



**Appendix E: Final Review Report – October 2015 Response**

**Response to the Interim  
Review of the ES for  
The Goodsyard**

**Prepared for:  
Bishopsgate Goodsyard  
Regeneration Ltd**

**October 2015**

**REVISION SCHEDULE**

Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed and Approved by
1		Final Version	James Sanders	James Sanders

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
1 Introduction and purpose .....	2
2 LUC/ Cascade REVIEW OF the ES for The Goodsyard - interim report .....	2
2.1 Review of the July 2015 ES .....	2
3 Conclusions .....	46
Appendix A - Revised text (not highlighted) in the July 2015 ES	

1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	
2 LUC/ CASCADE REVIEW OF THE ES FOR THE GOODSYARD - INTERIM REPORT	
2.1 Review of the July 2014 ES and the revised 2015 ES	

This response has been prepared on behalf of Bishopsgate Goodsyard Regeneration Ltd (the Applicant), for the Goodsyard (Application Ref. PA/14/02011 and 2014/2425). The London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) and the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) have commissioned Land Use Consultants (LUC) in association with Cascade Consulting and Delva Patman Redler to undertake a review of the Environmental Statement (ES) (submitted in July 2014) and the revised ES (submitted in July 2015) for the development.

The purpose of this document is to provide information and evidence to clarify and / or verify information in the ES and should be read alongside the ES.

LUC and Cascade Consulting and Delva Patman Redler (DPR) were commissioned by LBTH and LBH to provide a review of the ES for the Goodsyard development.

The review was undertaken using a criteria based approach, developed by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (Ref. 1) together with the scope of the EIA in relation to the requirements set out in the LBTH Scoping Opinion (LBTH EIA Scoping Opinion issued on 20 March 2014) (Ref. 2).

The LUC/ Cascade / DPR Final Review Report (FRR) provides a draft list of clarifications and potential Regulation 22 requests required from the Applicant. These are detailed in Table 23.1 'Assessment of Submitted Regulation 22 / Clarification Information' of the FRR. AECOM has provided a response to each of the clarification points / potential Regulation 22 requests in corresponding order with the responses in Table 23.1 of FRR. These have been presented within Table 1.

It should be noted that we consider all of the points identified within Table 23.1 of the FRR as 'Potential Regulation 22 Requests' to be clarification of information, as this information has either been provided elsewhere within the ES and associated appendices or cannot be considered to be 'substantive' in line with the definition presented within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2015), and therefore not Regulation 22 information.

However there are a number of instances where we consider for the sake of clarity, that there would be benefit in presenting this information within an addendum document. Where this is the case this has been highlighted as part of the response below.

Table1: EIA Team Response to LUC/ Cascade Draft Clarification Points/ Regulation 22 Requests

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response																				
1. Introduction	N/a	N/a	N/a																				
2. Regulatory Compliance	N/a	N/a	N/a																				
<b>3. EIA Content and Influence (Chapters 1, 2, 3 &amp; 4)</b>																							
3.1	N/a	The mix for the detailed element of the proposed development should be provided (and the LDS).	<p>We do not consider this to be Regulation 22 information as it has been previously provided. The following tables identify the unit mix for the detailed elements of the Proposed Development which was provided in Table 4.2 of <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 4 – The Proposed Development</i> and <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices - Appendix M – Development Specification</i>. The Limited Development Scenario (LDS) mix and tenure was provided within Table 2 of <i>ES Volume III – Technical Appendices – Appendix K - The Limited Development Scenario (LDS)</i>.</p> <p>For clarification this information has been provided in the tables below.</p> <p>Building C, F and G apply to the whole development and Building C only applies to the LDS.</p> <p><u>Building C</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Size</th> <th>Social</th> <th>Intermediate</th> <th>Market</th> <th>Number of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Studio</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>64</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>9</td> <td>111</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>133</td> <td>133</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units	Studio	0	0	64	64	1-bed	0	9	111	120	2-bed	0	0	133	133
Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units																			
Studio	0	0	64	64																			
1-bed	0	9	111	120																			
2-bed	0	0	133	133																			

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response																																																																																
			<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>3-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>36</td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>9</b></td> <td><b>349</b></td> <td><b>358</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Building F</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Size</th> <th>Social</th> <th>Intermediate</th> <th>Market</th> <th>Number of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Studio</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>31</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>136</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>126</td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3+-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>29</td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>322</b></td> <td><b>322</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Building G</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Unit Size</th> <th>Social</th> <th>Intermediate</th> <th>Market</th> <th>Number of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Studio</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>110</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>102</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3+-bed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>22</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>260</b></td> <td><b>260</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For clarification purposes in line with paragraph 2.1.5 above this information will also be presented in an ES addendum document to follow this submission.</p>	3-bed	0	0	36	36	4-bed	0	0	5	5	5-bed	0	0	0	0	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>358</b>	Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units	Studio	0	0	31	31	1-bed	0	0	136	136	2-bed	0	0	126	126	3+-bed	0	0	29	29	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>322</b>	Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units	Studio	0	0	26	26	1-bed	0	0	110	110	2-bed	0	0	102	102	3+-bed	0	0	22	22	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>260</b>
3-bed	0	0	36	36																																																																															
4-bed	0	0	5	5																																																																															
5-bed	0	0	0	0																																																																															
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>358</b>																																																																															
Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units																																																																															
Studio	0	0	31	31																																																																															
1-bed	0	0	136	136																																																																															
2-bed	0	0	126	126																																																																															
3+-bed	0	0	29	29																																																																															
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>322</b>																																																																															
Unit Size	Social	Intermediate	Market	Number of units																																																																															
Studio	0	0	26	26																																																																															
1-bed	0	0	110	110																																																																															
2-bed	0	0	102	102																																																																															
3+-bed	0	0	22	22																																																																															
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>260</b>																																																																															

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
3.2	N/a	An explanation should be provided as to how the indicative masterplan has been used as part of the assessment.	<p>The following information has been provided in explanation to how the masterplan was used within the assessment. This does not alter the assessment undertaken or provide any new information and therefore it is considered to be clarification.</p> <p>The masterplan is indicative and has not been assessed. The parameters of the outline element of the Proposed Development and the application drawings for the detailed element of the Proposed Development have been assessed. However, the masterplan has been used to provide context for the assessments providing an example of how the public realm, and landscaping could work around the site. This has been used to provide indicative figures for areas of green space both public and private and play space areas which have been taken into account when considering the socio economic and ecological impacts of the scheme.</p>
3.3	Clarification is sought over the distance of the protection zone around the London Overground and the Central Line.	N/a	<p>The Protection zone to London Overground is 2m clear to the sides and over the top of the viaduct box and station box.</p> <p>Exclusion zone to Central Line is London Underground Limited (LUL) standard of 3m to the side of the tunnel and 6m above the crown of the tunnel.</p>
3.4	Clarification is sought as to the difference between category A and B fit outs.	N/a	<p>Category A fit out generally described the level of fit out that the tenants' own space is completed to by the developer. This may include; raised floors and suspended ceilings, distribution of mechanical and electrical services, internal surface finishes and blinds.</p> <p>Category B office fit out is specific for the occupiers' needs and typically includes cellularisation into bespoke rooms, creation of specialist rooms such as data hubs etc where power and air conditioning requirements are in addition to the normal office</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			environment.
4. EIA Presentation	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>5. Review of Chapter 5: Demolition and Construction</b>			
5.1	N/a	Further information is required on how the worst case scenario has been assessed with respect to the phasing of the demolition/construction works, and how any deviations from the phasing programme will be captured (this also applies to the LDS).	<p>The phasing plan for the development has been compiled with the most realistic approach to the construction of the Proposed Development, assuming the construction of Buildings A, B, F and G although marginally staggered to be occurring simultaneously as presented in <i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 5 - Demolition and Construction - Figure 5.1 – Indicative Demolition and Construction Programme</i>, therefore providing the worst case scenario (i.e. the highest number of vehicle movements) for construction impacts.</p> <p>With regard to the LDS the phasing plan assumes that Buildings D, E and Plot I and J as presented in <i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 5 - Demolition and Construction - Figure 5.1 – Indicative Demolition and Construction Programme</i> will also be constructed in close progression which is understood to be the most realistic assumption to the phasing and also provides the worst case scenario with regard to the construction impacts.</p> <p>Any deviation to the phasing program would not alter the worst-case scenario as presented and as assessed within the main ES and the LDS. This information is considered to be clarification given that all of the information above has been provided in the main ES and LDS it does not therefore fall within the classification of Regulation 22 information.</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response																																															
5.2	N/a	Further information is required as to how the indicative routes for demolition and construction traffic have been identified (e.g. advice from transport consultants), and therefore ensure the worst case scenario has been assessed.	<p>The indicative routes for demolition and construction traffic were developed by the transport consultants WSP, taking into account their understanding of the local area, the background traffic levels and the most appropriate and conceivable routes into and out of the site for each particular construction phase of the individual plots. This is explained in <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix G Traffic Assessment</i></p> <p>Please see paragraphs 16.6.1 – 16.6.3 &amp; Table 16.1 from <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix G Traffic Assessment</i> identifying the effect on the local highway network, which for convenience have been reproduced below:</p> <p><i>“16.6.1 - The table below summarises a worst-case assessment regarding the effect of HGV vehicular movements on the adjacent highway network during excavation/demolition (expected to be the most intense activities). During all other construction phases, vehicular flows are generally a third, or less, than such peak activity periods.</i></p> <p><b>Table 16.1: HGV Vehicular Movements</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Link</th> <th colspan="6">Two-way Traffic Flow</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="3">Weekday AM Peak</th> <th colspan="3">Weekday PM Peak</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total Existing Traffic Flow</th> <th>Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic</th> <th>% Increase</th> <th>Total Existing Traffic Flow</th> <th>Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic</th> <th>% Increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bethnal Green Road</td> <td>1079</td> <td>12</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>1009</td> <td>12</td> <td>1.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sclater Street</td> <td>189</td> <td>12</td> <td>6.3%</td> <td>158</td> <td>12</td> <td>7.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Street</td> <td>1843</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.7%</td> <td>1451</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street</td> <td>1090</td> <td>12</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>1045</td> <td>12</td> <td>1.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>16.6.2 - It is predicted that the percentage change in vehicular flow with demolition</i></p>	Link	Two-way Traffic Flow						Weekday AM Peak			Weekday PM Peak			Total Existing Traffic Flow	Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic	% Increase	Total Existing Traffic Flow	Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic	% Increase	Bethnal Green Road	1079	12	1.1%	1009	12	1.2%	Sclater Street	189	12	6.3%	158	12	7.6%	Commercial Street	1843	12	0.7%	1451	12	0.8%	Shoreditch High Street	1090	12	1.1%	1045	12	1.1%
Link	Two-way Traffic Flow																																																	
	Weekday AM Peak				Weekday PM Peak																																													
	Total Existing Traffic Flow	Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic	% Increase	Total Existing Traffic Flow	Predicted HGV Demolition Traffic	% Increase																																												
Bethnal Green Road	1079	12	1.1%	1009	12	1.2%																																												
Sclater Street	189	12	6.3%	158	12	7.6%																																												
Commercial Street	1843	12	0.7%	1451	12	0.8%																																												
Shoreditch High Street	1090	12	1.1%	1045	12	1.1%																																												

