

Report

16 July 2020



TEMPLE

LEADERS IN ENVIRONMENT,
PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY.

Report for – Greater London Authority Bishopsgate Goodsyd Response to Draft Review Report Final



Document version control

Version	Date	Author	Reviewed by	Reviewed and approved by
1		Charlie Irwin	James Sanders	James Sanders

Report for:

Greater London Authority

Main contributors: **Charlie Irwin, James Sanders**

Temple Group

Copy to: **Tony Coughlan, Nicola Zech-Behrens**

Hammerson, Ballymore Group (Bishopsgate Goodsyrd
Regeneration Ltd)

This report has been prepared by Temple Group Ltd with all reasonable care and diligence within the terms of the contract with the client. We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the contract. We accept no responsibility to third parties to whom this report, or any part, thereof is made available. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Response	5

Appendices

Appendix A	Supporting Figures
Appendix B	Archaeology GLHER update
Appendix C	Additional TVIA Views
Appendix D	Revised NTS
Appendix E	Bat Hibernation Report
Appendix F	LBTH SUDs Proforma
Appendix G	Absent (replaced by Appendix H)
Appendix H	Built Heritage Addendum
Appendix I	Bat Mitigation Strategy
Appendix J	Air Quality Sensitivity Test
Appendix K	Updated Chapter 19 Effect Interactions
Appendix L	Updated Chapter 20 Residual Effects

1.0 Introduction

In February 2020 Bishopsgate Goodsyrd Regeneration Ltd (“the Applicant”) received a Final Review Report (DRR) of the Environmental Statement Addendum (ESA) (September 2019) for the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd development (Application References PA/14/02011 (LBTH) and 2016/1088 (LBH)) prepared by LUC in association with Clewlow Consulting, Xi Engineering and Ricardo Energy and Environment and commissioned by the Greater London Authority (GLA).

Temple Group Ltd (“Temple”) have been commissioned by the Applicant to prepare a response to the findings of the IRR.

The following report details responses to the findings of the DRR, including clarifications and potential information requests related to Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (“the EIA Regulations”).

2.0 Response

The responses to the findings of the DRR are set out in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1: Response to DRR findings

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
EIA Context and Influence (ES Chapters 1 to 5)		
No issues were raised		
EIA Presentation		
No issues were raised		
Construction Overview Summary		
CD1 (C)	Clarification on which Phase of construction will contain the development of aspects of the open space, recreation and green infrastructure aspects of the Revised Scheme. Further comment Acceptable.	Appendix A Figure 'Public Realm Completions Ground Level' - shows indicative areas that we would propose to complete with each phase of works. This plan is the basis of the assessment though may be subject to alteration at reserved matters stage at which point if necessary this would be considered further within the assessments.
CD2 (C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to when there would be new receptors created i.e. occupiers following the development of each phase. Further comments:	New receptors would be introduced in line with the occupation of each phase.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
CD3 (C)	Clarification is sought that the assessments have had regard to these new receptors in the technical assessments contained in the ESA. Further comments: Acceptable	Interim assessments considering newly introduced on site receptors during the construction phase have been provided where relevant throughout the ESA.
CD4 (C)	Clarification sought on whether the Phasing Scenario described in Figure 5.21 is a fixed Programme or whether it represents worst case scenario as requested by the Scoping Opinion. Further comments: Acceptable	The phasing plans in Figure 5.2-5.14 are based on a programme of 12 years from 2021 to 2033 and a show a worst case scenario as requested by the Scoping Opinion. It should be noted that should the start of the construction programme be delayed by up to 2 years this would still provide a worse case scenario and the residual effects would be representative and unchanged.
CD5 (C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant why details of the scope of works associated with the site clearance and enabling works have not been described in the ESA. Further comments: Acceptable	The broad detail of the enabling works and site clearance are included within the ES and have been used to inform the assessments. This is presented in Chapter 5, Tables 5.9, 5.11 and paragraphs 5.3.34 – 5.3.42 The detailed application was limited to Building 2 and Building 7, with the remaining buildings being defined by Parameter Plans and block diagrams. Because of this the full scope of enabling works had not yet been defined and were not fully identified within the phases. In addition, the full scope of enablement and site clearance will be subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • further detailed site surveys; • the detailed sequencing of the works and need to allocate enabling works to the individual phases; and

