

## 5 Historic Environment

---

### Introduction

- 5.1 This Chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) presents and assessment of the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development upon the historic environment resource, including on the archaeological remains which may be present within the site and heritage assets within the site's environs. This Chapter is supported by a Heritage Desk-Based Assessment (DBA) included as Appendix 5.1.

### Assessment Methodology

#### Legislation and Planning Policy Context

- 5.2 This Chapter is written within the following legislative and planning policy context:
- Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, which is an Act of Parliament providing for the maintenance of a schedule of archaeological remains of the highest significance, affording them statutory protection.
  - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which places a duty upon the Local Planning Authority (or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State) to afford due consideration to the preservation of Listed buildings and their settings (under Section 66(1)), and Conservation Areas (under Section 72(2)), in determining planning applications.
  - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2018) provides the Government's national planning policies for England and describes how these are expected to be applied within the planning system. Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the NPPF provides principal national guidance on the importance, management and safeguarding of the historic environment recourse within the planning process.
  - Reading Borough Council Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (Reading Borough Council; RBC, 2008), which comprises the local development plan (local plan), as required to be compiled, published and maintained by the local authority, consistent with the requirements of the NPPF (2018). Intended to be the primary planning policy document against which planning proposals within that local authority jurisdiction are assessed. Policies relevant to the historic environment include Policy CS33: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment.
  - Submission Draft Reading Borough Local Plan (RBC, 2018), which, when adopted, will replace the Core Strategy and detail Reading's development up to 2036. The plan was submitted to Secretary of State in March 2018 and will be subject to examination. Policies relevant to the historic environment include:
    - EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment;

- EN2: Areas of Archaeological Significance;
- EN5: Protection of Significant Views with Heritage Interest; and
- EN6: New Development in a Historic Context.

5.3 Further details relating to the legislative and planning policy documents are provided within Appendix 5.1.

#### **Relevant Guidance**

5.4 The preparation of this Chapter was informed by the following relevant guidance documents:

- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG): Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, which provides further guidance on the policies within the NPPF, including the assessment of significance and the judgement left to the decision maker of whether the proposal would result in substantial harm. In the assessment of harm, it is stated that “*the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of development*” needs to be assessed;
- Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment (Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA), 2014) which defines good practice for the execution and reporting of desk-based assessments, in line with other regulations and Code of Conduct of the CIfA.
- Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (English Heritage, 2008) which sets out approaches to making decisions about the historic environment in England. The assessment of the significance within this document is based upon the following criteria defined within this guidance: evidential value, historical value, aesthetic value and communal value.
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking (Historic England, 2015) which provides further information on good practice in implementing historic environment policy. It provides advice on the assessment of the significance of heritage assets in support of applications for planning permission and emphasises that the information required regarding heritage significance should be no more than necessary to inform the decision.
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2017) which includes guidance on setting and development management, including assessment of the implications of development proposals, and recommends a stepped approach for assessing the implications of development proposals.

5.5 Further details relating to these guidance documents, and details of methodology used, are provided within Appendix 5.1.

### Study Area

- 5.6 A 250 m study area, defined around the boundary of the site, was defined for the archaeology and heritage baseline research as, based on the initial appraisal of the site, this was considered sufficient to capture the Berkshire Historic Environment Record (HER) data and provide the necessary context for understanding archaeological potential and heritage significance in respect of the site. Further details relating to the study area are provided within Appendix 5.1.

### Baseline Methodology

- 5.7 As part of the assessment, a DBA (Appendix 5.1) was prepared and the following sources of heritage information were consulted:

- National Heritage List for England for designated heritage assets, such as Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments, which was consulted in September 2018;
- Berkshire HER (consulted in October 2017 and July 2018) for records of archaeological discoveries and heritage assets;
- Historic England Archives, consulted in October 2017 for database of any further records of archaeological discoveries and heritage asset;
- Berkshire Record Office, Reading for historic mapping, historic documents and relevant literature;
- Online sources, including previous archaeological reports, British Geological Survey information and the Reading Borough Council website (for local planning policy information and heritage assets, including Conservation Areas); and
- A site visit, which was undertaken on 20 June 2018, during which the site and its surroundings were visited to assess potential effects upon the historic environment resource.

- 5.8 In addition, the baseline assessment was informed by previous studies and surveys within the site which had been prepared in support of the expired planning application including Archaeological DBA (CgMs, 2010), geoarchaeological investigations (Quest, 2010) and Chapter 18: Archaeology of the 2011 Environmental Statement (planning ref. 11/00276/OUT).

### Consultation

- 5.9 The consultation response with regard the historic environment topic was received within the Scoping Opinion issued by RBC and this is summarised in Table 5.1 below.

**Table 5.1: Consultation Responses Relevant to this Chapter**

| Date          | Consultee and Issues Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | How/ Where Addressed                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 29 March 2018 | <b>RBC Scoping Opinion:</b><br>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 | 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. |

| Date | Consultee and Issues Raised                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | How/ Where Addressed |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
|      | 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 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). |                      |

### Assessment Criteria and Assignment of Significance

- 5.10 The methodology for the assessment of the likely effects of development on heritage assets followed the abovementioned policy and guidance documents, including the NPPF, and the language used within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, to ensure policy compliance.