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			<p>and construction traffic will be negligible along Bethnal Green Road, Commercial Street and Shoreditch High Street. The effect of demolition and construction traffic along Sclater Street will only occur during Phase 4, which forms approximately 10% of the density of the whole of the development being proposed. As such, Phase 4 will take place over a shorter time frame and consideration of 12 HGVs to and from the site during peak hour periods is likely to be an overestimation in any event.</p> <p><i>16.6.3 - In summary, the above shows a worst-case scenario which will be limited principally during excavation/demolition phases of the site. During all other construction phases, vehicular flows are generally a third, or less, than such peak activity periods.”</i></p> <p>Taking this information into account the most appropriate and conceivable routes into and out of the site for each particular construction phase of the individual plots were identified based on the estimated traffic numbers, which are (as stated above) likely to be an overestimation and therefore worst-case.</p> <p>This information has already been presented in <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix G Traffic Assessment</i> and briefly within <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 5 - Demolition and Construction</i> paragraphs 5.47 &amp; figures 5.23 &amp; 5.24 and therefore is considered to be clarification of information. It is not therefore Regulation 22 information.</p>
5.3	Paragraphs 5.53 to 5.61 consider traffic movements and this is considered to be acceptable. However, it is noted that paragraph 5.55 refers to	N/a	<p><i>ES Volume I: Chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction</i> Paragraph 5.5 refers to peak vehicle movements of 102 vehicles per day in 2022/2023 when Plots A, B, F and G are in construction. This is a typographical error and should have read 100 vehicles movements as described within <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 9 Traffic and Transport</i> paragraph 9.112 and within the <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix G Traffic Assessment</i>. This typographical error does not alter the assessment, findings or</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	peak vehicle movements of 102 vehicles per day in 2022/2023 when Plots A, B, F and G are in construction. This is inconsistent with paragraph 9.112 of ES Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport which refers to a peak of 100 movements per day in 2023 when plots A, B, F and G are in construction.		the conclusions set out within the ES.
5.4	There are a number of changes to the text of Chapter 5 that have not been highlighted in green (as stipulated in the Preface) and could therefore be missed, some of which have the potential to affect the evaluation of significance presented within the ES – such as an increase in the length of the construction programme (Chapter 5 - paragraph 5.5). Confirmation from the applicant should therefore be sought on what text has been updated within the	N/a	<p><i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 5 – Demolition and Construction</i> paragraph 5.5 should have been highlighted in green to identify the change in construction programme though this is correctly identified both in this chapter and throughout the rest of the ES.</p> <p>We can confirm that all of the additional information (not just text highlighted in green) has been reviewed for each topic and the relevant assessments updated in line with the revisions.</p> <p>Appendix A – Table 1 of this document provides a list of all of the paragraphs that were not highlighted in green in the main ES (as amended).</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	Revised ES as a result of the amendments, and that all the additional information (not just text highlighted in green) has been reviewed for each topic and the relevant assessments updated.		
5.5	N/a	The development now includes Plot K, development of a building for commercial use over the London Overground. However, very little additional detail has been provided about how this building will be constructed, other than in paragraph 5.20. Given the constraints of working over the operational railway and its location adjacent to protected heritage assets associated with the railway, further construction information specific to the additional building in Plot K is required to determine the potential effects of constructing the new building, including the deck over the railway. Provision of this information, along with updated topic assessments taking the information into account is considered to be a	<p>The mainline tracks from Liverpool Street station pass through the site from east to west, in a cutting approximately twenty-two metres wide, adjacent to Quaker Street. To the north of the mainline tracks, separated by an existing ramp structure, the twin tracks of the Suburban lines pass through the site from west to east. These are enclosed by a two storey brick and jack arch structure with further non-listed brick arches extending at the upper level.</p> <p>Bishopsgate Goodsyard Regeneration Ltd has air rights to build over the section of the railway cutting which runs between Commercial Road and Wheler Street.</p> <p>The proposed works comprise the construction of a permanent deck over the cutting from which the building will be constructed. Either side of the cutting will be piled to provide the foundations for the structural grid that will span the railway. Only non-listed elements of the existing site features will be removed. Listed elements will be clearly marked and protection barriers erected. A tower crane will be located to the north of the cutting once the permanent deck is in place, this will be used to erect the frame and place the cladding to the building in position.</p> <p>A component lead approach will be taken to the design and construction of the building to facilitate accurate construction and minimise rework in this sensitive</p>



ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
		Regulation 22 request.	location. The appropriate asset protection process will be followed with Network Rail. This form of air-rights development is carried out through-out London, it is a familiar process to Network Rail who are safeguarded by their asset protection process and development agreements. The information above although not explicitly stated within the ES was considered during the each of the technical assessments consideration of the demolition and construction effects of Plot K, and therefore this is considered to be a clarification of information. This information will also be presented in an ES addendum document to follow this submission. Further assessment associated with the construction of Plot K will be provided at reserved matters stage once detailed design has been undertaken.
5.6	Table 5.5 includes details of the plant and equipment to be used. Confirmation is sought to confirm whether the assessment has assumed a percussive or rotary piling method is likely to be used.	N/a	Please refer to <i>ES Volume 1 - Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</i> , which identifies a detailed noise assessment looking specifically at construction noise at the identified receptors, a range of piling methods are presented though rotary / auguring piling method will most likely be used.
<b>6. Review of Chapter 6: Waste and Recycling</b>			
6.1	N/a	Additional information is required to understand how the maximum parameter has been determined for the residential waste generation (this also applies to the LDS).	This application has outline and detailed components. With regards to the residential maximum and minimum parameters, the maximum parameters detail the maximum number of residential units to be provided by the Proposed Development (1,356 residential units) and in contrast, the minimum parameters detail the minimum

