

Appendix A.9: Consultation Schedule of Response

Appendix A.9 – Consultation undertaken

Source of comment	Stakeholder	EIA Discipline	Comment	Response
Senior Technical Officer Environmental Protection & Nuisance	Reading Borough Council	Air Quality	Email communication requesting confirmation of the methodology.	Approach acceptable.
WSP-PB	WBC (Various)	Ecology	18/07/2016 – 24/08/2016: Emails between WBC (various) and WSP PB to discuss the ecological constraints associated with the TVP P&R Site, and agree an approach to dealing with these as the permitted TVP P&R development progressed. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the TVP P&R Development – no PBA involvement.	
Principal Transport Planner, WSP PB	Planning Officer, WBC	Ecology	19/08/2017: Letter outlining the proposed approach to reptile mitigation, to be included within the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP), with additional comments provided on the approach to lighting and landscaping. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the TVP P&R Development – no PBA involvement.	
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	Planning Officer, WBC	Ecology	14/10/2016: Response from BBOWT confirming no objection to the scheme subject to detail on mitigation and probable impacts on protected species pre-, during and post-construction; and evidence that the development will ensure no net loss in biodiversity and will seek a net gain. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the TVP P&R Development – no PBA involvement.	
PBA	WBC / RBC	Ecology	29/04/2016 – 29/07/2017: Emails between PBA, WBC and RBC to discuss the ecological constraints associated with the East MRT Site, and agree an approach to the baseline survey data acquisition. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the original East Reading MRT Planning Application.	
PBA	WBC / RBC	Ecology	11/08/2016: Scoping report issued to both planning authorities – including Ecology. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the original East Reading MRT Planning Application.	
Natural Environment Officer and Ecologist, RBC	PBA	Ecology	12/08/2016: Pre-application advice relating to ecology and the natural environment. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the original East Reading MRT Planning Application.	
Natural England (NE)	PBA	Ecology	29/11/2016: NE's formal input to the EIA Scoping Opinion providing standing advice. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the original East Reading MRT Planning Application.	
PBA	Parks Team, RBC	Ecology	03/05/2017: Emails following up telephone conversation between PBA and Parks Team (RBC) to agree, in principle, an approach to ecological mitigation and management within The Coal, Kennetmouth and Kings Meadow East LWS, including portions of this land located outside the East MRT Site boundary, but still within RBC ownership and control. Note – this was undertaken in relation to the original East Reading MRT Planning Application.	

Source of comment	Stakeholder	EIA Discipline	Comment	Response
Various – including RBC and WBC ecological representatives, BBOWT, the Environment Agency, other interest groups and individuals	PBA	Ecology	During the public consultation period for the existing planning application (hereafter referred to as ‘the 2017 Planning Application (Refs: 171108 and 172048)’), comments were received from the sources identified.	An overarching Ecology and Landscape Consultation Response was produced, with further specific information provided to the Environment Agency (PBA, 2017). The scheme as then revised in light of these comments (i.e. during the addendum). Note – this was undertaken in relation to the East Reading MRT Addendum.
WA/2017/124095/01-L01, response to RBC application reference 171108, dated 21 st September 2017	EA	Hydrology	<i>“The proposed development will result in a loss of floodplain storage and will impede flood flow within the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100) within an appropriate allowance for climate change flood extent.”</i>	Flood compensation exercises have been completed for the Application Site which the EA considered sufficient to evidence that flood storage will not be lost as a result of the Proposed Development – see Appendix F.110 (Appendix C – PBA Drawings) and summary of EA letter reference WA/2017/124095/03-L01 (below). Post-development modelling has also been completed to represent flow routes and flood depths in a post-development scenario, including appropriate allowances for climate change. This was confirmed to be sufficient and is summarised below for EA letter WA/2018/124754/01-L01 (below).
WA/2017/124379/02-L01, response to WBC application reference 172048, dated 06 th December 2017	EA	Hydrology and Flood Risk	<i>“The proposed development will result in a loss of floodplain storage and will impede flood flow within the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) (1 in 100) within an appropriate allowance for climate change flood extent.”</i>	Noted. Comment is consistent with above, and therefore response for above remains applicable.
WA/2018/124754/01/L01, response to PBA, dated 06 th February 2018	EA	Hydrology and Flood Risk	<i>“Having reviewed technical note CBH/28701/SM/RMF dated January 15th 2018...we consider that this information is sufficient to address the points raised in our objection letter dated 6 December 2017.”</i>	Noted. Information from the aforementioned technical note has been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development.
			<i>“It is suggested in the note that minor amendments to the proposed ground level</i>	Noted. Minor amendments have been made to the flood compensation scheme for the east landing