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the timing and phasing of the installation of primary infrastructure services and drainage which may necessitate temporary installations and diversions of existing services. <p>This detailed scope will be established by the main works contractor when appointed.</p>
CD6 (C)	<p>Clarification is sought as to whether every construction stage described in Table 5.7 and paragraphs 5.3.5 to 5.3.15 are needed for all Phases 1-8.</p> <p><u>Further comment</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>They have been included as a worst-case scenario where detailed phase-by-phase construction has not yet been defined. The exceptions to this are as follows: Phases 2 concerns the restoration and conversion to retail uses of the arches underneath the Braithwaite Viaduct and the non-listed arches to the south of London Road, as well as the establishment of the open space at the podium level above the viaduct. The extent of the substructure works in this instance will be limited.</p>
CD7 (C)	<p>Clarification sought regarding the significance of Figures 5.27 and 5.28 and how they relate to the construction methodology.</p> <p><u>Further comment</u> Not Acceptable It has been stated that these are indicative traffic routes but the reasons behind why these routes were chosen over others, and the significance of both Silvertown and Rainham remains unclear. Further clarification is required.</p> <p><u>Further comment</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Figures 5.27 and 5.28 show indicative construction traffic routes from the site. These routes form the basis of the estimates of construction traffic flows that inform the following topic assessments: Traffic and Transport, Air Quality, Noise and Vibration.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>The routes identified were just to show a representative route out of town to the east of London using routes to the north and south of the River, the destinations of Rainham and Silvertown were of no specific significance. The main aim is to show the use of key arterial routes (A13 to the north of the river and A2 south of the river) that get vehicles out to the M25. The attached Figure "Traffic Routes" identifies the same basic routes though with the destinations amended to avoid confusion. We have shown an alternative route away from the A13 using the A406 North Circular Road from Beckton</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Additional Figures entitled "Traffic Routes" provided by the Applicant shows likely traffic routes from the site to the north and south as well as to the M25. This further detail is welcomed. No further clarification is sought.	
CD8 (C)	Table 5.8 shows average numbers of vehicle movements per day for each of the phases. It is not clear if the information presented reflects the overlap between phases of the development as shown in figure 5.21. Clarification on this matter is sought from the Applicant. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Table 5.8 presents the average number of vehicle movement per day which does take into account the overlap between the phases.
CD9 (C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant that the assessments contained in the ESA are based on the maximum traffic movements (not averaged traffic levels) and that these estimated have regard to all traffic movements related to the removal of wastes from the site. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	We can confirm that the assessment contained with the ESA are based on maximum traffic movements which include traffic movements associated with the removal of waste from the site. The average vehicle movements provided in table 5.8 are intended to show the relative scale of the traffic movements for each phase and have not been used for the basis of the assessments.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
CD10 (C)	<p>Clarification sought on whether the construction labour force commuting to the site via car has been assessed in Chapter 9: Traffic & Transport.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Chapter 5 states that all staff will be encouraged to use public transport and specific travel plans will be put in place to facilitate this. Chapter 7 confirms that no staff car parking will be provided on site and as such it has been assumed that minimal construction staff will be travelling to the site via car and this assumption forms part of the assessment.</p>
CD11 (C)	<p>Paragraph 5.3.38 of the ESA references crushing of materials will be undertaken on the site. Clarification is sought from the Applicant that these activities have been considered in the air quality and noise and vibration assessments contained within the ESA.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>While there will likely be some on-site crushing of materials on site, the overall quantity of material for demolition and site clearance is expected to be low. The dust risk assessment takes into account the potential for effects from demolition which includes the crushing of materials.</p> <p>The construction noise assessment is based on the indicative plant and equipment list provided in Table 5.7 of Chapter 5, which includes concrete crushers.</p>
CD12 (C)	<p>The NTS does not include details on maximum traffic levels during the construction phase or the employment numbers during this phase. Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to why this detail is not considered relevant to the NTS.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p>	<p>This information whilst informative does not result in the formulation of any significant effects and therefore, they have not been provided in the NTS. They are however provided in the full relevant assessment chapters. The NTS has however been updated and is appended to this response for information.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
CD13 (R)	Further information is sought from the Applicant relating to construction site plans, detailing, for example, locations of site compounds, welfare facilities and staff parking) as requesting in the Scoping Opinion and comments from the GLA and LBTH. Further comments: Acceptable	It is envisaged that the plots will stand alone in terms of compounds and site welfare to allow maximum flexibility for the plots to be built independently of one another. Once greater understanding of the detailed works required for the outline plots and the detailed scope of the site clearance and the enabling works has been formulated the appointed contractor will be able to specify the location of the construction compounds. It will be an objective in planning the works that site compounds and welfare facilities will be located within each plot. As will any other inner city site, each plot will be segregated from the adjacent plots by hoarding where the two have separate contractors. It is not currently envisaged that any one plot will be dependent upon another for welfare or project office space. Staff parking will not be permitted on site as explained in Chapter 7: Traffic and Transport.
CD14 (R)	Further details around crane requirements are sought from the Applicant. Further comments: Acceptable	It is likely that a combination of Tower Cranes and Mobile Cranes will be required during the construction of the Proposed Development. The exact locations of these will be determined by the relevant contractor deemed to be the most appropriate to serve the buildings in the most efficient manner. Tower Crane heights will be evaluated on a building by building basis they will not be of a height that has the potential to interact with London City Airport Physical Safeguarding Zone. The cranes will likely have luffing jobs to minimise the extent that they are able to oversail adjacent properties and/ or rail assets. And they will have limit switches and systems to eliminate oversail of any sensitive neighbours. Where adjacent sites are in progress at similar times the heights and locations of the cranes will be fully coordinated and a development of this size would engage an experienced crane coordinator to oversee crane operations across the Proposed Development.
CD15 (R)	It is recommended that further information is inserted into Chapter 21 on revised timescale for phasing for the Limited Development Scenario, with Table 5.6 and	In the limited development scenario, Plots 1,2, 3 and 8a along with accompanying open space would not be constructed. A table the equivalent of Table 5.6, but for the limited development scenario, is provided in Table 3 in Appendix M: Limited Development Scenario.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Figure 5.21 of the ESA replicated containing the revised information. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Figure 5.21, the construction programme, provides no information beyond that provided by Table 5.6.
CD16 (R)	Information required on how the following would differ from the Revised Scheme, in the Limited Development Scenario: required plant, worst case vehicle movements, predicted labour force numbers, quantities of waste created, or quantities of resources needed. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The required plant would be as in Chapter 5, as stated. The worst-case vehicle movements, predicted labour force numbers, and quantities of waste created are all outlined in Appendix M.
CD17(P)	The Sustainability Strategy (5.2.68-5.2.70), Energy Strategy (5.2.71-5.2.76), Crime Reduction Strategy (5.2.77-5.2.78), Lighting Strategy (5.2.79), Fire Safety Strategy (5.2.80-5.2.85), Drainage Strategy (5.2.86-5.2.89) and Operational Waste Strategy (5.2.90-5.2.97) should all be enforced via planning condition, following review and approval from the Local Planning Authority(ies).	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Further comments: Acceptable	
CD18(P)	The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be prepared and agreed in writing by the relevant local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. These plans should include all the mitigation measures referenced in the ESA as well as the measures detailed in Section 1.5 of the Code of Construction Practice. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.
CD19(P)	The anticipated core working hours stated in paragraph 5.3.30 of the ESA are to be enforced via planning condition, alongside the requirement to seek prior agreement to work outside these hours. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.
CD20(P)	Secure agreement to undertake an asbestos survey on site before	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	works commence and survey is to be completed by the applicant. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
CD21(P)	Secure agreement to the undertaking of the community liaison activities described in paragraph 5.3.50. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
Review of Chapter 6: Waste		
W1(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to how the comments made by the GLA on the Scoping Report have been addressed in the ESA. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Table 6.1 of the Waste and Recycling ES chapter outlines the comments received in the 2014 Scoping Opinion and the 2019 Scoping Opinion Review and where they have been addressed within the documentation. To summarise: Paragraph 4.37 of 2014 Scoping Opinion: “The ES should identify who is responsible for the Site Waste Management Plan.”, this is presented within the Construction assessment section of the Waste and Recycling ES chapter, within Paragraph 6.8.4. Paragraph 4.38 of 2014 Scoping Opinion: “The ES chapter should identify the current capacity at waste disposal sites, and identify whether there is sufficient capacity for the development and cumulatively.” this is presented within the baseline (Paragraphs 6.6.4 to 6.6.41) and cumulative effects (Paragraph 6.11.13) sections of the Waste and Recycling ES chapter respectively. Paragraph 4.39 of 2014 Scoping Opinion, updated in 2019 Scoping Opinion Review: “When estimating total waste arisings regard is to be given to the types and volumes of demolition, excavation and construction wastes likely to be generated. For each waste types the ES should clarify how