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			number of residential units to be provided by the Proposed Development (1,257 residential units). For the purpose of the waste and recycling assessment, maximum parameters have been used in the calculation of the residential waste arisings from the outline component of the Proposed Development, so as to provide a worst case approach. This approach also allows for greater flexibility within the Proposed Development to accommodate any changes in design sensitivity between maximum and minimum parameters. In order to calculate residential waste generation, a bespoke methodology was agreed with the LBH and the LBTH Waste Officers. This methodology provides a greater storage allocation than that of British Standards 5906 2005 Waste Management in Buildings, Code of Practice (BS5906:2005). It should be noted that the LBH have updated their waste storage calculation guidance since the agreement of the bespoke methodology. The waste storage requirements for the Proposed Development were re-calculated using this methodology in order to determine whether this provides for a greater or reduced waste storage requirements. It was determined that the bespoke methodology provides for greater storage requirements than the updated LBH storage requirements. Therefore the bespoke methodology (agreed with the council, and that was used within the Waste and Recycling ES Chapter) still provides for a worst case scenario when considering waste storage requirements. This explanation simply clarifies the details of the assessment and does not provide any new environmental information therefore is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
6.2	N/a	Further information is required as to how commercial waste floorspace relates back to the components in the Development Specification and how this has been used in the calculations (this also applies to the LDS).	<p>In order to calculate commercial floorspace, a breakdown of the individual retail units was provided by the architects. This breakdown was appended to the ES (please refer to <i>Volume III: Technical Appendices - Technical Appendix L - Waste</i> of the ES).</p> <p>The corresponding land use classes were obtained from the 'Retail Plan' (drawing number: AL (9)200 revision D, and AL(9)100 revision G) which detailed each commercial unit and its associated land use class i.e. A1 (which was calculated based on A1 land use class), and flexible A1/A2/A3 and D2 (which was calculated based on A3 land use class in order to provide a worst case scenario) and A3 land use class (which was calculated based on A3 land use class).</p> <p>This information clarifies how the assessment was undertaken for both the main assessment and the LDS and therefore is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.</p>
6.3	As in the previous ES, there is no current on-site waste arisings estimate, although this is assumed to be minimal (paragraph 6.79). However, paragraph 6.135 states that operational waste 'equates to 5,729 tonnes per year, which represents an increase from baseline conditions in the order of 1,000 tonnes'. These two statements appear contradictory	N/a	<p><u>Baseline Conditions</u></p> <p>The site is currently occupied by the new Shoreditch High Street Station on the London Overground. In the north of the site, adjacent to Bethnal Green Road, are number of 'Power League' temporary football pitches and the temporary 'Box Park' Shopping Mall, comprising of shops and cafes in refurbished shipping containers.</p> <p>As such the site is currently anticipated to produce a minimal amount of waste.</p> <p>Although in reality current occupiers will produce small amounts of waste, working on the assumption that there is currently no waste produced by the site will allow a worst case scenario of the magnitude of change to be presented: assuming the current waste generated at the site is zero tonnes per annum allows for the maximum</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	and should be clarified.		<p>uplift in waste arisings when comparing against the predicted operational waste arisings. Therefore this allows for a worst case scenario; if the projected waste arising from the Proposed Development was compared against the predicted waste generated from the current occupiers of the site (as opposed to assuming there is zero waste produced), there would not be such a large uplift, therefore the magnitude of change may not be as large. This would not be a worst case scenario. Further to this, the predictions of waste arising from the existing commercial units on-site would be an estimate only, and may be either an over-estimate, or an under-estimate. Should a waste audit be carried out on these current commercial units, the data may be inaccurate due to seasonal fluctuations in waste arisings, and the number, type and size of units currently on-site. Therefore, by assuming that no waste is currently generated on-site, this not only provides a worst-case scenario, but is the most reliable methodology as no inaccuracies may be predicted.</p> <p><u>Proposed Development</u></p> <p>The estimated tonnes of waste generated per year as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development equates to approximately 5,729 tonnes.</p> <p>When comparing the projected waste generation of the Proposed Development against that of the baseline conditions, it can be concluded that there is an increase of 5,729 tonnes. This can be considered to be of negligible significance please refer to Table 6-5 of <i>ES Volume 1 – Chapter 6: Waste and Recycling</i> for further detail relating to the factors used for assessing the magnitude of change.</p> <p>Therefore, the ES chapter provides a worst case scenario in assessing the magnitude of change due to the Proposed Development, as the estimated quantity of waste generated by the Proposed Development is compared against zero tonnes of baseline</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
			waste.
<b>7. Review of Chapter 7: Socio- Economics</b>	Applicant to confirm why the range of geographic data including ward, super output areas and postcode has been excluded from the baseline information.	N/a	The baseline assessment was made based on publically available information from published sources such as ONS.  The baseline presented data at a borough, Greater London, and England level as a complete set of data was available for all aspects of the baseline assessment at these three geographical levels.  A complete set of data for each component of the baseline assessment was not available at ward, super output, or postcode level, and therefore the use of these statistics would not have been uniform across each of the components of the baseline. To ensure clarity within the baseline section, it was therefore considered appropriate to present a consistent set of data at Borough level.
<b>7.2</b>	The Applicant is to confirm why mitigation of the effects on healthcare through the provision of offsite provision or financial contribution has not been provided for both the Proposed and Limited Development Scenarios.	N/a	No offsite mitigation has been proposed for healthcare as the Proposed Development will include floorspace to accommodate a healthcare facility that has the capacity for two GPs.  The service has a planned staffing level of 1FTE GP which will help to mitigate any additional pressure surrounding GP surgeries may be placed under as a result of the Proposed Development. Therefore, any additional offsite contribution is not considered to be required.
<b>7.3</b>	The Applicant is to confirm why their assessment of effects on health during the operation of the Limited Development	N/a	The Proposed Development will include floorspace to accommodate a healthcare facility that has the capacity for two GPs. The service has a planned staffing level of 1FTE GP, with the potential for a further GP to be accommodated in the future.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
	Scenario is only based on the provision of one additional GP when provision within the Proposed and Limited Development Scenarios includes floorspace for two GPs.		The applicant has provided floorspace to accommodate the healthcare facility and will work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to ensure that 1FTE GP is staffing the facility. It is the responsibility of the CCG to facilitate the employment of additional GPs at the facility.
<b>7.4</b>	Applicant to reconsider the impact on health for the Proposed and Limited Development Scenarios without the implementation of mitigation.	N/a	The ES found a potential long term temporary impact of negligible significance on health. Having reviewed the baseline and impact assessment findings, we conclude that this assessment is correct.  The Proposed Development will accommodate a new healthcare facility and ensure the provision of 1FTE GP to serve the inhabitants on site. This will help to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on existing GP surgeries within the local area through additional demand from new residents, and therefore the overall impact on health is of negligible significance. This is an inherent aspect of the scheme and therefore the assessment has not been considered without it.
<b>7.5</b>	Clarification should be provided on where these figures in Paragraph 7.134 have been taken from.	N/a	Figures in Paragraph 7.134 are presented in NIA as opposed to GIA, as NIA figures are required to perform calculations for operational employment generation (as stated in the cited source documents for these calculations).  The GIA figures, and accompanying NIA figures for the Proposed Development are outlined in ES Chapter 4: The Proposed Development, and it is therefore considered that readers are able to easily cross refer to this chapter should they also require information on the GIA figures.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
7.6	Additional information is required as to how the figures used in the ES have been calculated (in relation to the Development Specification).	N/a	The stated figures are sourced from the applicant’s accommodation schedule. The GIA figures and accompanying NIA figures for the Proposed Development are outlined in ES Chapter 4: The Proposed Development and calculations within Chapter 7 have been based on the figures outlined in the accommodation schedule.
7.7	The applicant needs to provide an explanation of how B and G will be split between LBTH and LBH.	N/a	Buildings B, G and K lay across the borough boundary with LBTH and LBH, therefore when calculating employment associated with retail and office space for these plots the default or GLA method has been used and applied to the whole plot.  This has only been applied when considering these plots, as the plots that fall solely within either LBH or LBTH have had their appropriate borough methodology applied.  With regard to s106 payments, the <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices - Appendix M – Development Specification</i> provides floorspace figures for each borough calculated using the existing borough boundary line. It is assumed that this will be used to calculate any financial contributions to the individual boroughs.  With regard to non-financial obligations this is currently under consideration by the boroughs and will be decided at a later date.
7.8	Clarification is requested on how the applicant has reached the conclusion that the impacts from the proposed development and the LDS are broadly the same.	N/a	Having reviewed the baseline and impact assessment findings for the Proposed Development and LDS, we conclude that this assessment is correct.  While the LDS proposes a smaller quantum of housing, employment and open space, the LDS will still have a range of positive beneficial impacts, including construction and operational employment, delivery of housing and affordable housing, and