#### Heritage Value

- 5.11 Heritage asset is defined by the NPPF as “*a building, monument site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)*”. Heritage assets may be designated (i.e. protected by further legislation, such as listed buildings or scheduled monuments) or undesignated. The significance of the heritage asset is defined as the value of the asset to this and future generations. In this chapter, the significance of a heritage asset is termed ‘value’; to avoid potential confusion with the term ‘significance of effect’ (see below).
- 5.12 The assessment of value was primarily guided by the policies and guidance contained in ‘Conservation Principles (English Heritage, 2008). The value of a heritage asset is defined with reference to four aspects:
- Evidential value, derived from “*the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity*” and primarily associated with physical remains or historic fabric;
  - Historical value, derived from “*the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present*”. This can derive from particular aspects of past ways of life, or association with notable families, persons, events or movements;
  - Aesthetic value, derived from sensory and intellectual stimulation and including design value, i.e. “*aesthetic qualities generated by the conscious design of a building, structure or landscape as a whole*”. It may include its physical form, and how it lies within its setting. It may be the result of design, or an unplanned outcome of a process of events; and

- Communal value, derived from *“the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it”*. Communal value derives from the meanings that a historic asset has for the people who relate to it, or for whom it’s in their collective experience or memory. It may be commemorative or symbolic, such as meaning for identity or collective memory.
- 5.13 The value (significance) derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical fabric, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined as the surroundings within which it is experienced; its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. However, setting is not a heritage asset in its own right, nor is it a heritage designation in its own right. Its importance lies in what it contributes to the value (significance) of the heritage asset. This contribution may be positive, negative or neutral.
- 5.14 The value of some cultural heritage assets may already be formally recognised through designation. Where there is no former assessment of value, criteria taken into consideration by the relevant authorities for designating archaeological remains and historic buildings were considered, including:
- the Secretary of State’s non-statutory criteria for the selection of monuments for scheduling; and
  - the Secretary of State’s principles for the inclusion of buildings on the statutory list.
- 5.15 The value of individual elements of the historic environment resource (archaeological and built heritage assets) is presented within Table 5.2, which illustrates the approach employed to assess the value of heritage assets, with reference to NPPF and relevant guidance. The language used in this ES Chapter is entirely consistent with the NPPF and the Planning Act 1990 and provides the decision-maker with sufficient information to understand how change could bring benefit or harm to the heritage significance of an asset(s), thus enabling an informed judgement to be reached.
- 5.16 The statements of value (significance) describe ‘what matters and why’, i.e. which aspects of an asset and its setting contribute to the heritage value of the asset and how. Although the statements rightly acknowledge the fabric of heritage assets as representing the principal embodiment and physical manifestation of their heritage significance, the surroundings of the assets, and the ways in which they can be experienced, often contribute to their overall significance. This was assessed in line with the settings assessment methodology (as presented within Appendix 5.1).

**Table 5.2: Value of Heritage Assets**

| Value            | Typical Descriptors                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Very High</b> | Designated heritage assets of the highest significance, which are of international importance, including World Heritage Sites.<br><br>Heritage assets displaying considerable evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal value, as identified by Conservation Principles, which are of comparable significance to World Heritage Sites, would also fall within this category. |
| <b>High</b>      | Designated heritage assets of highest and less than highest significance, which are of national importance. These include Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wreck Sites, Registered Battlefields, Grade I, II* and II Listed                                                                                                                                                      |

| Value             | Typical Descriptors                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                   | Buildings, Grade I, II* and II Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas.<br><br>Heritage assets displaying considerable evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal value, as identified by Conservation Principles, which are of comparable significance to designated heritage assets (including assets of archaeological interest which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to Scheduled Monuments), would also fall within this category.            |
| <b>Medium</b>     | Non-designated heritage assets of medium value would be expected to contribute to regional research objectives and may include archaeological remains, built heritage or historic landscape features which are not designated, but which display evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal values, as identified by Conservation Principles, and thus have a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions on the basis of their heritage interest. |
| <b>Low</b>        | Non-designated heritage assets, including archaeological remains, built heritage or historic landscape features which are of local importance. Such assets would be expected to display more limited evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal values, as identified by Conservation Principles, and thus have a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions on the basis of their heritage interest.                                             |
| <b>Negligible</b> | Sites or buildings which do not display sufficient heritage values, as defined by Conservation Principles, to be considered non-designated heritage assets and merit consideration in the planning process. These may include sites with no surviving archaeological interest or buildings of no architectural or historical merit.                                                                                                                                         |

#### Magnitude of Impact

- 5.17 The determination of the magnitude of impact is based on an understanding of how, and to what extent, the proposed development would impact upon the heritage assets.
- 5.18 The impact is defined as the change resulting from the proposed development that affects the historic environment resource. The classification of the magnitude of impact on heritage assets is rigorous and based on consistent criteria. This takes account of such factors as the physical scale and type of disturbance anticipated to affect them and whether features or evidence would be lost that are fundamental to their historic character and integrity.
- 5.19 The effects of a development arise as a result of change (impact) to the heritage assets. The value of a heritage asset can be harmed or lost through alteration, destruction or development within its setting. In terms of harm through changes to setting, as clearly illustrated within the NPPF, any attempt to convey the impact or harm of a development has to be framed within the tightly-defined parameters of harm to the significance of the heritage asset itself. This is a fundamental principle. In summary, a project could bring about change within the setting of a heritage asset, resulting in harm to its value, or the way in which that significance is experienced. References such as 'harm to setting' are therefore avoided.
- 5.20 The assessment of the effect of a development upon the historic environment resource considers numerous factors, including the scale of development, the type and extent of physical disturbance and the visual effects. The impacts may be:
- Direct or indirect. Direct impacts arise from physical change to the resource, which affects its physical remains or fabric (i.e. excavations which may affect the archaeological remains or

alterations to historic buildings). Indirect impacts relate to changes within the setting of heritage assets.

- Permanent or temporary. Due to their character, direct impacts upon the physical remains of heritage assets are permanent, and not reversible. However, impacts on the settings of heritage assets may be temporary, if the Proposed Development has a limited lifespan. These temporary effects can be short, medium or long-term.
- Beneficial, when the Application Scheme leads to the enhancement of the heritage resource, or adverse, when it results in harm to, or loss of, the value of a heritage asset. If the resource will not be affected by the Application Scheme, there will be no impact.

5.21 To further assist in the decision-making process, the following approach to the assessment of magnitude of impact was adopted (Table 5.3). This was prepared in order to improve the intelligibility of the assessment results for purposes of quick reference and ready comprehension.