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<p>the wastes are to be managed, for example re-used, recycled, landfilled and whether such activities are to be undertaken on-site or off-site.” This is discussed within the construction phase effects section of the Waste and Recycling ES chapter, specifically within Paragraph 6.8.16 to 6.8.26. The information is also presented within ES Volume 2, Chapter 5: Proposed Development and Construction Overview</p> <p>Paragraph 4.41 of 2014 Scoping Opinion: “The mode of waste transfer should be identified and where this is by road, the number of vehicle movements should be taken into account in the traffic impact assessment.” This is presented within ES Volume 2, Chapter 5: Proposed Development and Construction Overview</p> <p>2019 Scoping Opinion Review: “...the baseline environment including existing levels of waste generated at the site will be examined...” This is presented within the baseline section of the Waste and Recycling ES chapter, specifically within Paragraphs 6.6.1 to 6.6.3.</p>
W2(C)	<p>Clarification as to why properties adjacent to the proposed development site, are not considered to have a high level of sensitivity is sought from the Applicant. Furthermore, under this description of medium sensitivity is reference to potential occupiers of the Revised Scheme during construction in other phases.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>“Clarification as to why properties adjacent to the proposed development site, are not considered to have a high level of sensitivity is sought from the Applicant.” - as discussed within Table 6.2 of the 2019 ES Addendum, only those receptors with direct dermal contact with waste are deemed highly sensitive receptors: construction-site workers, future on-site users, and the local waste management infrastructure (under certain circumstances). This has been based on professional judgement, as there is no formal guidance for the identification of sensitive waste and recycling receptors.</p> <p>Presenting neighbouring receptors as highly sensitive would ‘down-play’ the sensitivity of the future on-site workers and construction-site workers, and due to the nature of the waste and recycling technical assessment would also be an over-assumption of the sensitivity of this receptor group.</p> <p>“Furthermore, under this description of medium sensitivity is reference to potential occupiers of the Revised Scheme during construction in other phases.” - the introduced receptors (i.e. residents who occupy built-out phases when other phases are undergoing construction) are also considered to have a medium sensitivity to construction waste (during the demolition and construction phase). This because, as per the reasons above, the introduced residential receptors would not have direct contact with the waste, and would, in reality, not be affected by waste produced during this phase of the Proposed Development, only by the secondary effects (e.g. construction traffic effects on air quality, construction dust from waste-producing activities, noise from waste-producing activities).</p>
W3(C)	<p>Clarification as to why such properties potentially adjacent to</p>	<p>See response to comment W2 above.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>construction works, are not considered to have a high level of sensitivity is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
W4(R)	<p>Paragraph 6.5.13 of the ESA suggests that the magnitude of impact is only affected as a result of the composition of the waste and not the volumes of waste generated. It is stated that the OWMP would mitigate any increase in magnitude of impact resulting from an increase in waste volumes. Magnitude of impact should have regard to projected increases in waste volumes. Further information is sought from the Applicant on the magnitude of impacts that has regard to proposed increases in waste volumes.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u></p> <p>Not Acceptable The assessment does not consider that volumes of waste are applicable to the assessment of</p>	<p>This assumption made in this statement is incorrect.</p> <p>“Magnitude of impact should have regard to projected increases in waste volumes.” – Agreed. The magnitude of impact is indeed affected by both volumes of waste and waste composition, as discussed within paragraphs 6.2.2 and 6.5.13 – 6.5.18. However, these are applied differently to the different sensitive receptors:</p> <p>The volume of waste should only have an effect on the sensitive receptor of the local waste management infrastructure; the volume of waste could directly impact the capacity of local waste management infrastructure. Therefore, the magnitude of change based on the volume of waste has been applied to this sensitive receptor. The magnitude of change based on the composition of waste has also been applied to this sensitive receptor.</p> <p>An overall magnitude of impact is determined when considering both composition and volume of waste. For example, if the volume of waste is considered to have a high magnitude of impact, but waste composition is considered to have a low magnitude of impact, the overall magnitude of impact will be medium. In the event that an average magnitude of impact cannot be determined in this way (i.e. volume of waste is deemed to have a low magnitude of impact and waste composition is considered to have a medium magnitude of impact), the higher magnitude of impact will be defaulted to, in order to provide a worst-case approach to the assessment.</p> <p>The magnitude of change based on the composition of waste has been applied to the sensitive receptors of the local waste management infrastructure (as above), future on-site users, sensitive neighbouring receptors, and construction-site workers.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>magnitude with regard to on-site uses, sensitive neighbouring receptors or construction workers. The stated reason for this is due to the implementation of the operational waste management strategy. This approach is questioned since there will be an increase in waste arisings from zero currently at the site, in terms of construction and demolition wastes, and the operational waste management strategy does not cover the construction period when some 95,000 tonnes of waste will be generated. It is also considered inappropriate for the magnitude to be averaged to assess a worst-case scenario, the greater magnitude of impact should be adopted. Further information is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further Comment</u> Acceptable</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that whilst the waste chapter does not consider the indirect impacts of waste volumes on onsite demolition and construction workers, and nearby sensitive</p>	<p>As all handling, storage and waste management will be in line with applicable legislation, guidance and practice requirements, these receptors are unlikely to be impacted by the volume of waste generated as a result of the Revised Scheme.</p> <p>“Further information is sought from the Applicant on the magnitude of impacts that has regard to proposed increases in waste volumes.” – see paragraphs 6.8.27 – 6.8.31, and 6.8.38 – 6.8.39.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>It is noted that the reviewer does not consider that the volume of waste has been taken into account for the assessment of demolition/construction or operation, and also queries the application of the magnitude of impact. Each point is discussed in detail below.</p> <p>Demolition and construction – The direct effects of waste from demolition and construction does assess the volume of waste, in respect to the impact on waste infrastructure. This is included in paragraphs 6.8.36 of the ES Addendum., whereby the magnitude of impact is low (based on the very low magnitude of impact regarding waste composition and the low magnitude of impact regarding waste volume).