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
			provision of open and play space.  The construction of the LDS will result in a considerable improvement in comparison with the baseline situation and is likely to create new benefits for local residents, employees and visitors to the area, as well as those people working and residing at the site. As such, both of the Proposed Development and LDS present beneficial impacts for these factors and can be considered broadly the same.
7.9	Clarification is sought to confirm the correct size for the components making up the private space provision.	N/a	Paragraph 7.184 states:  “ 11,040m <sup>2</sup> of private realm with 4,361 m <sup>2</sup> of private space at ground and park level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 452m<sup>2</sup> private realm attached to ground floor;</li> <li>• 385m<sup>2</sup> private gardens attached to ground floor residential units;</li> <li>• 3,524m<sup>2</sup> roof gardens accessible to residents at the Proposed Development;</li> <li>• 4,053 m<sup>2</sup> commercial garden private space (roof level); and</li> <li>• 2,626 m<sup>2</sup> biodiverse (roof level).”</li> </ul> This was correct at the time of submitting the application (as varied).
7.10	N/a	Applicant to update the assessment of baseline information for healthcare using whole time equivalent GP numbers.	The assessment has been based on GP numbers provided by the local authorities. The terms whole time equivalent (WTE) and full time equivalent (FTE) can be used interchangeably. The chapter describes FTE GPs; however the numbers provided and stated in the chapter are identical to those referring to WTE GPs.  This purely relates to the use of terminology (AECOM use the term FTE as standard, whereas the local authorities use WTE). There is no change to the numbers stated as they describe WTE GP figures, therefore this is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
7.11	The assessment of open space has been updated with revised population information. A total of 80,214m <sup>2</sup> of open space is required to meet residential and employment needs. The proposed development will provide a total of 22,642m <sup>2</sup> of open space, 11,040m <sup>2</sup> of private realm and 4,053 m <sup>2</sup> commercial private space. Paragraph 7.184 provides information on the components which will make up the open and private spaces and their sizes. Clarification is sought to confirm the correct size for the components making up the private space provision as they do not total the overall figure of 11,040m <sup>2</sup> .	N/a	The Proposed Development will include 11,040m <sup>2</sup> of private realm. This consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4,053m<sup>2</sup> commercial private space;</li> <li>• 4,361 m<sup>2</sup> of private space at ground and park level (which consists of 3,524m<sup>2</sup> + 385m<sup>2</sup> +452m<sup>2</sup>); and</li> <li>• 2,626 m<sup>2</sup> biodiverse (roof level).</li> </ul> This was stated in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 7 –Socio-economics</i> paragraph 7.184 and was correct at the time of submitting the application (as varied).
7.12	In line with the original, ES, the Applicant states that “all residual impacts for the Limited Development Scenario have been assessed as being the same as	N/a	Table 17 in <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario</i> and Table 7.44 of <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics</i> are both correct and should not correlate as they are reporting the effects associated with different schemes.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	<i>those for the Proposed Development.</i> ” In Table 17 of Appendix K, the residual effects for health have been identified as being of minor beneficial long term permanent effect at the local level. However, this does not correlate with Table 7-44 in the Revised ES, where they are reported as being negligible beneficial long term temporary effect at the local level. Clarification is sought to confirm the correct conclusion to the effects to the proposed and LDS upon health.		Table 17 <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario</i> refers to the Limited Development Scenario (plots C, D, E, H, I & J) which for the assessment on health includes the provision of a GP surgery, though to cater for a smaller population only associated with the LDS scheme. Therefore it has a corresponding beneficial effect.  Table 7.44 of <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 7 – Socio-Economics</i> refers to the whole development including both the LBTH and LBH elements and therefore the effects are reduced.  Although quantitatively the requirement and provision are of different levels the ultimate residual impacts are the same.
<b>8. Review of Chapter 8: Ground Conditions</b>			
8.1	The origin of the guideline value used for lead, with an updated value to be provided if appropriate.	N/a	The guideline value used for lead was from the Arup Report of 2008, which was reviewed within this ground conditions assessment. The Arup report used a generic commercial screening criteria of 750mg/kg for lead.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
8.2	The criteria to be used for assessing the need for remedial measures for gas in the ground.	N/a	The criteria to be used for assessing ground gas and the need for mitigation / remedial measures is CIRIA C665, Assessing risks posed by hazardous ground gases to buildings (2007).
8.3	An explanation should be provided as to why the future site users are not high sensitivity.	N/a	Future site users would normally be assigned a high sensitivity as shown in Table 8.8, however in this case the actual sensitivity has been considered to be lower due to the end use being commercial / residential without gardens, thus removing potential contamination pathways.
8.4	Confirmation is required that the maximum development basement levels have been assessed with respect to ground conditions.	N/a	The assessment takes into account the maximum basement levels (7.81m AOD or 7m BGL) and the worst case (deepest) scenario for piles.
8.5	Confirmation should be provided that the worst case scenario has been assessed with respect to building foundations.	N/a	WSP can confirm that the worst case scenario has been assessed with regard to the depth, type and size of the foundations.
<b>9. Review of Chapter 9: Traffic and Transportation</b>			

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
9.1	Clarify the Limited Development Scenario's impacts on pedestrian movement and capacity and pedestrian delay.	N/a	Table 27 <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario</i> and Paragraph 164 identifies that the impact of the LDS on Pedestrian movement and capacity can be considered to be of minor adverse significance. Pedestrian delay is identified as a minor adverse impact in paragraph 166 and Table 27 of the LDS. This is correct.
9.2	Paragraph 131 of Appendix K should be revised to state "the assessment prepared for the outline and detailed components of the maximum build out scenario..."	N/a	Agreed.
9.3	Paragraph 132 of Appendix K should state figure 9.5, not 9.14.	N/a	Agreed.
9.4	Clarify if the impact recorded in paragraph 144 of Appendix K should be "major and moderate".	N/a	The impact recorded in Paragraph 164 (previously 144) of <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario</i> is accurate and states that the impact is of moderate adverse reduced to minor adverse significance. This is inconsistent with paragraph 158 which should read moderate adverse for the LDS.
9.5	Clarify if paragraph 154 of Appendix K should state "a reduction by 57 two-way rail trips	N/a	This is a typographical error. It should state 'two way rail trips'. It does not alter the assessment, findings or the conclusions set out within the ES.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	compared with the maximum build out scenario”.		
9.6	Chapter 21 should be revised to detail the difference between the proposed development and the Limited Development Scenario as per paragraph 21.23.	N/a	<i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 21 – Summary of the Limited Development Scenario</i> Paragraph 21.25 should state that the impact is of moderate adverse reduced to minor adverse significance.
9.7	N/a	Provide the impact of operational trips as a percentage increase over the baseline and an assessment of operational traffic impacts on junction capacity.	<p>As stated in <i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 9 -Traffic and Transport</i> paragraph 9.212 of the 2015 updated ES, the percentage change in vehicular flow with demolition and construction traffic is negligible on adjacent roads Bethnal Green Road, Commercial Road and Shoreditch High Street. Specifically the impact on these links, including Sclater Street, is below 10% which is classified as a negligible impact based on IEMA guidance for significance. On the basis of this evidence it is not considered necessary to assess junction capacity.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 9.212 notes that the effect of demolition and construction vehicles on Sclater Street will only occur during Phase 4, which takes place over a shorter time frame, and the forecast of 10 HGVs is likely to be an overestimation in any event. It is also noted that the number of demolition and construction vehicles generated by the development is less than the forecasted operational traffic flow, the TA assessment for which concluded no requirement for junction capacity assessments.</p> <p>The 2015 update to the ES included percentage change in Proposed Development related traffic flows by arm at four key junctions compared with the baseline (Tables 9-47 to 9-50). The greatest percentage change was forecast during the AM peak on</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			<p>the Sclater Street arm of the Bethnal Green Road / Sclater Street junction. The forecast net change on the Sclater street arm is an additional 22 two-way vehicles, equivalent to a single vehicle every two minutes and is therefore considered a negligible impact on traffic flow and junction capacity.</p> <p>The ES acknowledges that Shoreditch High Street experiences congestion, in particular at its signal controlled junction with Commercial Street/Great Eastern Street, at which location the greatest need for improvement to the existing junction is for pedestrian movement. The 2015 update to the ES made reference to the ‘Shoreditch Triangle Project’ and the improvements it is expected to provide at the junction and the wider area. The Project is under design development, and the ES notes the Applicant’s commitment to supporting the delivery of pedestrian and cycle improvements at local junctions as a contribution to the wider TfL/LBH agreed scheme. With these forthcoming improvements to the junction, and probable changes to the junction layout, it is not considered possible or appropriate to provide a detailed assessment of junction capacity. For the purpose of the TA it has been agreed with TfL and the Boroughs that junction capacity assessments are not required.</p> <p>This information clarifies the approach taken which is in line with both IEMA guidance and the method agreed with TfL, reiterating information that has already been presented and therefore is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.</p>
9.8	N/a	Provide an assessment of the operational development’s impacts on water transport.	Similarly to the reference in <i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 9 -Traffic and Transport</i> paragraph 9.216 regarding water transport for construction access, there is no practical opportunity for future residents, staff and visitors to use the River Thames to access the Site due to its distance from the nearest pier (2km+ walk distance) and it was