**Table 5.3: Magnitude of Impact**

| Magnitude  | Typical Descriptors                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High       | Adverse: Substantial harm or total loss of the value of a heritage asset. The proposals would very much reduce the designated heritage asset's significance or vitiate that significance altogether.                                                                          |
|            | Beneficial: Development will deliver a significant positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a heritage asset.                                                                                                                                                |
| Medium     | Adverse: Less than substantial harm (higher end) to the value of a heritage asset. The proposals would lead to a notable level of harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. A reduced, but appreciable, degree of its heritage significance would remain.      |
|            | Beneficial: Development will deliver a degree of positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a heritage asset.                                                                                                                                                  |
| Low        | Adverse: Less than substantial harm (lower end) to the value of a heritage asset. The proposals would be anticipated to result in a restricted level of harm to the value of a heritage asset, such that the asset's contributing heritage values would be largely preserved. |
|            | Beneficial: Development will deliver some, but limited, positive contribution and / or better reveal the value of a heritage asset.                                                                                                                                           |
| Negligible | Adverse: Very minor changes to heritage assets or their settings that would not result in perceptible harm to their heritage values.                                                                                                                                          |
|            | Beneficial: Very minor positive contribution, which does not result in perceptible improvements to the heritage value of an asset.                                                                                                                                            |
| No change  | No change or harm to the heritage asset or its setting.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

#### Significance of Effects

5.22 The significance of effect upon any heritage asset is a product of the value of the asset and the magnitude of impact upon it. This is illustrated in Table 5.4 below. The significance of effect can be adverse or beneficial.

5.23 Where two alternatives are given in the table, professional judgement is used to decide which best reflects the significance of effect in each particular case, taking into account the value (heritage significance) of the assets as well as the magnitude of impact (harm) upon them and its extent. The assessment of the significance of effect considers whether the level impact comprises substantial

harm or total loss of the value of an asset and whether the asset is of a value that such a change should be exceptional or indeed wholly exceptional.

**Table 5.4: Significance of Effect Assessment**

| Value             | Magnitude of Impact |                     |                     |                      |                      |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                   | No Change           | Negligible          | Low                 | Medium               | High                 |
| <b>Negligible</b> | No change           | Negligible          | Negligible or Minor | Negligible or Minor  | Minor                |
| <b>Low</b>        | No change           | Negligible or Minor | Negligible or Minor | Minor                | Minor or Moderate    |
| <b>Medium</b>     | No change           | Negligible or Minor | Minor               | Moderate             | Moderate or Major    |
| <b>High</b>       | No change           | Minor               | Minor or Moderate   | Moderate or Major    | Major or Substantial |
| <b>Very high</b>  | No change           | Minor               | Moderate or Major   | Major or Substantial | Substantial          |

5.24 The approach to the assessment of the significance of effect with regard to the historic environment resource, in line with the terminology used within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, is set out below. In this assessment, moderate or higher significance of effect would be considered significant, with the following definitions used:

- **Substantial:** this significant, adverse effect would occur if substantial harm to (or total loss of) designated heritage assets of highest significance (value), especially those of international importance, would be incurred. In certain cases, a high level of less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets of highest significance and international importance would also trigger substantial level of effect, although no prescriptive criteria are proposed to prejudice this threshold.
- **Major:** this significant effect would be triggered by substantial or less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets (adverse), or a comparable level of heritage benefit (beneficial). Substantial harm (or total loss) of non-designated heritage assets could also trigger the same significant effect. There are no prescriptive criteria to prejudice this threshold, leaving it to professional judgement as this will be dependent on the extent of harm (magnitude of impact) and its effect on the heritage value of the asset. Such beneficial or adverse effects are considered to be very important considerations and are likely to be material in the decision-making process.
- **Moderate:** this significant effect would be triggered by less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets (adverse), or a similar level of heritage benefit. Harm to, total loss of or beneficial effects upon non-designated heritage assets could also trigger the same significant effect. There are no prescriptive criteria to prejudice this threshold, leaving it to professional judgement as this will be dependent on the extent of benefit or harm (magnitude of impact) and its effect on the heritage value of the asset. Such beneficial or adverse effects may be important, but are not likely to be key decision-making factors.
- **Minor:** such non-significant effects would be incurred as a result of limited less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, or by harm to non-designated heritage assets.

- Negligible: this level of effect would incur when limited harm would be identified with relation to non-designated heritage assets. Such effects would unlikely to be perceptible and would not be significant in EIA terms.
- 5.25 Where significant effects upon the archaeological resource have been identified, mitigation measures are proposed to prevent, reduce or offset any significant effects. It may also be possible to enhance heritage assets as part of a development.

#### **Limitations of the Assessment**

- 5.26 This assessment was based principally on desk-based research, utilising predominantly secondary information derived from a variety of sources, and the accuracy of data sourced from secondary sources has had to be assumed. It should also be noted that it cannot be ruled out that, due to the buried nature of the archaeological resource, previously unrecorded remains may be present within the site. Due to the buried nature of archaeological deposits, there is often an element of uncertainty regarding the survival, condition, nature and extent of the remains which can only be clarified through intrusive works. Whilst the geoarchaeological investigations provided information on the likely stratigraphic sequence within the site and previous truncation, due to the limited extent of these investigations, it was not possible to assess the archaeological and palaeoenvironmental potential across the entire site. Nevertheless, it is considered that the such limitations in this case do not affect the robustness of the assessment for EIA purposes.

#### **Baseline Environment**

- 5.27 This section of the ES Chapter presents a summary of the historic environment baseline of the site, with further detail provided within the DBA (Appendix 5.1) on which this section is based.

#### **Stratigraphy**

- 5.28 The site is situated on the Thames Valley floodplain, c. 260 m south and south-west of the River Thames and is located at c. 37-39 m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
- 5.29 The underlying geology is recorded as Seaford and Newhaven Chalk Formations, which are overlain by Langley Silt Member, with Alluvium, sealing river terrace gravels of the Taplow Gravel Member formation recorded to the south (British Geological Survey (BGS)).
- 5.30 Boreholes within the site (Quest, 2010) revealed between 1.8 m and 2.1 m of made ground deposits. In one location, alluvial deposits were encountered at 36.2 m AOD and were observed to seal river terrace deposits (observed at 35.5 m AOD). In another location, the made ground sealed river terrace deposits (encountered at 35.9 m AOD). The lack of topsoil/subsoil and lack of Alluvium in the second borehole indicate truncation to the stratigraphic sequence within the site. It should be noted that the Alluvium within the site comprised a sterile deposit, which did not contain organic or archaeobotanical evidence, although to the west of the site, alluvial deposits containing peat were recorded, indicating potential for the presence of organic material in areas where the horizontal truncation is perhaps less extensive.