</p> <p>Whilst not included within the Waste chapter itself, the indirect impacts of the volume of waste has been taken into account through the increased HGV traffic movements (generated by the volume of demolition and construction waste) on the local highway network within the Traffic and Transport chapter of the ES Addendum. In addition, the indirect effects of these HGV movements (moving this volume of waste) on on-site demolition and construction workers, and nearby sensitive receptors has been assessed within the Air Quality, and Noise and Vibration chapters of the ES Addendum.</p> <p>During the demolition and construction programme the volumes of waste will be managed (i.e. reduced/recycled wherever possible so that the volume of waste generated is less) by a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) which will be prepared and agreed with LBH and LBTH prior to the commencement of any on-site works. The implementation of this SWMP is therefore expected to reduce the volume of waste, and therefore the magnitude and residual effect are reduced accordingly in the Waste chapter of the ES Addendum.</p> <p>We are therefore of the opinion that demolition and construction waste volumes have been assessed comprehensively in the ES Addendum.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>receptors these impacts have been assessed in the assessments undertaken in the transport, air quality and noise and vibration chapters of the ES. Furthermore, confirmation is given that the Site Waste Management Plan will manage construction and demolition wastes and this plan will be subject to a planning condition. In accordance with the ES this Plan should include the target of 95% of construction.</p>	<p>Completion and Operation – The direct effects of waste from the completion and operation of the Revised Scheme does assess the volume of waste, in respect to the impact on waste infrastructure. This is included in paragraphs 6.8.45 of the ES Addendum., whereby the magnitude of impact is low (based on the very low magnitude of impact regarding waste composition and the low magnitude of impact regarding waste volume).</p> <p>Whilst not included within the Waste chapter itself, the indirect impacts of the volume of waste has been taken into account through the increased road traffic (servicing) movements (generated by the volume of operational waste) on the local highway network within the Traffic and Transport chapter of the ES Addendum. In addition, the indirect effects of these road traffic movements (moving this volume of waste) on on-site users, and nearby sensitive receptors has been assessed within the Air Quality, and Noise and Vibration chapters of the ES Addendum.</p> <p>During the completion and operation of the Revised Scheme, the volumes of waste will be managed by an Operational Waste Management Plan, which has been prepared for the planning application for the Revised Scheme. The implementation of this OWMP is expected to appropriately manage the volume of waste generated from the operation of the Revised Scheme. We are therefore of the opinion that operational waste volumes have been assessed comprehensively in the ES Addendum.</p> <p>Magnitude of Impact:</p> <p>Whilst it is noted in the original response that there are two ways in which to assign magnitude (either by an average or by the worst case scenario), it can be confirmed that the ES Addendum only applies the worst case methodology i.e. in all instances where there is a range of magnitudes, the worse impact was applied. For example, where a very low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste composition, and a low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste volume. The overall magnitude of impact of low was applied (as the worst-case scenario).</p> <p>As we have assessed the worst-case scenario, the assessment is considered robust and reliable.</p>
W5(R)	<p>Paragraph 6.5.15 of the ESA indicates when considering magnitude of impact that an average of the magnitude of an</p>	<p>As discussed above, the methodology discussed (in paragraph 6.5.15) that: Scenario 1) an overall ‘average’ magnitude of impact would be sought with regard to volume and composition of waste (e.g. high magnitude of impact + low magnitude of impact would be averaged as an overall magnitude of impact of medium), and Scenario 2) where an average magnitude of impact cannot be determined in this way (e.g. low + medium,</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>impact will be taken. This approach does not appear to have regard to the worst-case scenario of taking the higher level of impact. Having regard to the worst-case scenario would be considered the appropriate methodology to adopt when considering magnitude of impacts. Further information is sought from the Applicant on this matter.</p> <p><u>Further comment</u></p> <p>Not Acceptable As discussed above, the assessment should consider volumes of waste in the assessment of magnitude with regard to all receptors including on-site uses, sensitive neighbouring receptors or construction workers. It is not clear with this reassessment whether Scenario 1 as provided in the response from the Applicant would apply or not. It is considered inappropriate for the magnitude to be averaged and to assess a worst-case scenario, the greater magnitude of impact should be adopted. Further</p>	<p>very low + low), the higher magnitude of impact would be defaulted to, in order to provide a worst-case approach to the assessment.</p> <p>“This approach does not appear to have regard to the worst-case scenario of taking the higher level of impact.” – it is considered that where one level of magnitude of impact separates the final magnitude of impact (Scenario 2 of the paragraph above e.g. very low + low), the reasonable worst-case scenario would be to assume the higher as the final magnitude for impact to assess effects against. Where two levels of magnitude of impact separate the final magnitude of impact (Scenario 1 e.g. very low + medium), it is considered that assuming the higher would result in an unreasonable worst-case scenario, in which effects assessed would be much greater than in those anticipated to be experienced in reality.</p> <p>Therefore, an ‘average’ magnitude of impact has been assessed in this circumstance, as it is considered that this provides for a more reasonable assessment scenario.</p> <p>Regardless, only Scenario 2 has been used within the Waste and Recycling ES chapter: a very low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste composition, and a low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste volume. Thus, an overall magnitude of impact of low was applied to the sensitive receptor of the local waste management infrastructure (Paragraph 6.8.36 and 6.8.45), therefore providing a worst-case assessment.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>As discussed within the response above, it can be confirmed that the ES Addendum only applies the worst-case methodology i.e. in all instances where there is a range of magnitudes, the worse impact was applied. For example, where a very low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste composition, and a low magnitude of impact was identified with regard to waste volume. The overall magnitude of impact of low was applied (as the worst-case scenario).</p> <p>As we have assessed the worst-case scenario, the assessment is considered robust and reliable.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>information is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that the worst-case scenario has been applied in the waste assessments undertaken.</p> <p>No further information is sought.</p>	