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
			therefore scoped out (in agreement with LBTH and LBH) of the assessment.  This information was scoped out of the assessment as it was not considered to be required accordingly no information will be provided which could be considered to be Regulation 22 information.
9.9	N/a	Provide the significance of effect of HGV movements on Sclater Street.	This relates to <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 9 -Traffic and Transport</i> paragraph 9.212 in the 2015 updated ES. The paragraph discusses the effect on Sclater Street noting that the forecast represents a worst-case scenario and the impact on Sclater Street would be limited to Phase 4 only which is over a shorter time compared to the other phases. In addition the percentage change is less than 10% as stated in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 9 – Traffic and Transport</i> paragraph 9.214 and is therefore categorised as negligible based on the IEMA guidance on significance. On this basis the impact is considered to be negligible. Although the impact was not explicitly stated here it was taken into consideration for the overall residual effect and therefore this is considered to be clarification of information and not Regulation 22.
9.10	N/a	The assumptions used to generate the population yield should be confirmed to ensure that the worst case scenario has been assessed with respect to traffic generation.	It is considered neither relevant nor appropriate to consider population yield for the purpose of peak hour trip generation assessments. The trip generation assessment for the whole of the Proposed Development follows best practice in line with TfL and the borough's guidance. In summary, the trip generation of the Proposed Development has been forecast using the TRICS and TRAVL databases, and supplemented with comparable surveys undertaken by independent companies for identified peak hour periods. Selected survey data was based on sites with comparable locations, PTAL rating, size, parking ratio, and tenure and unit mix (for residential). The trip generation methodology for the whole of the Proposed Development was agreed as part of pre-application scoping discussions with TfL and

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyrd EIA Team Response
			the boroughs. The trip generation assessment has been agreed for the purpose of the TA and furthermore it considers the Maximum Build Out scenario and is therefore robust.  This information clarifies the approach taken which is in line with best practice of both TfL and borough's guidance and the agreed method with TfL and therefore is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.
9.11	N/a	The Limited Development Scenario should provide the information requested as set out in paragraph 9.15 of this Report.	The assessment methodology, effect significance criteria and baseline conditions applied to the LDS remain as per <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 9 -Traffic and Transport</i> Chapter 9 of the revised ES. This information was stated in Chapter 9 and referenced within the LDS it was therefore not felt necessary to re-provide information. This request is not considered to be Regulation 22 information as the required information has already been stated and adequately referenced.
9.12	N/a	Paragraphs 9.61 and 9.189 set out the revised maximum build out. Below is a comparison between paragraph 9.61 and paragraph 4.10 of The Proposed Development Chapter:  It is unclear why the above two paragraphs differ. Confirmation is sought on which is the correct figure, and that these have been used where required in the assessment.	For clarification purposes both sets of figures are correct.  Paragraph 9.61 and 9.189 accurately reflect the maximum build figures assessed as measured in Gross External Area (GEA).  Paragraph 4.10 accurately reflects the maximum build out Figures in General Internal Area (GIA) as presented in <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices - Appendix M - Development Specification</i> .  This information has been accurately presented and therefore it is not Regulation 22 information.



ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
<b>10. Review of Chapter 10: Wind and Microclimate</b>			
10.1	N/a	Provide model results for configuration with mitigation measures in place so that residual impacts can be verified.	<p>The following mitigation measures have all been tested in the wind tunnel with the 2014 scheme, as shown in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 10 –Wind Microclimate</i> Figure 10-11 to Figure 10-13. It is noted that wind conditions in the presence of the Proposed Development are ‘calmer’ than those recorded for the 2014 scheme. Therefore mitigation developed for the 2014 scheme would be expected to provide a consistent or ‘calmer’ wind environment for the Proposed Development (when compared to the 2015 scheme with mitigation in-situ).</p> <p><i>ES Volume I: Chapter 10 –Wind Microclimate</i> Figure 10-11 to Figure 10-13 show the pre mitigation and post mitigation results for the 2014 scheme to demonstrate the effectiveness of the suggested mitigation measures against ‘windier than desired’ conditions (with respect to pedestrian comfort in relation to the intended use of the Site) and occasional strong winds, as reported in the preceding sections of this chapter, and shows that these wind impacts can be adequately managed. Many of the potential adverse impacts identified and the mitigation measures put forward are located within the outline elements of the scheme (public realm) and therefore their exact location and form will be finalised at detailed design when the subsequent reserved matter applications are submitted.</p> <p>The presentation of results has been clarified and remains as presented within the ES and therefore this is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
10.2	N/a	Update NTS to revise number of configurations tested in wind tunnel model and remove reference to residual minor adverse impact at London Overground thoroughfare.	<p>The correct number of configuration were stated in the NTS as five configurations in Section 10 paragraph 2 of the NTS.</p> <p>With this mitigation applied the residual effect for the London Overground thoroughfare was reduced from Minor Adverse to Negligible. This has not been explicitly stated within the NTS.</p> <p>This information will also be presented in an ES addendum document to follow this submission.</p>
10.3	N/a	Further information should be provided on how the ‘potential entrances’ and other locations for the outline element have been determined to ensure the worst case scenario has been assessed.	<p>Potential entrance locations for the outline element were confirmed in the Ground Floor Master Layout drawing ‘AL(9)1101_A ’ (received by RWDI 12 May, 2015). The locations were identified as the most likely and practical for the outline design. The entrance locations were not chosen on the basis of the worst case scenario for Wind Microclimate as it would not make sense to do this and would be unrealistic. The assessment assesses the ‘Likely Significant’ effects with these locations.</p> <p>The locations will also be subject to change at reserved matters stage at which point the scheme will be reassessed if necessary.</p> <p>This explanation does not alter the assessment undertaken or provide any new information, but clarifies the assessment methodology and therefore it is considered to be clarification and not Regulation 22 information.</p>
10.4	N/a	An additional Configuration was assessed in the wind tunnel: Configuration 5 – Limited Development Scenario Plots C, D, E, H, I, J (Limited Development Scenario) with existing	<p><u>Mitigation during Demolition and Construction</u></p> <p>Mitigation measures identified for construction Configuration 2 (within <i>ES Volume I – Chapter 10: Wind Microclimate</i>) that apply for the Limited Development Scenario are</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
		<p>surrounding buildings. Potential cumulative effects were assessed using professional judgement, informed by results from Configuration 4.</p> <p>Receptor 80 (thoroughfare) is suitable for business walking, and so represents a minor adverse effect during the windiest season. Plot C rooftop terrace receptor 141 and 160 are suitable for leisure walking during the summer, and so signify a moderate adverse effect. Plot D and E rooftop terrace receptors 163, 164, 165 and 167 are suitable for leisure walking, and so represent a moderate adverse effect at terrace level.</p> <p>Receptors 138, 140 and 144 are located within amenity areas at terrace level and experience wind conditions in exceedance of the B6 threshold. Mitigation will be required. B7 is exceeded at receptor 80 (thoroughfare), receptors 141, 160 and 163 (which also exceeded B8), 164, 165 and 167 (amenity spaces of terraces), would also require mitigation. A description of suitable mitigation measures has not been provided, and this</p>	<p>outlined below.</p> <p><u>Detailed Component of the Limited Development Scenario</u></p> <p>The wind microclimate at ground level when Plots C and H are in place is suitable for the intended uses of the site. Private balconies on Plots C were also found to be suitable for their intended use. The only mitigation required at this stage of the overall construction of the Proposed Development is localised shelter for the terrace areas of Plot C.</p> <p>On the podium level of Plot C, the terrace located on the south side of the podium (represented by receptors 140 and 141) is windier than desired in the absence of mitigation. A 2m glazed screen will be implemented on the south edge of the terrace, which has been tested and shown to be effective at creating calmer conditions suitable for a mixture of standing and sitting during the summer (which would be appropriate for a shared amenity space where a variety of activities would be expected to occur). Further beneficial shelter would be provided to seating areas on the terrace in the form of localised porous screens or planting.</p> <p>In a similar way, mitigation has been put forward relating to the roof terraces of Plot C (represented by receptors 153 and 160) to increase the shelter to these areas by increasing the balustrade height (to 1.8m) or adding shrubs of a similar height located around the perimeter of the terraces. Either of these measures would create conditions suitable for at least standing during the summer. Further beneficial shelter could be provided to seating areas on the terrace (in the form of localised porous screens or planting) in order to optimise the usability of these spaces.</p> <p><u>Outline Component of the Limited Development Scenario</u></p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
		<p>should be provided.</p>	<p>The park areas on Plots H, I and J would be suitable for a mix of sitting and standing during the summer, which is considered to be suitable for a large amenity space where a variety of leisure activities are expected to take place. Soft landscaping is planned for this area, which would be expected to provide additional local beneficial shelter, these details will be finalised at reserved matters stage at which point reassessment will take place if necessary.</p> <p>The passage under the London Overground between Plots C and D (receptor 80), will be windier than desired as a result of wind being channelled between the buildings and under the railway line. Overhead porous baffles suspended from the underside of the London Overground at receptor 80 were tested in the wind tunnel and achieved a change from “business walking” to “leisure walking” during the windiest season, together with a reduction in the occurrence of strong winds.</p> <p>The roof terraces of Plots D and E were shown to be relatively windy in the maximum parameter models (receptors 143, 144, 163, 164, 165, 166 and 167), but the terraces were bare, with no screening. A combination of balustrades, screens (localised to seating areas, with a height of at least 1.5m) and soft landscaping will provide beneficial shelter to these areas. An increase in shelter from such mitigation would also be expected to reduce or eliminate the occurrence of strong winds. However, these will need to be reassessed at reserved matters stage for Plots D and E, because the configuration of the buildings will have a significant impact on the wind conditions at the terraces.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Once the Limited Development Scenario is Complete and Occupied</u></p> <p>Configuration 5 (Limited Development Scenario with Existing Surrounds)</p> <p>In the Limited Development Scenario, where only the LBTH plots are present on the</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			<p>site, the windy conditions noted previously in ES Volume I – Chapter 10: Wind Microclimate associated with Plots A, B, F and G no longer occur. The mitigation discussed for the Detailed and Outline Components of the Limited Development Scenario, (as discussed above) will remain appropriate for the completed and operational Limited Development Scenario.</p> <p>The information provided above is to clarify the mitigation measures described for the relevant effects for the LDS. This information was provided for the main assessment as referenced and presented above again for clarification. Therefore this is not considered to be Regulation 22 information.</p>
10.5	Paragraph 208 of the Limited Development Scenario, describes results from Configuration 6 – clarification is required as to whether this is an additional configuration tested in the wind tunnel.	N/a	<p>Five configurations were tested in the wind tunnel in this round of testing. This paragraph should read:</p> <p><i>“For Configuration 5 there are fourteen locations where the wind speed exceeds B6, B7 or B8 on occasion (refer to ES Volume III: Technical Appendices - Appendix H: Wind Microclimate (Table 4)).”</i></p>
11. Review of Chapter 11: Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing N/a (Separate response on Daylight and Sunlight to be provided by GIA)			