### Designated Heritage Assets

- 5.31 There are no designated heritage assets within the site. There are no Registered Battlefields or World Heritage Sites within the study area or its environs. The designated heritage assets located within the study area and in the wider environs of the site are illustrated on Figure 6 of Appendix 5.1 and include:
- Grade II Listed Main Building at Reading General Station, c. 125 m to the south east of the site (A);
  - Grade II Listed Statue of King Edward VII, c. 200 m to the south (B);
  - Grade II Listed Great Western House, c. 240 m to the south (C);
  - Grade II Listed Regent Place, c. 160 m to the south-west (D);
  - Market Place/London Street Conservation Area, located c. 250 m to the south-east;
  - Reading Abbey Scheduled Monument, c. 360 m to the south-east; and
  - The Forbury Garden, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, c. 360m to the south-east.
- 5.32 Following Step 1 of the settings assessment, carried out as part of the DBA (Appendix 5.1), it was established that the heritage assets within the surroundings of the site which may be affected by the Proposed Development include the abovementioned Listed Buildings (A-D) and the Conservation Area. Due to the distance, lack of intervisibility or known historical connections, no other designated heritage assets are likely to be affected.

### Archaeological and Historical Baseline

#### Prehistoric

- 5.33 Archaeological evidence for prehistoric activity within the surroundings of the site is limited to chance finds of flint and stone tools, including Palaeolithic handaxes, and artefacts dating from Mesolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age periods (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: refs. 2, 6, 11). As many of these findspots have been found in association with river terrace gravel geology, of which deposits were recorded within the site, there is the potential for recovery of prehistoric finds, although there is limited evidence to suggest significant early settlement in Reading.

#### Romano-British

- 5.34 The evidence for Romano-British activity within the study area is represented by findspots of Roman coins (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: refs. 3 and 7). During this period, the activity within the region would have been focused on the Roman town of *Calleva* (Silchester), over 13 km to the south-west of the site and whilst there may have been a port in Reading serving the Roman town, there is no known evidence to support this.

### Early Medieval

- 5.35 Reading is thought to have originated in the early medieval period and is first mentioned in AD 870. The Saxon town would have developed around a minster church, which preceded St Mary's Church, located approximately 420 m to the south-east of the site. During this period, the site is likely to have been situated outside the Saxon town, within an area later known as Vastern Meadows. Whilst it has been suggested an early Saxon fortified structure may have been located in the area, there is no evidence to support this. Nevertheless, early medieval activity in the vicinity of the site is represented by Saxon findspots and a burial of a man with a horse. The latter, thought to have been recorded close to the eastern edge of the site (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: ref. 5), probably dates to shortly after AD 800 and likely represents a Viking burial associated with the Danish occupation of Reading which was reputedly found during excavation of ballast pits (some of which may have been within the site). These remains indicate the potential for the presence of early medieval remains or finds within the site, perhaps including features associated with funerary activity.

### Medieval

- 5.36 The growth of Reading in the medieval period was influenced by the establishment of Reading Abbey in 1121, which later became, until its Dissolution, one of the wealthiest religious houses in England. The archaeological remains recorded during investigations in the town centre, including along Friar Street, c. 250 m south of the site, provide evidence for medieval and later buildings and features associated with domestic activity (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: ref. 8).
- 5.37 The site continued to be located outside the main settlement during the medieval period. Based on later mapping, it is likely to have been situated within an area recorded as Vastern Meadows (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: 9). This land was given to Friars Minor by Reading Abbey and is thought to have comprised wilderness.

### Post-medieval and Modern

- 5.38 Whilst Reading began to expand in the late 18th century, the cartographic evidence indicates the site remained in agricultural use during the post-medieval period and into the 19th century (Appendix 5.1: Figure 4).
- 5.39 The development of the site is associated with the establishment of the Great Western Railway Line and Reading Station (Appendix 5.1: Figure 3: ref. 1). The 1847 survey of Reading Station (CgMs, 2010) shows a series of drainage ditches within the site, as well as an irregularly shaped feature, which has been suggested to potentially represent a ballast pit, although there is no clear documentary evidence to support this.
- 5.40 By 1879, the Great Western Railway Works had been extended into the site, and the development included buildings such as a foundry and large engineering sheds, as well as railway sidings. During the late 19th and in the 20th century, numerous phases of development occurred within the site, associated with the expansion of the railway works and subsequent establishment of the Royal Mail Sorting Office (Appendix 5.1: Figure 5), which resulted in amalgamation, removal and replacement of the railway works buildings.

### Value of Sensitive Receptors

- 5.41 The baseline summarised above and presented in the DBA (Appendix 5.1) was used to identify potential sensitive historic environment receptors with regard to the Proposed Development. These sensitive receptors and their value (heritage significance) are discussed below and summarised in Table 5.5. The assets that may be affected by the proposals comprise archaeological remains within the site and heritage assets outside the site boundary (which could be affected as a result of change within their settings).

#### Heritage assets within the surroundings of the site

##### *Grade II Listed Main Building at Reading General Station*

- 5.42 The Railway Station building, built between 1865 and 1867 and characterised by symmetrical appearance and Italianate detailing, is located on the south side of the railway line and fronts onto a pedestrianised area. The value (heritage significance) of this asset derives from a combination of evidential, historical, architectural and communal heritage values associated with the form and function of the building. The building is of special historic and architectural interest as part of the development of the Great Western Railway line and its contribution to the associated urban expansions, in this case that of Reading. The Listed Building is set within a modern urban context, with the integral setting formed by the railway line, station buildings (including the new gangway providing access to platforms), and the open area which allows uninterrupted views of the building. Beyond the station, the surroundings of the asset are characterised by modern built form of varying design and scale.