W6(C)	<p>Clarification is sought as to why the Applicant considers the generation of inert wastes is considered a benefit of the development.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>“Clarification is sought as to why the Applicant considers the generation of inert wastes is considered a benefit of the development.” - the generation of inert waste in itself is not considered a benefit of the Proposed Development. As per Table 6.3, the generation of inert waste is only considered a benefit if there is an increase in the proportion of this waste stream relative to the baseline proportion, resulting in a decrease in the proportion of hazardous/specialised waste streams requiring specialist management, disposal and treatment.</p> <p>A change from the baseline waste streams would be deemed as positive as there would be a decrease in the proportion of hazardous/specialised waste streams requiring specialist management, disposal and treatment. It could therefore be assumed that, as a proportion, respective vehicle trips would reduce as more waste could be collected from fewer waste streams at a time, and it could be assumed that as there would be a decrease in specialist waste management and treatment, more waste could be sent for recycling, thus aiding in the meeting of borough/GLA recycling targets.</p> <p>No discernible change from the baseline waste streams to the proposed waste streams would neither be beneficial nor adverse, but a neutral nature of effect. This is what was identified for the Proposed Development.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
W7(C)	<p>Paragraph 6.5.18 suggests that where the waste from the proposed development would be in excess of existing capacity in the Borough this would be classified as a medium magnitude effect. Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to why such a scenario is not considered to be an effect with a high magnitude.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>“Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to why such a scenario is not considered to be an effect with a high magnitude” - there is no formal guidance for the assessment of waste and recycling effects, thus professional judgement has been used in the formulation of identifying significance criteria.</p> <p>The criteria for determining magnitude of impact (with regard to waste volume) needs to account for boroughs / district councils with no waste management infrastructure / no reference to existing capacity or future waste management strategy ('high' magnitude of impact).</p> <p>A medium magnitude of impact would be identified with regard to waste volume should the borough not have the capacity to manage waste generated by proposed development, and has to outsource its waste. This would be classified as medium magnitude of impact under the circumstance that there is an appropriate future waste management strategy in place/being prepared by the borough which sets out a clear strategy and targets for the borough, with waste management sites identified.</p> <p>Therefore, the 'high' magnitude of impact is essentially the 'medium' magnitude of impact with the exception of no future strategy prepared for the borough in question.</p> <p>As discussed above, an element of professional judgement is made when determining the magnitude of impact with regard to local waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>Regardless, the baseline review identified that the LBTH and NLWA have sufficient capacity to manage waste apportionment targets, and have identified a number of future strategies for the management of waste arising from the boroughs. In addition, a number of new sites have been built / safeguarded for future use (e.g. the EfW facility located within Edmonton). And therefore a 'low' magnitude of impact was applied with regard to waste volume.</p>
W8(C)	<p>Paragraph 6.5.28 of the ESA set out a conversion factor to convert 1m³ of household or commercial waste into 0.21 tonnes in weight. Clarification is sought from the Applicant for the appropriateness of the application of this conversion rate in the assessment.</p> <p>Further comments:</p>	<p>“Clarification is sought from the Applicant for the appropriateness of the application of this conversion rate in the assessment.” – the application of this conversion rate is entirely appropriate in the context of the Proposed Development; 0.21 is a standard conversion rate for mixed municipal waste, as presented within Waste and Resources Action Plan (WRAP), (2014), 'A Guide to Volume Mass Conversion Factors and List of Waste Categories' [conversion factor 0.21 used for Mixed Municipal Waste LOW Code 20 03 01]. Located within the WRAP 'Waste Volume to Mass Conversion Factors' Tool [downloaded from URL: www.wrap.org.uk/content/waste-conversionfactors- wrap-construction-tools]</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
W9(C)	<p>Clarification as to why organic wastes have not been assumed to arise from the A3 restaurant use is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p>Further comment Not Acceptable In Table 6.6 the A3 restaurant row has an assumption of a 50:50 split between mixed dry recyclables and residual waste has been calculated. It is unclear why organic wastes have not been assumed to arise from the A3 restaurant use. Further clarification is required.</p> <p>Further comment: Acceptable</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further information on the split of waste types.</p> <p>No further clarification is sought.</p>	<p>“Clarification as to why organic wastes have not been assumed to arise from the A3 restaurant use is sought from the Applicant.” - this is an incorrect statement. As per Table 6.6, for restaurant/café facilities proposed for detailed plots (A3 use class), food waste has been calculated separately based on the following percentages; 50% recyclable waste, 30% organic food waste and 20% residual waste.</p> <p>As per paragraph 6.5.34, for the outline elements, where flexible retail space is proposed (A1-A5 / A, A1+, A3), all flexible retail proposed has been assessed as A3 use class, as this use class generates the largest quantity of waste and thus provides a worst case scenario with regards to waste volumes, and subsequent waste storage requirements. For these outline plots, a 50:50 split between mixed dry recyclables and residual waste has been calculated. At the reserved matters stage the waste strategy for the outline plots will be revisited, and there should be sufficient space within the allocated waste stores (as a result of the flexibility built into the outline operational waste management strategy) for a number of waste streams and receptacles.</p> <p>For the outline elements where restaurant/café facilities have been proposed only (i.e. A3 use class, not flexible retail space), food waste has been calculated separately as per for the detailed plots, based on the following percentages; 50% recyclable waste, 30% organic food waste and 20% residual waste.</p> <p>Further response</p> <p>It is noted that there an inaccuracy in Table 6.6 of the ESA. For clarity that statement that for A3 uses that ‘an assumption of a 50:50 split between mixed dry recyclables and residual waste has been calculated’ is not correct.</p> <p>Instead the split (including organic waste) are set out below for both the detailed and outline components of the scheme. Note: whilst statement is incorrect in Table 6.6, the split set out below has been applied to the actual assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed component of the planning application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A3 (only)– Where A3 uses are proposed within the detailed plots, separate organic waste <i>has</i> been assumed to arise from the restaurant use, with storage provisions allocated according to organic storage requirements as follows: 50% recyclable waste, 30% organic food waste and 20% residual waste;