Source of comment	Stakeholder	EIA Discipline	Comment	Response
			<i>changes could be addressed at a later stage in the planning process. We would be willing to disc with the LPA [Local Planning Authority] a suitably worded planning condition to allow this to be achieved."</i>	since February 2018, providing further net gain in floodplain storage. See drawing 28791-4001-011-C in Appendix F.1 (Appendix C – PBA Drawings).
			<i>"The level of detail provided to demonstrate post scheme flood flows is considered sufficient to address our second outstanding point of flood risk objection."</i>	Noted. The post-development modelling has continued to be used to inform the Proposed Development.
WA/2017/124095/03-L01, response to RBC application reference 171108 (ES Addendum), dated 13 th June 2018	EA	Hydrology and Flood Risk	<i>"The Environment Agency accepts in principle that there is scope to deliver the flood compensation proposed within the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (FRA) (version 2, April 2018) as included in Appendix 4.1 in the Environmental Statement Addendum (version 2, April 2018). We are satisfied with the revised details and consider that any further detail in relation to flood risk can be adequately dealt with via appropriate planning conditions. This will include approval at the detail design stage although we are satisfied with the principles in the FRA and FRA Addendum. We are now able to remove our objection on the basis of flood risk."</i>	Noted. The Proposed Development is consistent with that approved by the EA.
			<i>"We find the current proposal for the marginal shelf acceptable as it will allow for the safe construction of the three mooring platforms, however this is on the proviso that the existing failing mooring section at Kennetmouth will be fully repaired as part of the scheme. The detailed finalised design for the shelf and mooring platforms including sizes and dimension will need to be agreed."</i>	Noted. The details of the marginal shelf and moorings are consistent with those referenced, and will be finalised at detailed design stage.

Comment Section (of Scoping Report)	Topic of Scoping Report/ ES	Scoping Opinion Comment (comments not included where 'no comments' is provided)	Response
		RBC Scoping Opinion - Planning reference 181542/SCO	
Chapter 1	Introduction	The ES should be clear that the Highway Authority is independent of the applicant (who is Reading BC Highways Department).	This is clarified in Section 1.1 of the ES.
Chapter 1	Introduction	1.1.2 to 1.1.5: The new Reading Local Plan Inquiry has now ended and the Inspector's report is awaited.	Chapter 6 of the ES sets out the planning policy for the Proposed Development, and Section 6.3 clarifies that for the new RBC Local Plan the <i>"inquiry has now ended and publication of the Inspector's report is awaited"</i> .
Chapter 2	Site Description	For the avoidance of doubt, the geographical scope of the ES should include the Wokingham Park and Ride site.	The geographical scope of the ES includes the Wokingham Park and Ride site as clarified in Section 1.13 : <i>"This ES documents the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the East MRT scheme now proposed, in combination with the already permitted Thames Valley Park (TVP) Park & Ride Site (referred to as 'TVP P&R')."</i>
Chapter 2	Planning Policy	Update re: new local plan advised	As above Section 6.3 explains the updated status of the Local Plan.
Chapter 2	Site Description	As with the previous Scoping Report, this appears to be missing mention of the TPO.	Reference to the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and trees which will be retained/ removed is included within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment within Appendix H.4
Chapter 6	Cumulative Effects	6.4.1 and 6.4.13 Cumulative effects: please contact the LPA to discuss any possible developments which may be relevant. RBC officers are not aware of significant developments since the previous Scoping Opinion was issued to advise of.	A list of approved developments was submitted with the scoping report (within Appendix C). We did not identify any further significant developments since the previous Scoping Opinion was issued. Appendix A.10 identifies the approved developments that have been considered in the EIA with regards to likely significant cumulative effects.