- 5.43 By virtue of its designation, the railway building is a designated heritage asset of **High Value**.

##### *Grade II Listed Statue of King Edward VII*

- 5.44 The Statue, located on a lawned island between Blagrove Street and Station Road to the south of Reading Station, is made of bronze and was erected in 1902 on a high granite plinth. The Listed Building derives its value (heritage significance) primarily from its evidential and aesthetic values based on its physical fabric and design as a decorative feature, and due to its historical association with King Edward VII.

- 5.45 By virtue of its designation, the statue is a designated heritage asset of **High Value**.

##### *Grade II Listed Great Western House*

- 5.46 This Listed Building, which dates to 1844, represents one of the first railway hotels in Britain and is attributed to Brunel or one of his assistants. The building, which fronts onto Station Road to the west, is characterised by Italianate design and stucco decorations. The value (heritage significance) of this designated asset derives from its surviving historic fabric which contributes to its architectural interest, and due to its historical associations with the development of railways and Brunel, and its continued use as a hotel.

- 5.47 By virtue of its designation, the Listed Building is a designated heritage asset of **High Value**.

*Grade II Listed Regent Place*

- 5.48 Regent Place is an 1847 terrace block of red brick with stucco detailing. The building is located at the junction between Caversham Road to the east (onto which it fronts) and Great Knollys Street to the south. Its value is derived from the evidential and historical heritage values, as it represents a mid-19th century residential terrace with limited alterations.
- 5.49 By virtue of its designation, the Listed Building is a designated heritage asset of **High Value**.

*Market Place/London Street Conservation Area*

- 5.50 The Conservation Area, designed in 1972 and extended in 1982, is linear in form and encompasses the planned medieval southern approach road, over the River Kennet to the Market Place. Its character and appearance are defined primarily by the built environment within it, including churches, commercial buildings and residential properties, as well as the Market Place. The Conservation Area is located within the urban context of Reading, which comprises its setting.
- 5.51 By virtue of its designation, the Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset of **High Value**.

Archaeological remains within the site*Previous disturbance*

- 5.52 The value of any archaeological remains which may be present within the site may have been affected or compromised by previous disturbance and therefore before the value of any remains is assessed, the potential effects of previous impacts within the site must be taken into consideration.
- 5.53 Previous development within the site, including construction of previous and extant buildings, associated services, landscaping or quarrying (i.e. potential excavation of ballast pits) may have compromised the survival of archaeological deposits and features. The borehole investigations recorded extensive made ground deposits (1.8-2.1 m) sealing alluvium and river terrace gravels. Lack of buried topsoil/subsoil deposits, and no presence of alluvium within one of the boreholes, are indicative of large scale horizontal truncation to the east of the site. However, as the borehole survey tested only a small part of the site, the potential for the survival of archaeological remains within areas of more limited disturbance (if present) cannot be wholly ruled out.
- 5.54 Any known or previously unrecorded archaeological remains which had been removed as a result of impacts associated with previous development within the site would be of **Negligible Value**.

*Prehistoric and Roman remains*

- 5.55 Later development is likely to have compromised any substantial remains associated with prehistoric or Romano-British activity. However, the presence of stray finds within later deposits, especially in areas associated with the river terrace gravel deposits (recorded at the site) cannot be ruled out. As stray finds would only display limited evidential and historic heritage values, it is considered that any such remains would comprise non-designated heritage assets of **Low Value**.
- 5.56 There is the potential for the presence of palaeoenvironmental remains within the site, as such deposits were recorded in the vicinity. However, due to the recorded truncation and lack of any archaeobotanical evidence within the alluvial deposits recorded at the site, the potential for the survival of any significant deposits is considered to be extremely limited. Palaeoenvironmental

remains, if present within the site, may contain deposits which could contribute to the understanding of the environment in the prehistoric and Romano-British periods. Depending on the survival (which would likely be fragmentary), these deposits could constitute non-designated heritage assets of **Medium** or, more probably, **Low Value**.

*Early medieval and later remains*

- 5.57 The available evidence indicates that from the early medieval period, until its development in the late 19th century, the site would have been located within an area of meadows. Whilst remains associated with agricultural activities would contribute to the understanding of the site and its environs during these periods, any surviving remains would constitute non-designated heritage assets of **Low Value**.
- 5.58 Due to the discovery of a burial to the east of the site, there is a potential for the presence of early medieval remains associated with funerary practices within the site. Well preserved early medieval remains could potentially contribute to regional research objectives, however, later development may have compromised the survival. Depending on the condition and survival, which are at present uncertain, such remains (if present) would comprise non-designated heritage assets of **Medium** or, more likely, **Low Value**.
- 5.59 The later 19th and 20th century within the site has been associated with the construction of the adjacent station and railway line. The recorded features and structures within the site included the (probable) ballast pits, and buildings and sidings associated with Great Western Railway Works. Whilst the site's association with the development of the railways is of historical importance, features and buildings associated with the railway works had been removed and any associated buried remains are likely to have been affected by later redevelopment (and as such of limited, if any, archaeological interest). Depending on date and extent of survival, any buried remains associated with the railway works would be of **Low** or **Negligible Value**.

**Table 5.5: Summary of Value of Identified Sensitive Receptors**

| <b>Value</b>      | <b>Identified sensitive receptors</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Very High</b>  | None.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>High</b>       | Grade II Listed Main Building at Reading General Station;<br>Grade II Listed Statue of King Edward VII;<br>Grade II Listed Great Western House;<br>Grade II Listed Regent Place; and<br>Market Place/London Street Conservation Area.                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Medium</b>     | Well-preserved archaeological remains associated with potential early medieval burials;<br>Well-preserved palaeoenvironmental deposits.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Low</b>        | Truncated archaeological remains associated with potential early medieval burials;<br>Truncated palaeoenvironmental deposits;<br>Archaeological remains associated with agricultural activity of early medieval and later date;<br>Stray finds (including findspots of prehistoric lithic material);<br>Buried remains associated with the Great Western Railway Works. |
| <b>Negligible</b> | Archaeological remains which had been removed by previous impacts;<br>Remains of no archaeological interest.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

### **Future Baseline Conditions**

- 5.60 No foreseeable changes to the baseline conditions as discussed above are anticipated should the Proposed Development not occur, including in relation to future climate change.