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A3 (flexible use) Where A3 uses are proposed (as part of a total flexible retail area allocation) within the detailed plots, separate organic waste <i>has</i> been assumed to arise from the restaurant use, with storage provisions allocated according to organic storage requirements as follows: 50% recyclable waste, 30% organic food waste and 20% residual waste; • Outline component of the planning application: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A3 (only)– Where A3 uses only are proposed within the outline plots, organic waste <i>has</i> been assumed to arise from the restaurant use, with storage provisions allocated as follows: 50% recyclable waste, 30% organic food waste and 20% residual waste; and <p>A3 (flexible use) – This is the only scenario in which A3 uses have not been provided separate organic waste storage provisions i.e. when they form part of a flexible retail allocation within an outline plot. For these outline plots, a 50:50 split between mixed dry recyclables and residual waste has been calculated (based on 50:50 A1:A3 total area split) – given that restaurant (A3) uses provide the largest quantum of waste associated with the ‘A’ use classes, and that it is highly unlikely that 50% of the total flexible area coming forward as part of the flexible retail provision will be restaurant use, the storage requirements outlined for these plots are likely a substantial overprovision. This is considered to be a worst-case scenario with respect to the overall waste volume to ensure there is sufficient capacity. As part of the future reserved matters applications, the specific amount of space required will be confirmed - this will be less than that assessed within the ES Addendum, including provision for organic food waste. This will be secured by a planning condition.</p>
W10(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to justifications for assuming that daily collections will be undertaken for non-household wastes. Further comments: Acceptable	“Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to justifications for assuming that daily collections will be undertaken for non-household wastes.” - a daily collection frequency for all plots has been assumed for non-residential waste, with the exception of Plot 7, which is split into individual small retail units, for which a twice weekly collection frequency has been assumed. This collection frequency has been built into the waste strategy which has been agreed by the Applicant. The Applicant will arrange for the collection of non-household wastes via private waste contractor as per the relevant waste collection frequencies. It should be highlighted that, to allow for potential missed collections as a result of strike action, adverse weather conditions, bank holidays etc., a two-day storage capacity has been provided for within the non-residential waste stores being collected on a daily basis. In addition, by assuming all flexible-retail space is restaurant (A3 use class) space (as this use class generates the largest quantity of waste), flexibility has been built into the waste strategy so as to allow for potential future changes at the reserved matters stage.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		Further to this, no compaction of recyclable waste has been assumed, and compaction of residual waste has only been assumed within Plots 1 and 2 (non-residential waste) and at a 2:1 compaction ratio only. In reality, a number of waste minimisation techniques could be applied to the non-residential waste, and the compaction units identified can compact at a much higher ratio. The above allow for flexibility within the waste strategy, and allows for future consideration of less frequent waste collection. The waste strategy will be revisited and refined at the reserved matters stage.
W11(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to whether contact has been made with the relevant LPA's to determine if this assumption on weekly collections on household wastes accords with the collections proposals for the Council's in the medium and long term. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	All residential uses are proposed within the LBTH, thus LBTH methodology has been used in the calculation of residential waste. LBTH guidance for the calculation of residential waste storage requirements (as presented within the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031) was used to calculate waste arising from the residential units proposed, assuming full occupancy. The LBTH methodology allows for eight days' worth of waste within the calculation methodology, and assumed a weekly collection of waste streams, as outlined within the OMWS prepared for the Proposed Development. This weekly waste collection frequency is inline with the frequency of current household collections made by the LBTH1. Further to this, The Local Plan 2031 sets out policies for the borough until 2031, and thus it is assumed that the collection guidance set out by the LBTH accords with their medium- and long-term goals.
W12(R)	Further information is sought from the Applicant to update the number of recycling and collection bins proposed to ensure that they are sufficient to provide the necessary capacity of the waste arisings from the proposed development,	Waste storage requirements have been calculated for both residential and non-residential waste streams in line with relevant policy and guidance requirements: The LBTH Local Plan 2031 has been used for the calculation of residential waste storage requirements; The LBTH Local Plan 2031 and British Standards 5906:2005 have been used for the calculation on non-residential waste storage requirements. Space for corresponding numbers of waste storage receptacles has been designed into the Proposed Development and presented on plans. The Operational Waste Management Strategy (located within ES Addendum Volume 4: Appendix B Waste) presents this information, including plans and tables depicting the location of waste stores and quantity of waste storage receptables provided.