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
12. Review of Chapter 12: Air Quality			
12.1	N/a	<p>“Air Quality Neutral” assessment.</p> <p>The AQN results for transport are in compliance with guideline values. However, the AQN results for building emissions are marginal. Further information regarding what emissions controls could be adopted to bring them in line with AQN requirements is sought.</p>	<p>As the Total Benchmarked Building Emissions (BBE) (10,137 kg NOx / annum) are lower than the Total Building Emissions (TBE) (10,312 kg NOx / annum), the building emissions are above the benchmark. However, the TBE are only 1.7% above the BBE, and therefore the exceedence is considered to be within the margins of error of the calculation, and the development can be considered to be neutral in terms of air quality.</p> <p>It has been assessed as being over the benchmark by 5kg NOx. This is a very small margin and deemed insignificant and within the margins of error of the assessment and therefore no further control measures were considered as this is not necessary. The guidance document supporting the AQN calculation suggests financial mitigation. This has been calculated at £145. The client is prepared to pay the financial mitigation calculations if required to do so. In line with the guidance it is not deemed necessary to provide any further reduction in emissions subject to the proposed financial mitigation. This is not therefore considered to be Regulation 22 information.</p>
13. Review of Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration			

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response												
13.1	N/a	There seems to be a difference in the impact descriptions in Table 13.11, referring to 'low medium and high' when compared to the descriptions in Table 13.10. This should be clarified.	<p><i>ES Volume I: Chapter 13 – Noise and Vibration</i> Table 13.10 is referenced directly from Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and contains noise impact terms negligible, small, medium and large. The ES uses impact terms very low, low, medium and high which relate to magnitude of effect in Table 13-12. The scale of impact remains the same per impact table. For clarification, Table 13-10 can be reproduced as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Noise Change Band</th> <th>Magnitude of Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0 dB(A)</td> <td>No change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0.1 – 0.9 dB(A)</td> <td>Negligible (Very Low)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 – 2.9 dB(A)</td> <td>Small (Low)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 – 4.9 dB(A)</td> <td>Medium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 dB(A) or more</td> <td>Large (High)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Noise Change Band	Magnitude of Impact	0 dB(A)	No change	0.1 – 0.9 dB(A)	Negligible (Very Low)	1 – 2.9 dB(A)	Small (Low)	3 – 4.9 dB(A)	Medium	5 dB(A) or more	Large (High)
Noise Change Band	Magnitude of Impact														
0 dB(A)	No change														
0.1 – 0.9 dB(A)	Negligible (Very Low)														
1 – 2.9 dB(A)	Small (Low)														
3 – 4.9 dB(A)	Medium														
5 dB(A) or more	Large (High)														
13.2	N/a	Although criteria are described in 13.79, no further consideration of noise in amenity areas is given. This should be provided (including LDS).	Guidance provided in BS 8233 states an upper guideline value of 55 dB LAeq,T for outdoor amenity areas (e.g. gardens and patios). It is accepted in BS 8233 that achieving guideline values may not be practicable in high noise environments such as that of the Proposed Development so elevated amenity noise levels are acceptable and should not be considered as a factor to prohibit development. Consequently, it is recommended that balconies in the Proposed Development are designed to achieve as low noise level as practicable through screening or building design.												
<b>14. Review of Chapter 14: Water Resources, Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment</b>															

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
14.1	Provide detail regarding proposed water reuse/recycling or rainwater harvesting.	N/a	At this time there are no specific details for water harvesting systems, as this would be developed at the next design phase. However, the intention was to locate rain water harvesting tanks under all blocks, with the reclaimed water used for irrigation purposes. Further to this, the proposal is to install a grey water system to the private blocks (C, D, F & G). The reclaimed grey water would be filtered and used to flush toilets within the apartments.
14.2	Confirmation is required that the maximum development basement levels have been assessed with respect to water resources, drainage and flood risk.	N/a	The assessment takes into account the maximum basement levels (7.81m AOD or 7m BGL) and the worst case (deepest) scenario for piles, which were taken into account when assessing water resources, drainage and flood risk.
14.3	Confirmation should be provided that the worst case scenario has been assessed with respect to building foundations.	N/a	The assessment takes into account the maximum basement levels (7.81m AOD or 7m BGL) and the worst case (deepest) scenario for piles.  WSP can confirm that the worst case scenario has been assessed with regard to the depth, type and size of the foundations.
14.4	The assumptions used to generate the population yield should be confirmed to ensure that the worst case scenario has been assessed with respect to water demand and sewerage	N/a	The population yield of the development has been calculated in line with recognised policy; for LBH this is based on the Wandsworth New Housing Survey figures, and for LBTH based on the LBTH Planning Obligations SPG calculated on the maximum development scenario to provide the highest possible figures and therefore the worst case scenario for water and wastewater demand.  The commercial population has also been calculated using both LBH and LBTH