### **Mitigation Measures Adopted as Part of the Project**

- 5.61 With regard to archaeology, it is likely that the construction methodology will include piling foundation. Where these are located outside the planned basement, and if appropriately designed, piling foundations have the potential to preserve buried archaeological remains in situ within the footprints of new buildings. As the foundation construction details (including details, type, layout, and clustering of piles as well as any associated excavations) are not yet available, the additional mitigation measures are discussed below under Further Mitigation.

### **Assessment of Construction Effects**

#### **Identification of Impacts**

- 5.62 With regard to the historic environment resource, effects that would occur during the construction phase of the Proposed Development would mainly relate to physical impacts upon heritage assets located within the site (the potential buried archaeological remains). There is also the potential of temporary effects upon designated heritage assets, as a result of construction works occurring with their setting.
- 5.63 The physical impacts of the Proposed Development upon the potential archaeological resource within the site would primarily result from groundworks associated with the site investigation and preparation works, demolition and construction. As detailed construction techniques are not available at the time of writing, the specific construction methods are at present unknown. However, the on-site activities which are likely to impact upon the archaeological resource could comprise some or all of the impacts discussed below.

#### Impacts during demolition

- 5.64 The demolition of the extant buildings within the site to ground level would not affect any potential buried archaeological resource. However, any grubbing out of the foundations, basements or other below ground structures (if present) could potentially impact upon any archaeological features or deposits which may survive within undisturbed ground on either side of foundation trenches. The removal of hard standing surfaces could also lead to the exposure of underlying archaeological deposits. Based on the results of the borehole survey (Quest, 2010), it appears that the surfaces seal made ground deposits and their removal has little potential to expose earlier archaeological remains, although features associated with the railway works could be present at higher levels.
- 5.65 Demolition works would not affect the settings of nearby heritage assets as these works would unlikely be perceptible from the vicinity of the Listed Buildings.

#### Impacts during construction

- 5.66 It is anticipated that the ground works entailed in the construction of the new buildings at the site may result in physical impacts on archaeological remains (where present). The key impacts associated with the Proposed Development relate to the excavations associated with the

construction of the basement levels and tanks. Excavations to facilitate the construction of these below ground features would have the potential to expose and truncate archaeological remains. However, the potential to encounter archaeological deposits at the site would be entirely dependent on the extent of previous disturbance, with evidence for truncation provided in the borehole survey.

- 5.67 It is understood that the foundations for the new buildings would comprise pile foundations. Whilst the foundation design, including the number, size, type, location and grouping of piling foundations is not available at the time of writing, the use of pile foundations is one of the recommended engineering solutions for the preservation of archaeological remains in situ. The guidance on piling and archaeology (Historic England, 2015) states that piling serves to limit the impacts of a development to a low percentage across a development site, and new piling should be kept to minimum, with clusters avoided and non-vibratory piles recommended.
- 5.68 In association with piling, it is anticipated that a degree of stripping and excavation would be required, including excavations to facilitate construction of pads, slabs, or ground-beams, or to facilitate the construction of pile-caps on top of piling. Such excavations would have potential to expose archaeological remains.
- 5.69 Associated works which would involve below ground impacts, including excavation of service trenches, drainage features, stripping or landscaping, could also impact upon buried archaeological remains.
- 5.70 The on-site activities during construction, including construction traffic, noise, dust and temporary structures which may be erected within the site (i.e. scaffolding, cranes, compounds) are likely to change the surroundings of the nearby heritage assets. Any potential impacts would be temporary and largely limited to the tallest structures (i.e. cranes) as there is no intervisibility at ground level. Any such impacts would be limited, temporary and insignificant when compared with the completed development and therefore it was considered that the discussion of impacts upon heritage assets in the vicinity of the site is discussed as part of the operation phase of the Proposed Development.

#### **Effects on the archaeological remains within the site**

- 5.71 The abovementioned impacts upon the archaeological resource as a result of the Proposed Development would result in physical, permanent and irreversible harm to any remains affected and are likely to result in complete or partial loss of an archaeological feature or deposit.
- 5.72 The predicted magnitude of impact on any archaeological remains where extensive construction activities are likely to remove or extensively truncate the features would be **High Adverse**. This represents the worst-case scenario; where the impacts would result in a more limited damage to the asset (i.e. an asset would be affected in a limited way), the predicted magnitude of impact would be reduced (if applicable).

#### Archaeological remains associated with potential early medieval burials

- 5.73 With regard to the potential burial remains at the site, it is considered that even limited truncation, also as a result of piling, would be regarded as **High Adverse** magnitude of impact. Such impact upon remains of **Low** or **Medium Value** would result, without the implementation of appropriate mitigation, in **Moderate** significance of effect (significant).

Palaeoenvironmental deposits

- 5.74 Truncation or removal of palaeoenvironmental deposits which may be present within the site would be regarded as **High Adverse** magnitude of impact. Such impact upon deposits of **Low** or **Medium Value** would result in **Moderate** significance of effect (significant) without the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Archaeological remains associated with agricultural activity of early medieval and later date

- 5.75 Such remains would likely be removed by construction activities. **High Adverse** magnitude of Impact upon **Low Value** remains would result in **Moderate** significance of effect (significant).

Stray finds (including findspots of prehistoric lithic material)

- 5.76 Any finds within the site are likely to be removed by the construction works (**High Adverse** impact). However, as these finds display only limited heritage values (**Low Value**) as they are likely to comprise residual finds within later deposits, the resultant significance of effect would be **Minor Adverse** (not significant).

Buried remains associated with the Great Western Railway Works

- 5.77 Truncation or removal (**High Adverse** magnitude of impact) of the buried remains associated with 19th and 20th century works would result, due to the limited archaeological importance of these remains of **Low Value**, in a **Minor Adverse** effect (not significant).