¹ https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lqn/environment_and_waste/recycling_and_waste/waste_collections.aspx

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p><u>Further comment</u> Not Acceptable Appendix 2 of the OWMS contains calculations for the waste storage requirements of the proposed development. On review of the residential storage requirement tables there appears to be some errors in the number of storage bins required. For example, with Plot 4 and Plot 8a the volume of the recycling bins proposed would not appear to cover the volumes of waste estimated to be generated at these plots. Further information is sought from the Applicant to update the number of bins proposed to ensure that they are sufficient to provide the necessary capacity of the waste arisings from the proposed development.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable</p> <p>While the information provided is acceptable for the purposes of this review, it does not fully demonstrate that sufficient waste and recycling storage has been provided to cover the reasonable</p>	<p><u>Further response</u> All plots have been designed with sufficient waste storage requirements – a plot by plot breakdown is provided below, with an explanation on the methodology where appropriate.</p> <p>NON-RESIDENTIAL WASTE</p> <p>Plot 1 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 16,240L. The 15 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 16,500L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 1 – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 2 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 22,392L. The 21 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 23,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 2 – residual (non-residential) The total daily non-residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 20,931L. 19 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 20,900L) have been provided.*</p> <p>Plot 2 – organic waste (non-residential) The total daily non-residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 1,461L. 6 x 240L Bins (total volume 1,440L) have been provided*</p> <p>* As discussed within the calculation spreadsheet regarding rounding: if, when summed, the number of bins required equates to a decimal digit up to <.3, the number of bins required has been rounded down to the nearest whole number (e.g. 11.25 has been rounded down to 11 x 1,100L bins required). Where this is greater than .3, the number has been rounded up to the nearest whole number (e.g. 5.57 rounded up to 6 x bins required).</p> <p>This is common practice, and given the additional days' worth of waste calculated into the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 3 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 12,738L. The 12 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 13,200L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 3 – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>worst-case scenario. The Council should have regard to this in making their determination. As such this has been downgraded to a clarification.</p> <p>Whilst a condition could be attached to any grant of consent requiring further submission of a waste strategy that requires approval from the Council, there may be the risk that the design does not allow for all the necessary bin storage.</p> <p>The Applicant response identifies a number of examples where the volumes of bins provided do not meet the estimated waste volumes expected to be generated.</p> <p>For example, with regard to non-residential wastes this includes:</p> <p>Plot 5 (Weaver's cottage) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 282L. 1 x 240L bin (total volume 240L) have been provided.</p> <p>Plot 5 (Victorian building) – recyclable (non-residential)</p>	<p>Plot 4 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 1,984L. The 2 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 2,200L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 4 – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 5 (including chapel) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 2,180L. The 2 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 2,200L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 5 (including chapel) – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 5 (weaver's cottage) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 282L. 1 x 240L bin (total volume 240L) have been provided.* As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 5 (weaver's cottage) – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above.</p> <p>Plot 5 (Victorian building) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 303L. 1 x 240L bin (total volume 240L) have been provided.* As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 5 (Victorian building) – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above.</p> <p>Plot 6 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 1,089L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 6 – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 7a (oriel) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 755L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 7a (oriel) – residual (non-residential) The total daily non-residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 529L. 2 x 240L Bins (total volume 480) have been provided.* As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 303L. 1 x 240L bin (total volume 240L) have been provided.</p> <p>Plot 7a (oriel) – residual (non residential) The total daily non-residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 529L. 2 x 240L Bins (total volume 480) have been provided.</p> <p>Plot 9 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 1,137L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) have been provided There is reference made by the Applicant that such an under provision is due to rounding – justification for this approach is not considered appropriate. It is considered that full provision for the likely waste storage requirements should be provided by the proposed development.</p> <p>There are also examples where this also relates to residential wastes, for example: Plot 4 – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have</p>	<p>Plot 7a (oriel) – organic waste (non-residential) The total daily non-residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 227L. The 1 x 240L Bins (total volume 240L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 7E (London Rd & Kiosks) – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 1,078L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 7E (London Rd & Kiosks) – residual (non-residential) The total daily non-residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 838L. The 1 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 1,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 7E (London Rd & Kiosks) – organic waste (non-residential) The total daily non-residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 240L. The 1 x 240L Bins (total volume 240L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8a – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 671L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8a – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 8b – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 5,343L. The 5 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 5,500L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8b – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 8c – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 3,732L. The 4 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 4,400L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8c – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p> <p>Plot 9 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 1,137L. The 1 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 1,100L) have been provided. * As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable</p> <p>Plot 9 – residual waste – as per the recyclable provisions above</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>been identified as 12,380L. The 11 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 12,100L).</p> <p>Plot 5 inc. chapel – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 9,075L.</p> <p>The 8 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 8,800L) have been provided.</p> <p>Plot 8a – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 8,940L. The 8 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 8,800L).</p> <p>Plot 8a – organic waste (residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 3,174L.</p> <p>The 13 x 240L Bins (total volume 3,120L) have been provided.