Chapter 10	Air Quality	The Council's Environmental Protection (EP) Team advises that the methodology proposed is acceptable, but the ES should take into account updated guidance on air quality, which has been issued since the previous ES (ref. 161515/SCO) for this project. See the EP (air quality) response appended to this letter. As there have been changes to technical data and guidance since the previous environmental statement, the impact of the development on air quality should be reassessed.	Chapter 10 contains the Air Quality Assessment for the Proposed Development. The Assessment accords with the requirements set out including updating the assessment with the latest emission factors, background concentrations, and traffic data.
Chapter 13	Landscape and Visual	Landscape and Visual section of the ES should include an update in terms of the redesign/additional mitigating landscaping. Whilst not technically required, good-quality rendered views would be advisable for inclusion in the ES.	Section 3.4 (Design Evolution) explains the reasonable alternative designs options considered and sets out the preferred design option. Planters have been selected as the preferred option. Chapter 13 contains the Landscape and Visual (including Lighting) assessment which assess the likely significant effects of the proposed development including the revised mitigation. The Design and Access Statement, and Appendix A.3 of the ES, includes rendered views of the Proposed Development. Further rendered views will be provided following the submission of the Planning Application.
Chapter 14	Ecology	I attach below the detailed comments from the Council's retained Ecologist. Re: Consultation on an Application 181542 - MRT Bus Route - Scoping Opinion The scoping document appears have scoped out numerous potential impacts at an early stage and is appears to be playing down what will be a very damaging scheme. I feel an updated report should be submitted that clearly sets out the likely scope of the environmental impacts of the scheme. Two key bullet points are provided below:	The comments received are addressed in Section 14.4 of the ES, and further in Appendix A.9 in the consultation tracker. No sites designated for breeding birds have been identified within the vicinity of the Application Site, nor have habitats likely to be of value to a notable assemblage of breeding birds (see Section 14.5 for further information on the baseline conditions). The existing baseline information on birds at the Application Site is considered sufficient to inform the ecological baseline and assessment of likely significant effects; further surveys are not considered necessary.

		• No breeding bird surveys have been undertaken despite previous requests • The statement that there will be no adverse impact on Habitats of Principal Importance (Table 14.3 summary of residual effects) is untrue. The proposals will result in the loss of a large area of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland which is a "Habitats of Principal Importance".	Given that the majority of the area designated as HPI 'Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland' is located within The Coal, Kennetmouth and Kings Meadow East LWS, the assessment for The Coal, Kennetmouth and Kings Meadow East LWS takes in to account this habitat type where covering the same extent (see Section 14.7: The Coal, Kennetmouth and Kings Meadow East LWS). Where this HPI is identified to be located on-site but out with The Coal, Kennetmouth and Kings Meadow East LWS, further consideration is made within Section 14.7: Habitats of Principal Importance.
Chapter 15	Noise and Vibration	The EP Team has confirmed that they are content for noise to be excluded from the ES on the basis of the information in the scoping report and I confirm this, providing that any impacts on wildlife are covered in Chapter 14	No response necessary.
Chapter 15	Cultural Heritage	Regarding cultural heritage, the statement at 15.3.9 that the settings of the Listed Bridges will not be affected is not accepted and accordingly, this should be assessed in the ES.	Archaeology and Built Heritage is addressed in Section 15.1 , including consideration of the Listed Grade II Listed Railway Bridge and attached Accommodation Bridge that lie immediately to the south of the Application Site.
		WBC Scoping Opinion - Application Number: 182448	
Chapter 13	Landscape and Visual	WBC Tree and Landscape: The Landscape and Visual section of the EIA Scoping Report makes reference to a number of views in Table 13.2 that will be scoped out as part of the revised visual impact assessment. It would have been really helpful to have the viewpoints provided as an appendix to the Scoping Report. I understand why certain views will be scoped out especially as there was no view of the proposal due to intervening built development or vegetation, however I would still prefer for Views VP1 & VP7 retained as part of the new assessment.	The locations of representative viewpoints for the visual impact assessment are set out in Section 2 of Appendix H.1, LVIA Methodology and shown on Figure 12.2, Appendix H.6. Viewpoints scoped out of the assessment (including VP1 and VP7) and the rationale for scoping out is included in Section 2.3 of Appendix H.1. The previous LVIA identified the visual effects at VP1 and VP7 as not significant. Section 3.4 (Design Evolution) explains the reasonable alternative designs options that have been considered and sets out the preferred design option and the rationale. Planters have been selected as the preferred option. Planters

		Paragraph 13.4.6 (and Section 1.1) refers to a design review to consider other options for the structure. This is welcomed, as the design of the viaduct in relation to the surrounding landscape is a fundamental issue that will need to be explored and request that further thought is given to including extensive planting as part of the bridge structure. The use of planters on the bridge could possibly work only if they are substantial in size, otherwise they will have little effect. Green pigment in the concrete is like to be more visual prominent rather than less, and suggest that as part of the redesign of the bridge, other materials could be incorporated to reduce the amount of concrete visible from the Thames side of the structure.	have been selected as the preferred option, as this would correspond with the proposed approach of a 'living green wall' at the TVP P&R development and would provide 'greening' of the upper level of the viaduct for local views from the Thames Path and river.
--	--	--	---