it was considered inappropriate to scope out heritage assets from the ES, including archaeological remains, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas and it was advised these assets should be subject to a Historic Environment Chapter. This comment was informed by advice from Berkshire Archaeology, the archaeological advisor to RBC, who stated that the chapter, informed by the Desk Bases Assessment (DBA), should consider the potential for archaeological remains to exist within the site, the extent and nature of the potential impact caused by the construction of the proposals and an archaeological mitigation strategy, including preservation in situ (as appropriate).	In response to these comments it was agreed that the historic environment resource will be scoped in to the ES and the assessment of the effects are presented within this Chapter 8 Historic Environment. The DBA is provided in Appendix 5.1.
Townscape and Visual Resources		
1 November 2018	Richard Eatough, Case Officer, RBC: Consultee advised that the proposed representative viewpoints were acceptable, “<i>subject to minor adjustments in the field to ascertain the best representative view from this general location</i>”. The following comments were made about certain representative viewpoints: Representative Viewpoint 3: “<i>There may be a further</i>	The locations of all representative viewpoints are shown on Figure 6.4.

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	<i>useful easterly view, but it may be on Kings Road, London Road or perhaps even Shepherds Hill (Wokingham Borough) on the A4, Woodley. Kings Point 162087/VARIAT is under construction."</i> Representative Viewpoint 9: <i>"Important to note the 162166/FUL Thames Quarter Scheme in this view, under construction."</i> Representative Viewpoint 10: <i>"Depends. A4155 view, I am assuming that this is beyond the 2km boundary and there have been views of tall buildings in Reading before at Toker's Green, out of Reading on the A4155."</i> Representative Viewpoint 14: <i>"OK, but a clearer view and arguably more sensitive is from Caversham Court Gardens, a Registered Garden."</i> The response also included the following <i>"Additional Suggestions:</i> <i>Two important townscape views of this development are going to be from Station Square North and Station Square South (by the statue on the roundabout).</i> <i>A middle-distance westerly view is missing, suggest Victoria Recreation Ground, Great Knollys Street"</i>	Representative Viewpoint 3 positioned unchanged on the basis that the representative viewpoint used is on London Road and that potential effects upon views from this area would be not significant. Representative Viewpoint 9 re-positioned to a point further east to include the Thames Quarter development within the foreground to the view. Representative Viewpoint 10 position unchanged on the basis that the position intended is the same as that used in the original ES and that Toker's Green is outside of the 2km study area. Potential effects upon views from Toker's Green would also be not significant. Representative Viewpoint 14 re-positioned to a point within the Caversham Court Registered Park and Garden. Both of these views from Station Square North and South have been included as representative viewpoints 19 and 20 respectively. A view from Victoria Recreation Ground has been included as representative viewpoint 21.
Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions		
29 March 2018	RBC Scoping Opinion <u>General comment</u> The site is/was known to have its own vehicle depot and filling station for Royal Mail fleet vehicles. Fuel tanks will	Additional information regarding the fuel tanks was provided as part of the Arup Interpretative Report on Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Ground Investigation (ref: REP/10-2012/001/RO, dated 14th November 2012). It was

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	need to be re-surveyed, if still on site and if still at risk of leaking any residual fuel. <u>EA</u> The EA believes that groundwater quality should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. This site lies on Principal and Secondary Aquifers. This includes a chalk aquifer. Elevated concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and petroleum hydrocarbons have previously been identified in groundwater samples. Our understanding of the site investigation that identified this groundwater contamination was that it was a very limited investigation. The report commented that the investigation was not carried out in the potentially most contaminated part of the site, namely not in the refuelling area and vehicle maintenance and repair workshop. Further site investigation was recommended. Given that this Royal Mail site housed a refuelling area and vehicle maintenance and repair workshop there is potential for contamination to be present in the soils and groundwater and this should be explored. The need for further	reported that in December 2009, the two fuel tanks beneath the fuel island were decommissioned, the tanks remained in the ground but were foam filled. It should also be noted that the fuel tanks are not located within the current application red line boundary. During the site walkover undertaken by RPS in November 2018 it was noted that this area had been redeveloped and comprised a new entrance area to Reading train station. Consideration of groundwater quality beneath the site has been included as part of the Assessment of Construction Effects section. Following the submission of the previous ES, a site investigation has been undertaken at the site (as discussed in the Arup Interpretative Report on Phase 2 Geo-Environmental Ground Investigation (ref: REP/10-2012/001/RO, dated 14th November 2012). The site investigation included exploratory hole locations in the vicinity of the refuelling area and vehicle maintenance and repair workshop. Although it should be noted that these areas are outside of the current red line boundary. A summary of the findings of the site investigation are given in the Contamination Assessment section below. It should be noted that during the site walkover undertaken by RPS in November 2018 this area had been redeveloped and comprised a new entrance area to Reading train station.



Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
November 2018	<u>Contaminated Land Officer at RBC</u> The site has been identified by RBC as being potentially contaminated due to its former use as a works and a coal depot. It has been identified for future investigation under the Council's Part 2A inspection strategy. The site is currently classified as a low risk. There is no schedule set for the investigation of the site.	No action required.
Hydrology and Flood Risk		
12 February 2018	The EA were contacted for flood information in relation to the fluvial flood risk in the area.	The EA provided flood maps, flood levels, flows for the River Thames which is potential source of any fluvial flooding and they proposed extents of historic flood events in the area. This information has been in the FRA in Appendix 8.2 to assess the impact of flooding on the proposed development.
29 March 2018	RBC Scoping Opinion A request for a scoping opinion and the EA made the following comments. An FRA will be required for the development Floodplain storage should be considered to ensure no detrimental impact on third parties is made, they also recommended the following: <i>"The Proposals should be designed to the recommendations for floodplain storage, floor levels, basements and a safe route of access and egress recommended in the level 2 SFRA assessment (site AB004: NORTH OF THE STATION (Local Plan Ref: CR11e))".</i>	A full FRA has been produced and is included in Appendix 8.2 The FRA Appendix 8.2 has considered the impact the development has on the floodplain storage and confirm there is no loss of storage or determinantal impact on the surrounding area. Also the recommendations in the SFRA have been used in the FRA for assessing storage, floor levels and safe access, and where necessary mitigation measures have been recommended in the FRA to ensure the development is safe and won't increase the risk of flooding in the area.

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	Climate change allowances based on: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances should be factored into the flooding assessment in the FRA.	The current climate change allowances have been included in the assessment of flooding in the FRA in Appendix 8.2, which is also as recommended in RBC SFRA level 2 assessment of the application site.
29 March 2018	RBC Scoping Opinion - Network Rail comments They requested that any drainage should fall away from Network Rails land. They also stated that in the interest of stability any soakaway or attenuation tanks should be 20 m away from any Network Rail boundary.	The site has been designed so that ground falls away from Network Rail Land as outlined in Appendix 8.2 Drainage Strategy. The drainage strategy for the development with the FRA in Appendix 8.2 has been prepared on the basis that all attenuation tanks are located a minimum of 20 m from the Network Rail boundary.
19 October 2018	Thames Water (sewage) were contacted for details of any existing sewers within the site that be may affected.	Thames Water confirmed they do not have any sewers within the site, they also confirmed they do not own or manage the culvert running through the site.
Traffic and Transport		
15 November 2017	E-mail from Darren Cook (RBC Transport Development Control Manager) to Richard Eatough (RBC Planning Officer) The following was requested: 1. Provide dates of ATC surveys. 2. Clarify vehicular access points to avoid rat-running through site. 3. Retain existing taxi rank at southern end of Trooper Potts Way. 4. All servicing and delivery activity to be undertaken	1. The traffic surveys were undertaken on 11 to 17 October 2017. 2. See paragraphs 4.9 at Appendix 9.1 and Annex E of the Transport Assessment (TA). 3. Retained – see paragraph 4.12 at Appendix 9.1.

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	within the site boundary. 5. Confirm flows leaving eastern access are lower than those in the previous consent to avoid need for detailed assessment of visibility splay from Aviva site to the north. 6. Amend pass-by assumption for restaurant element to only 50% of trips. 7. Adjust mode shares of residential and office trips to reflect onsite parking provision. 8. External highways impacts should consider net change in trips between agreed former use of site and current proposals. 9. Framework Travel Plan(s) should be provided as part of the application documentation.	4. Confirmed – see paragraph 7.1 at Appendix 9.1. 5. Confirmed – see paragraph 4.9 at Appendix 9.1. 6. Confirmed – see paragraph 5.17 at Appendix 9.1. 7. Confirmed – see paragraphs 5.22 and 5.25 at Appendix 9.1. 8. Confirmed – see paragraph 9.131 of Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport. 9. Confirmed – see Annexes J and K of the TA.
29 March 2018	RBC Scoping Opinion Baseline transport condition is not the lapsed 2012 permission but the lawful use of the site as applied for in the CLP certificate 121483/CLP. Confirm flows leaving eastern access are lower than those in the previous consent to avoid need for detailed assessment of visibility splay from Aviva site to the north. All servicing being undertaken from within the site is acceptable although tracking analyses are required to	Confirmed – see paragraph 9.67 of Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport. Confirmed – see Table 6.4. at Appendix 9.1. Confirmed – see Annex H of the TA.