**Further Mitigation and Monitoring**Introduction

- 5.78 Where significant effects are anticipated with regard to archaeological remains, mitigation may be necessary to adequately address these effects in order to reduce or offset the effect on the value of these non-designated heritage assets.
- 5.79 The NPPF makes the following provisions in respect of the effects on the value of non-designated heritage assets: *“the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”* (NPPF; Paragraph 197). It further states that local councils should *“require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact”* (NPPF; Paragraph 199) (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2018).

Proposed further mitigations

- 5.80 As impacts to archaeological remains, if present, are likely to be incurred as a result of the construction phase of the Proposed Development, and these could result in significant effects, any mitigation would need to be implemented prior to or during this phase of development.
- 5.81 As no potential archaeological remains of High Value have been identified, it is considered that mitigation through preservation in situ would not be required and thus any harm to the archaeological resource resulting from construction could be satisfactorily mitigated by preservation

by record. This would be secured via a standard archaeological planning condition and agreed with Berkshire Archaeology, the archaeological advisor to RBC.

- 5.82 Previous development within the site is likely to have compromised the survival of the remains, however, the potential for the survival and heritage value of the remains is not fully understood. Therefore, a staged approach to archaeological investigations is proposed.
- 5.83 In the first instance, an appropriate programme of an archaeological evaluation would be undertaken, in order to establish presence/absence, survival, date and significance of potential archaeological remains within the site.
- 5.84 The results of the evaluation would inform the need for a scope of the archaeological mitigation strategy, which would be proportionate to the significance of assets affected and would secure preservation by record of these assets at an appropriate stage in the Proposed Development. The mitigation may include, as appropriate, excavation, strip map and sample investigation, an archaeological watching brief during construction works, with appropriate reporting, analysis and dissemination of results, or, if deemed necessary, preservation in situ.

#### Residual Effects

- 5.85 Any physical impacts upon archaeological remains would occur as a result of construction activities and would be non-reversible. However, assuming that the compensatory mitigation measures identified above are implemented prior to the development/harm, the loss of heritage value of these remains would be offset by an increase in archaeological knowledge, which could contribute to the enhancement of our understanding of the archaeology in Reading. As no harm to designated heritage assets (of **Very High** or **High Value**), or assets of comparable importance is anticipated, it is considered that, following mitigation, no significant adverse effects would be incurred. Following the implementation of the mitigation measures, the identified Moderate Adverse effects for potential early medieval funerary remains, paleoenvironmental deposits and archaeological remains of agricultural activity of the early medieval period and later would be reduced to residual **Minor Adverse** effect (not significant). This is summarised in Table 5.6.

#### Monitoring

- 5.86 Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation, to be agreed with the archaeological advisor to RBC (i.e. a scheme of archaeological investigation and subsequent dissemination of results), it is considered that there will be no residual significant adverse effects upon the archaeological resource. However, in order to ensure the archaeological investigations and dissemination are carried out to appropriate standards, and the mitigation is effective, the archaeological fieldwork will be monitored in line with industry guidance by relevant heritage consultees (including the archaeological advisor to RBC).

#### **Accidents and/or Disasters**

- 5.87 No accidents or disasters which are relevant to this topic were identified.

## Assessment of Operational Effects

### Identification of impacts

- 5.88 Whilst there may be some temporary impacts during the construction stage upon the heritage assets within the surroundings of the site (i.e. the introduction of cranes to facilitate construction within the setting of these assets), these impacts will be relatively limited, temporary and insignificant when compared with the completed development and therefore the discussion of impacts upon these assets is undertaken under the Operational Effects of the Proposed Development.
- 5.89 The impacts of the Proposed Development during the operational phase relate to the erection of new tall buildings which have the potential to introduce permanent change within the surroundings of heritage assets.
- 5.90 No additional impacts upon the archaeological resource would occur during the Operational phase of the Proposed Development. As such, these are not discussed further in this section.
- 5.91 The construction of new buildings within the site could potentially permanently alter the settings of heritage assets located in the vicinity of the site. Change within the setting of a heritage asset could affect its value (heritage significance) and these potential effects are considered here.

### Grade II Listed Main Building at Reading General Station

- 5.92 The DBA (Appendix 5.1) concluded that the Proposed Development would not affect the Listed Building directly and therefore the key contributors to the significance of the asset of **High Value** would be unaffected. Whilst the proposal would introduce a new built element of greater scale within the surroundings of Reading Station, the change introduced would reflect the continuing urban regeneration of this area and would be in keeping with the character of the urban environs of the Listed Building. It was concluded that the heritage significance (value) of the Listed Building of **High Value** would not be harmed (**No Change**) and the resultant effect would be **No Change** (not significant).

### Other designated heritage assets

- 5.93 The DBA (Appendix 5.1) concluded that the Proposed Development would not affect the other Grade II Listed Buildings (Statue of King Edward VII, Great Western House and Regent Place) and the Conservation Area directly and therefore the key contributors to the significance of these assets of **High Value** would be unaffected.
- 5.94 The Proposed Development could result in the new structures becoming perceptible within the settings of these heritage assets. However, as the settings of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area comprises modern urban development, it is considered that the change introduced by the Proposed Development can be accommodated without harm to the heritage significance (value) of these assets. As the heritage assets of **High Value** would not be harmed (**No Change**), the resultant effect would be **No Change** (not significant).

### Further Mitigation and Monitoring

- 5.95 As no harm to designated heritage assets was identified, and there will be no significant effects, further mitigation and monitoring is not necessary.

**Accidents/Disasters**

- 5.96 No accidents or disasters which are relevant to this topic were identified.

**Potential Changes to the Assessment as a Result of Climate Change**

- 5.97 As no foreseeable changes to the baseline conditions as discussed above are anticipated due to climate change, the assessment would not be affected by the potential changes.