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	demand.		relevant policy based on the maximum development scenario to provide the highest possible figures and therefore the worst case scenario for water and wastewater demand.
14.5	Confirm that Thames Water has been consulted regarding the water supply network capacity and the wastewater network capacity.	N/a	<p>TWUL have been consulted with regard to water supply and waste capacity of the local network.</p> <p><u>Water Supply</u></p> <p>TWUL have been contacted and briefed about the scheme. A water application depicting the current needs of the scheme has been issued to them for consideration. We are currently awaiting their response.</p> <p>A water main will be provided to serve the private and affordable flats as well as the offices via metered supplies to bulk storage tanks located in Energy Centres 1 and 3 as indicated previously. Booster pumps will distribute potable water to these dwelling's.</p> <p>It is proposed individual water supplies will be provided to all the retail units via their own metered supply direct from the infrastructure water mains (this is subject to confirmation of the water pressure availability from TWUL. Preliminary inquiries indicate that there will be adequate pressure).</p> <p><u>Waste Water</u></p> <p>All below slab and sewer connections will be detailed within the Civil/Structural Engineers reports.</p> <p>It is proposed to connect the foul water systems directly to the infrastructure drainage systems. Separate rainwater and foul water systems will be maintained throughout the building.</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			<p>The design of the foul drainage above ground systems will in accordance with the requirements of BS EN 12056 Gravity drainage systems inside buildings.</p> <p>It is proposed that a system to harvest and collect rainwater for irrigation purposes will be provided to meet Code for Sustainable Homes credit requirements.</p> <p>A detailed network (waste water) capacity assessment is currently being undertaken by TWUL. This assessment should determine the capacity of the local network and the point of connection and will identify any requirement to upgrade the local network.</p> <p>If TWUL determine that there is not capacity within the local sewer network then it will be necessary for works to be undertaken to upgrade it.</p>
<b>15. Review of Chapter 15: Archaeology</b>			
15.1	N/a	An assessment of the potential effects of Plot K on buried heritage assets during construction and demolition has been undertaken in response to the change of development proposed here. The assessment should assess the likely effects of Plot K on previously unrecorded remains dating from the prehistoric to early medieval periods in keeping with the assessment of the other plots.	<p>Due to the proposed construction of Plot K deck above the existing railway line and piled foundation between the railway and Quaker Street coupled with the low potential for prehistoric remains and the low sensitivity it was concluded that this was not relevant with regard to Plot K and was therefore scoped out of the assessment. The other plots have deeper foundations / basements as a result of their construction hence why a greater scope of assessment has been considered.</p> <p>It is not considered justifiable to include this within this part of the assessment just because it has been included elsewhere. This explanation does not alter the assessment undertaken or provide any new information and therefore it is considered to be clarification.</p>
<b>16. Review of Chapter 16: Built Heritage</b>			

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
16.1	There seems to be some discrepancies between the resulting impacts in the assessment and those described in Table 16-1 and paragraph 16.60.	N/a	We have carefully reviewed the assessments that are made regarding the impacts predicted in the construction and operational phases of the development. We are content that the assessments made are consistent and accurate, and they reflect our judgement as historic environment professionals. However, we accept that <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 16 –Built Heritage</i> paragraphs 16.74, 16.75 and 16.81 should conclude an impact concerning the heritage assets in question that is moderate adverse and not minor adverse.
16.2	The assessment does not seem to have followed English Heritage’s advice in the Scoping Opinion with regards to sensitivity of Grade I and II listed buildings.	N/a	The Scoping Opinion set out that ‘English Heritage has previously advised that there should also be no distinction drawn between grade I and II* buildings and grade II buildings. The degree of protection afforded to listed buildings by the legislation does not distinguish between grades and as a national designation all grades should be regarded as ‘high’ importance.  The paragraph referred to (now paragraph 16.54) sets out part of the general approach to assessing the level of impact on surrounding heritage assets. The assessment methodology considers all listed buildings to be of high importance as per the Historic England guidance set out in the Scoping Opinion. The level of sensitivity has been assessed through an understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and then other considerations such as distance from the site, its relationship to the site and intervisibility between the site and any heritage asset. The setting of heritage assets, in its broadest sense, and how the site would affect that setting has also been taken into account.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
16.3	Clarification is required to determine if paragraph 831 in the LDS should read, “the proposed mitigation once the Proposed Development is complete and operational would not change from the Proposed Development. This is detailed in ES Volume I – Chapter 16: Built Heritage”.	N/a	The paragraph quoted should read as ‘the proposed mitigation once the Proposed Development is complete and operational would not change from the Original Scheme. This is detailed in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 16: Built Heritage</i> .’
16.4	Clarify how the heritage values and significance of the heritage assets has influenced the applicant’s interpretation of sensitivity to development and whether English Heritage was consulted on the assessment methodology of the chapter. If English Heritage has not been consulted, this should be carried out to confirm the adopted method is acceptable.	N/a	English Heritage/Historic England was consulted on the proposed methodology in the original Scoping Report, and was consulted on the application for which the ES was a supporting document. HE has not made any comment on the chapter.  As set out above, <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix J - Built Heritage</i> and <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 16 - Built Heritage</i> of the EIA established the value and significance of the relevant heritage assets through site assessment and consideration of the assets’ special interest. No distinction was made between listed buildings of varying grades with all being considered to be of high importance. Obviously, high importance does not necessarily lead to ‘high sensitivity’ to development given a number of factors which include distance from or proximity to the site, whether there are additional levels of designation (such as WHS status), the topography and street layout, orientation of heritage asset to street and site, visual links between the site and relevant heritage assets, and associational links between the site and heritage assets or between heritage assets. Heritage values and significance have been taken into account but there are a number of factors that also have to be taken into account to judge the level of sensitivity.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
16.5	A revised assessment of the proposed changes to Plots F and G on the Tower of London World Heritage Site (WHS) once the development is complete and operational has been undertaken. Clarification is required in relation to the significance of impact predicted as a minor impact as this is not consistent with Table 16.1 which indicates that a moderate effect would be predicted as the WHS is of high sensitivity, and the magnitude of the effect will be moderate.	N/a	We have reviewed point, and we agree that given the impact is moderate and the sensitivity of the Tower of London World Heritage Site is high, then magnitude of the effect on Tower of London should be 'moderate'.
<b>17. Review of Chapter 17: Ecology</b>			
17.1	Clarify whether there are any local sites of ecological interest that might be affected by dust emissions.	N/a	The only designated site of ecological interest within close proximity to the site is Spitalfields City Farm and Allen Gardens SBINC which is located approximately 100m to the east of the site. Assuming the CEMP and impact avoidance measures are adhered to during construction and demolition, the residual impact upon the designated site from dust would be of negligible significance as stated in <i>ES Volume I</i> :

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
			<i>Chapter 17 – Water Resources and Flood Risk</i> Table 17.7. All other designated sites are located at a distance greater than 500m from the Proposed Development. It is unlikely that the designated sites will be directly or indirectly impacted by the Proposed Development. Therefore demolition and construction works are unlikely to affect these sites and the impact is assessed as of negligible significance, therefore no mitigation is required as identified in Table 17.7 and paragraphs 17.172 – 17.173.
17.2	Provided a figure for how much of the site is considered to be OMH.	N/a	A small amount of sub optimal open mosaic land (approximately 1000 m <sup>2</sup> ) would be removed to facilitate the Proposed Development. However this will be replaced as part of the landscape and public realm proposals which will incorporate approximately 2,116m <sup>2</sup> of habitat areas that replicate open mosaic habitats on previously developed land made up of soft landscaping within the new park area and within biodiverse roofs associated with the buildings.
17.3	Clarification on exact timescales of the demolition and construction phase.	N/a	<i>ES Volume I: Chapter 17 – Water Resources and Flood Risk</i> Paragraph 17.175 of the ES should state that the demolition and construction phase is "likely to span 16 years".
17.4	N/a	According to Appendix O: Table of Amendments, the Assessment of Impacts and Significance section had been revised, but it is not clear what revisions have been made in	<i>ES Volume I: Chapter 17 – Water Resources and Flood Risk</i> Paragraph 17.205 was amended to incorporate the biodiverse garden and additional private gardens to be included within the Proposed Development. This information although included was not highlighted and therefore it is considered to be clarification.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
		this section (no text highlighted).	
<b>18. Review of Chapter 18: TV and Radio – Electronic Interference</b>			
18.1	Clarify if the supporting guidance of PPG8 Telecommunications has been taken into account during the assessment.	N/a	<p>The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (PPG 8) ‘Telecommunications’ (2001) has been taken into account during the electronic interference assessment, however this document was not referenced within the ES chapter.</p> <p>Particular attention to paragraph 36 of the supporting guidance document was given, which states that:</p> <p><i>“the construction of new buildings...can interfere with broadcast and other telecommunications services, and the possibility of such interference can be a material planning consideration.”</i></p> <p>Attention was also given to paragraph 104 of this supporting guidance document which states that:</p> <p><i>“the local planning authorities will need to satisfy themselves that the potential for interference has been fully taken into account...”</i></p>
18.2	Clarify the detailed and outlined components’ impacts on satellite TV prior to mitigation.	N/a	<p><i>ES Volume 1: Chapter 1 – Electronic Interference</i> Paragraph 18-55 are correct and 18-58 should read “Minor Adverse Impact” prior to mitigation as is stated in table 18.1.</p>