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	demonstrate it is workable. Confirmed that the draft December 2017 Transport Assessment addresses the following points previously raised: 1. Date of ATC surveys 2. Access points to reflect those agreed for the 2012 permission 3. Taxi rank at Northern Interchange retained 4. 50% pass-by assumption for restaurant trips 5. Proposed all modes trip rates for residential and office components are acceptable 6. Appropriate to adjust Census mode shares to reflect on-site parking provision 7. No further junction assessments required as the impacts will generally be less than those of the 2012 permission	1. See paragraph 9.26 of Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport. 2. See paragraphs 4.9 at Appendix 9.1 and Annex E of the TA 3. See paragraph 4.12 at Appendix 9.1 4. See paragraph 5.17 at Appendix 9.1 5. See paragraphs 5.22 and 5.25 at Appendix 9.1 6. See paragraphs 5.22 and 5.25 at Appendix 9.1 7. See paragraphs 6.8 and 6.10 at Appendix 9.1
Air Quality		
10th July 2018	Ross Jarvis, Environmental Protection Officer RBC Detailed the proposed methodology and requested comments and approval; alongside the most recent LAQM Annual Status Report.	Approval received regarding methodology with no additional comments.
17th August 2018	Adrian Cole, Traffic Data survey Queries regarding the trip development and traffic flows associated with the development.	Baseline Traffic Data received
January 2018	RBC Scoping Report Consideration of predicted changes in baseline	No effects regarding climate change in regard to air quality. All future pollution

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	environmental conditions, including changes resulting from climate change, will be set out within each ES topic chapter (Chapters 5 to 12), where robust information is available at the time of writing.	levels have been addressed in Table 10.16 of Chapter 10 Air Quality.
	An assessment of the amount of carbon generated from operational traffic will be included within Chapter 9 (Air Quality) of the ES. Consideration has been given to the potential health pathways associated with the proposed development. Scoping report Paragraph 5.63 states that the proposed development is not anticipated to include any centralised means of providing heat and/or power, so intends to scope out this aspect of combustion point sources. However, you are advised that adopted planning Policy DM2 (Decentralised Energy) requires decentralised energy which may include such equipment and the ES will need to discuss this, as appropriate.” Additionally, the operation of the proposed development is not likely to generate dust and therefore an assessment of operational dust effects is also proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	All future year operational traffic both committed developments and the proposed development site have been taken into account during the air quality assessment. Sensitivity of an area and specific sensitive receptors have been addressed in section ‘Assessment of construction effects’ and ‘Assessment of operational effects’ Energy production at the development site is currently undergoing discussions. It has been proposed that CHP and boiler units may be installed. Further assessment to follow the air quality assessment once all relevant information has been received. Operational dust has not been assessed within this report.
Noise and Vibration		
29 th March 2018	RBC Scoping Opinion Vibration effects on the development as a result of proximity to the railway.	A vibration survey has been carried out and discussion is included within Chapter 11.

Date	Consultee and Issues Raised	How/ Where Addressed
	Chapter outline otherwise accepted.	All other items within the scoping report for noise are addressed.
6 th December 2018	Rebecca Moon, Environmental Protection and nuisance team, RBC. Internal noise level criteria; Plant noise limits; Internal noise level criteria during overheating conditions.	Internal noise levels need to meet the requirements of BS8233 (see Chapter 11). Plant noise needs to meet a specific level of 10dB below the background noise level, and a rating level no higher than background. A tolerance of 5dB can be allowed during overheating conditions (see Chapter 11).
Further Information		
	RBC Scoping Opinion RBC Ecologist/Planning Natural Environment Team The ecology section of the scoping report sets out the likely ecological impact of the proposals, and states that the development site will be subject to an updated Phase 1 Habitat Survey and bat survey. This will be adequate to assess the likely ecological impact of the proposals and the applicant should submit the survey reports with the application. Ecology can be scoped out of the EIA but advises that the applicant should submit the reports (updated Phase 1 Habitat Survey and bat survey) with the planning application.	Detail of the Phase 1 and Bat surveys carried out in 2018 are given in Chapter 12 Further Information.