**Assessment of Cumulative Effects**

- 5.98 A total of 25 major committed developments within the surroundings of the site were identified and these are detailed in Appendix 4.6. These committed developments were considered with regard to cumulative effects of the Proposed Development on the historic environment resource.
- 5.99 The Proposed Development and other ongoing and planned developments in the vicinity of the site will continue to lead to a loss of buried archaeological remains which, in line with the NPPF, are viewed as an irreplaceable resource.
- 5.100 However, the majority of the other developments are located at a distance from the site and are proposed on brownfield land, within which there is anticipated at least a degree of disturbance to the underlying archaeological deposits. Due to the fact that any surviving archaeological remains will be subject to appropriate mitigation (not significant effect), there would be no additional adverse impacts upon the archaeological resource within the site due to the cumulative impacts from these schemes.
- 5.101 In terms of heritage assets located in the vicinity of the site, it was concluded that the Proposed Development would not result in harm to these assets. As such, there would be no additional adverse impacts upon these due to the cumulative impacts from the identified schemes.

**Inter-relationships**

- 5.102 There is a recognised inter-relationship between historic environment and the Townscape and Visual Resources (subject to ES Chapter 7). Heritage assets may be perceived as prominent, landmark features within the local townscape and a development could affect these assets either by harming their heritage significance or their landmark qualities (or both). In this instance, no harm to heritage significance of the potentially susceptible heritage assets within the local townscape was identified and therefore no additional effects of the Proposed Development due to the inter-relationships between these topics are anticipated.
- 5.103 It is considered that there are no additional inter-relationships with any other topics. It is also considered that there are no additional effects as a result of combination of construction and operational effects.

**Summary of Effects**

- 5.104 The Proposed Development is considered to have the potential to affect potential archaeological remains within the site (during construction phase) and to change the settings of heritage assets within the surroundings of the site (operational phase).

- 5.105 With regard to the archaeological remains, it has been established that the impacts associated with the Proposed Development could result in total removal of archaeological remains, which could lead to significant effects, as the physical impacts upon archaeological remains would be permanent and non-reversible. In order to ameliorate these effects, compensatory mitigation measures are proposed which would offset the harm to the archaeological resource. Following the implementation of the mitigation, no significant adverse effects would be incurred, and this is summarised in Table 5.6.
- 5.106 Potential impacts of the Proposed Development upon heritage assets in the vicinity of the site were also assessed, with sensitive receptors comprising four Grade II Listed Buildings and a Conservation Area, all of High Value. It was established that the change within the settings of these assets would not result in harm to their heritage significance (value) and no significant effects were identified (Table 5.6).

**Table 5.6: Summary of Likely Residual Environmental Effects on Historic Environment**

| Receptor                                                                                      | Sensitivity of receptor | Description of impact                     | Short/ medium/ long term | Magnitude of impact | Significance of effect | Significant/ Not significant | Notes                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Construction phase</b>                                                                     |                         |                                           |                          |                     |                        |                              |                                                                                                                                      |
| Archaeological remains associated with potential early medieval burials                       | Low or Medium           | Truncation or removal during construction | Long term                | High                | Minor Adverse          | Not significant              | The residual effect is reduced by appropriate mitigation measures (the loss of the resource is partially offset by knowledge gained) |
| Palaeoenvironmental deposits                                                                  | Low or Medium           | Truncation or removal during construction | Long term                | High                | Minor Adverse          | Not significant              | The residual effect is reduced by appropriate mitigation measures (the loss of the resource is partially offset by knowledge gained) |
| Archaeological remains associated with agricultural activity of early medieval and later date | Low                     | Truncation or removal during construction | Long term                | High                | Minor Adverse          | Not significant              | The residual effect is reduced by appropriate mitigation measures (the loss of the resource is partially offset by knowledge gained) |
| Stray finds (including findspots of prehistoric lithic material)                              | Low                     | Truncation or removal during construction | Long term                | High                | Minor Adverse          | Not significant              | The loss of the resource is partially offset by knowledge gained                                                                     |
| Buried remains associated with the Great Western Railway Works                                | Low                     | Truncation or removal during construction | Long term                | High                | Minor Adverse          | Not significant              | The loss of the resource is partially offset by knowledge gained                                                                     |
| <b>Operational phase</b>                                                                      |                         |                                           |                          |                     |                        |                              |                                                                                                                                      |
| Grade II Listed Main Building at Reading General Station                                      | High                    | Change within the setting                 | Long term                | No Change           | No Change              | Not Significant              | Change within the setting would not affect the asset                                                                                 |
| Grade II Listed Statue of King Edward VII                                                     | High                    | Change within the setting                 | Long term                | No Change           | No Change              | Not Significant              | Change within the setting would not affect the asset                                                                                 |
| Grade II Listed Great Western House                                                           | High                    | Change within the setting                 | Long term                | No Change           | No Change              | Not Significant              | Change within the setting would not affect the asset                                                                                 |

| Receptor                                     | Sensitivity of receptor | Description of impact     | Short/medium/long term | Magnitude of impact | Significance of effect | Significant/Not significant | Notes                                                |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Grade II Listed Regent Place                 | High                    | Change within the setting | Long term              | No Change           | No Change              | Not Significant             | Change within the setting would not affect the asset |
| Market Place/London Street Conservation Area | High                    | Change within the setting | Long term              | No Change           | No Change              | Not Significant             | Change within the setting would not affect the asset |

## References

Act of UK Parliament (1979) Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

Act of UK Parliament (1990) Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

CgMs (2010) Former Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment: Royal Mail Sorting Office, Caversham Road, Reading, Berkshire

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (2014) Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment

English Heritage (2008) Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment

Historic England (2015) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment

Historic England (2015) Piling and Archaeology: Guidelines and Best Practice

Historic England (2017) Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Second Edition)

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2014) National Planning Practice Guidance: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2018) National Planning Policy Framework

Quest (2010) A Report on the Geoarchaeological Borehole Investigations at the Royal Mail Sorting Office, Caversham Road, Reading, Berkshire Unpublished report ref: 130/10

Reading Borough Council (2008) Local Development Framework: Core Strategy

Reading Borough Council (2018) Submission Draft Reading Borough Local Plan