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
18.3	Clarify the detailed and outlined components’ impacts on satellite TV prior to mitigation in Appendix K.	N/a	<p><u>Detailed:</u></p> <p>Within the predicted Crystal Palace terrestrial TV shadow from the Limited Development Scenario there are 32 terrestrial aerial installations that are identified as being at risk of experiencing adverse impacts to TV reception. This represents a potential permanent minor adverse impact. However, of the 32 aerial installations, 30 also have satellite dishes, leaving 2 that only have terrestrial aerials (and they may be availing themselves of cable TV services). It is therefore likely that only a small number of terrestrial aerial installations are actually being used (they may be using satellite or cable services instead and have just left their terrestrial aerial on their roof), but using a worst case approach the 32 figure will be used.</p> <p><u>Outline:</u></p> <p>Within the predicted Crystal Palace terrestrial TV shadow from the Limited Development Scenario there are 36 terrestrial aerial installations that are identified to being at risk of experiencing adverse impacts to TV reception. This represents a potential permanent minor adverse impact. However, of the 36 aerial installations, 30 also have satellite dishes, leaving 6 that only have terrestrial aerials (and they may be availing themselves of cable TV services). It is therefore likely that only a small number of terrestrial aerial installations are actually being used (they may be using satellite or cable services instead and have just left their terrestrial aerial on their roof), but using a worst case approach the 36 figure will be used.</p> <p>The impact on satellite TV reception due to TV Shadowing for both the Demolition and Construction and once the Proposed Development is Completed and occupied is of Minor Adverse pre mitigation and Negligible significance residual effect.</p>



ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
<b>19. Review of Chapter 19: Impact Interactions and Cumulative Effects Assessment</b>			
19.1	Table 19.1 should be revised to detail the residual impact on the Redchurch Street and Fournier Street conservation areas.	N/a	The residual impacts upon Redchurch Street and Fournier Street conservation areas have not been detailed in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 19 - Impact Interactions and Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> Tables 19.1 or 19.2 these have been provide in Table 19.3 as this details the with Townscape and Conservation Visual Impacts.
19.2	Table 19.2 should be revised to detail the residual impact on the Redchurch Street and Fournier Street conservation areas.	N/a	The residual impacts upon Redchurch Street and Fournier Street conservation areas have not been detailed in <i>ES Volume I: Chapter 19 - Impact Interactions and Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> Tables 19.1 or 19.2 these have been provide in Table 19.3 as this details the with Townscape and Conservation Visual Impacts.
19.3	N/a	The effects recorded in Table 53 and 54 are the same as set out in Tables 47 and 48 of the original Appendix K. This is considered acceptable subject to Table 53 being amended to reflect the correct impact recorded against construction dust and short term concentrations of PM <sub>10</sub> – negligible to minor adverse and Table 54 being amended to reflect the correct impact recorded against pedestrian movement and capacity and pedestrian delay – minor adverse as per table 20.1 and 20.1.	Table 53 of <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario - Impact Interactions and Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> should have read: <b>“Air Quality</b> (impact from construction dust and short-term concentrations of PM <sub>10</sub> - <b>Minor Adverse</b> ” Table 54 should have read: <b>“Traffic and Transport</b> (pedestrian movement and capacity – <b>Minor Adverse</b> )” This was incorrectly presented, however the correct residual impact was used within the assessment and therefore this is considered to be clarification. This information will also be presented in an ES addendum document to follow this submission.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
<b>20. Review of Chapter 20: Residual Effects Assessment</b>			
N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>21. Review of Chapter 21: Summary of Impacts of the Limited Development Scenario</b>			
N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>22. ES Volume II Townscape, Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment</b>			
22.1	The adverse impact on VP49 is explained to be because “the effect on this view is likely to generate strong differences of opinion given the contrast in scale. In light of this and the cohesive nature of the existing view along this street, and the uniform townscape derived from the common elevation details, it is considered that on balance the effect will be adverse” (para. 6.403). Could this be said for	N/a	The assessment of effect on each view is a matter of professional judgment based on the methodology in section 2 of the TVIA and in line with the assessment of the Site and its surroundings as set out in section 4. The TVIA assessed the effect on each view individually, providing an assessment of each view as existing and an assessment of the effect of the Proposed Development in the view as proposed. The TVIA found and adverse effect in view 49 (day and night) and explained why this was the case in this particular view. It is the assessment of the TVIA that there is no adverse effect on any other view, including views 32 and 34.

ES Chapter Section / Comment Ref	Summary of Clarification Required	Summary of Potential Regulation 22 Information Request	The Goodsyard EIA Team Response
	other VPs e.g. VP32 and 34?		
<b>23. ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario</b>			
23.1	Table 48 of Appendix K should be revised to reflect to the correct predicted impacts on pedestrian movement and capacity and pedestrian delay.	N/a	<p>Table 54 (previously 48) of <i>ES Volume III: Technical Appendices – Appendix K – Limited Development Scenario - Impact Interactions and Cumulative Effects Assessment</i> should have read:</p> <p><b>“Traffic and Transport (pedestrian movement and capacity – Minor Adverse)”</b></p> <p>This was incorrectly presented, however the correct impact was used within the assessment.</p>

**3 CONCLUSIONS**

It is pleasing to note that LUC (in association with Cascade Consulting and Delva Patman Redler) are generally supportive of the ES as submitted.

Table 1 addresses all of the points identified within Table 23.1 of the FRR. We do not consider any of the points noted in the FRR as ‘Potential Regulation 22 Requests’ to be justified or ‘substantive’ in line with the definition presented within the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended 2015). Each comment is considered to be clarification of information.

However there are a number of instances where we consider for the sake of clarity, that there would be benefit in presenting this information within an addendum document. This document will follow this submission.

We trust that the answers set out in Table 1 address the questions/queries raised and that they will now be in a position to issue a Final Review Report with a conclusion consistent with the ES, as supplemented by Table 1 that the Proposed Development will not result in unacceptable significant environmental impacts.

## References

- 1.) Institute for Environmental management and Assessment (IEMA) (2011) IEMA Quality mark Review criteria.
- 2.) London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) Scoping Opinion (March 2014).
- 3.) LBH, (2014) Draft Revised Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document

***Appendix A – Revised Text (not highlighted) in the July 2015 ES***

# Appendix A

**Table 1 – Revised Text (not highlighted) in the Revised July 2015 ES**

ES Chapter	Paragraph / Table Number	Description
Chapter 1: Introduction	N/A	N/A
Chapter 2: Methodology	N/A	N/A
Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution	N/A	N/A
Chapter 4: The Proposed Development	N/A	N/A
Chapter 5: Demolition and Construction	Paragraph 5.5	Demolition and construction programme
Chapter 6: Waste and Recycling	N/A	N/A
Chapter 7: Socio economics	Paragraph 7.110 Paragraph 7.186 Paragraph 7.184 Paragraph 7.204 Paragraph 7.221	Public open space Raised public park Gross, net / jobs Formal play space
Chapter 8: Ground Conditions	Paragraph 8.18 Paragraph 8.19	Minor alterations
Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport	N/A	N/A
Chapter 10: Wind Microclimate	N/A	N/A
Chapter 11: Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing	N/A	N/A
Chapter 12: Air Quality	Paragraph 12.4 Paragraph 12.23 Paragraph 12.37 Paragraph 12.38 Paragraph 12.174	Ecological receptors Policy Local planning policy Local planning policy Standard mitigation measures
Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration	Table 13.4 Paragraph 13.115 Table 13.13 Table 13.14 Table 13.16 Paragraph 13.143, 13.145, 13.146 Paragraph 13.150, 13.152 Paragraph 13.183 Paragraph 13.184	Indoor Ambient Noise Levels Building services Noise Survey Results Noise Survey Results Locations of Sensitive Receptors Construction works vibration Traffic Calculations Ground borne noise Construction noise
Chapter 14: Water resources, Drainage and Flood Risk	N/A	N/A
Chapter 15: Archaeology	Paragraph 15.97	Maximum assessment levels
Chapter 16: Built Heritage	N/A	N/A
Chapter 17: Ecology	Paragraph 17.205	Private gardens
Chapter 18: Electronic Interference	Paragraph 18.41	Assumptions
Chapter 19: Residual Impact Assessment	N/A	N/A
Chapter 20: Impact Interactions	N/A	N/A
Chapter 21: Summary Impact of Limited Development Scenario	N/A	N/A

Note: All of this information was included within the Revised July 2015 ES however it was not highlighted in green to represent a change to the July 2014 ES.

**ABOUT AECOM**  
In a complex and unpredictable world, where growing demands have to be met with finite resources, AECOM brings experience gained from improving quality of life in hundreds of places.

We bring together economists, planners, engineers, designers and project managers to work on projects at every scale. We engineer energy efficient buildings and we build new links between cities. We design new communities and regenerate existing ones. We are the first whole environments business, going beyond buildings and infrastructure.

Our Europe teams form an important part of our worldwide network of nearly 100,000 staff in 150 countries. Through 360 ingenuity, we develop pioneering solutions that help our clients to see further and go further.

[www.aecom.com](http://www.aecom.com)

Follow us on Twitter: @aecom