</p>	<p>Plot 10 – recyclable (non-residential) The total daily non-residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 6,326L. The 6 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 6,600L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 10 – residual (non-residential) The total daily non-residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 2,589L. The 3 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 3,300L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 10 – organic waste (non-residential) The total daily non-residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 3,737L. The 16 x 240L Bins (total volume 3,840L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>RESIDENTIAL WASTE</p> <p>Plot 4 – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 12,380L. The 11 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 12,100L).As discussed within the calculation spreadsheet regarding rounding: if, when summed, the number of bins required equates to a decimal digit up to <.3, the number of bins required has been rounded down to the nearest whole number (e.g. 11.25 has been rounded down to 11 x 1,100L bins required). Where this is greater than .3, the number has been rounded up to the nearest whole number (e.g. 5.57 rounded up to 6 x bins required). This is common practice, and given the additional days' worth of waste calculated into the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 4 – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 16,050L. The 15 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 16,500L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 4 – organic waste (non-residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 3,312L. The 14 x 240L Bins (total volume 3,360L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 5 inc. chapel – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 7,010L. The 7 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 7,700L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<p>Plot 5 inc. chapel – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 9,075L. The 8 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 8,800L) have been provided.* As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable</p> <p>Plot 5 inc. chapel – organic waste (residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 1,886L. The 8 x 240L Bins (total volume 1,920L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 5 Victorian building – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 240L. The 1 x 240L Bins (total volume 240L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 5 Victorian building – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 180L. The 1 x 240L Bins (total volume 240L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 5 Victorian building – organic waste (residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 46L. The 1 x 240L Bins (total volume 240L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8a – recyclable (residential) The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 8,940L. The 8 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 8,800L). As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 8a – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 10,760L. The 10 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 11,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.</p> <p>Plot 8a – organic waste (residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 3,174L. The 13 x 240L Bins (total volume 3,120L) have been provided. As above, the methodology has followed common practice, and the waste storage requirements are deemed fully acceptable.</p> <p>Plot 10 – recyclable (residential)</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		The total weekly residential recyclable waste arisings have been identified as 10,910L. The 10 x 1,100L Euro Bins (total volume 11,100L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated. Plot 10 – residual (residential) The total weekly residential residual waste arisings have been identified as 14,015L. The 13 x 1,100L Bins (total volume 14,300L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated. Plot 10 – organic waste (residential) The total weekly residential organic waste arisings have been identified as 3,082L. The 13 x 240L Bins (total volume 3,120L) proposed covers the volume of waste estimated to be generated.
W13(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant to further explain how this figure of existing waste management capacity within LBTH has been calculated and how this capacity relates to the likely types of waste to be generated by the proposed development. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	“Clarification is sought from the Applicant to further explain how this figure of existing waste management capacity within LBTH has been calculated [...]” - LBTH capacity was calculated using information presented within a number of documents and local/regional plans and reports: GLA (2016) The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (Policy 5.17 Waste Capacity, specifically Table 5.2 and 5.3); GLA (2017) The Draft London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London Draft for Public Consultation (Policy SI8, specifically Table 9.1 and Table 9.2); LBTH, (2017); LBTH Local Plan 2031 (Chapter 10: Managing our Waste); LBTH draft Area Action Plan sites; LBTH (2019); Waste Management Evidence Base Review 2017 (Chapters 3 and 4, and Appendix 4-8); and LBTH (2013); Managing Development Document (Policy DM14, Chapter 3 Site Allocations, Appendix 2.3, 3, 5 and 6). “[...] and how this capacity relates to the likely types of waste to be generated by the proposed development.” - the waste capacity reviewed relates to the waste generated by the Proposed Development in that the waste facilities accept waste streams accepted by the Proposed Development (no specialist waste streams are anticipated to be produced from the use classes proposed for the Proposed Development).
W14(C)	The Applicant states that there will be targets to achieve waste recycling levels and monthly monitoring of achievement of recycling rates. Clarification is	The Applicant will instruct the production of a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) for the demolition and construction of the Proposed Development, which will form part of the overall Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which will be secured via planning condition.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>sought as to how achievement of the targets will be enforced and any penalties that will be imposed on contractors that fail to meet the targets set.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The CEMP will include roles and responsibilities, detail on control measures and activities to be undertaken to minimise environmental impact, and monitoring and record-keeping requirements. A commitment will be made to periodically review the CEMP and undertake regular environmental audits of its implementation during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The CEMP will be prepared and agreed with LBH and LBTH prior to the commencement of any on-site works. An appropriate person (i.e. the Principal Contractor) will be responsible for producing the document, implementing and updating the document throughout the development process, in agreement with LBH and LBTH.</p> <p>“Clarification is sought as to how achievement of the targets will be enforced and any penalties that will be imposed on contractors that fail to meet the targets set.” - in the event of non-compliance of CEMP actions, the Environmental Manager and / or Construction Contractor can request corrective action to make amends and to ensure construction activities are in accordance with legislative and best practice environmental actions and requirements, and agreed mitigation measures. This will be issued to the relevant contractor via an CEMP Corrective Note, stating what action is needed.</p> <p>Measures within the Mitigation Schedules - any breaches of legislative requirements will be immediately acted upon to cease activity (if necessary) and reported to the relevant authorities within 24 hours.</p> <p>Results of the Monitoring - should any non-compliance be identified this will be recorded in site inspection records and copied at Project Manager level for action.</p>
W15(C)	<p>Clarification is sought as to whether there will be sufficient space on-site for demolition and excavation arisings as well as construction wastes to be stored and crushed during the development. A plan showing these locations would be welcomed.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Initial review of the site indicates that sufficient space will be available on site for on-site crushing of demolition arisings. Crushing facilities will generally be located within the areas within which they are generated. Excavation arisings that are not to be re-used will be removed from site at the earliest opportunity and will only be stockpiled for short periods.</p> <p>Construction waste will be held locally to the phased site area within which they arise and will be removed from site at the earliest opportunity to avoid any significant stock-piling on site. Crushed waste will be held temporarily on the site within the area where they are to be generated and transported within the site to the areas within which they will be used to suit the phasing of the works.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
W16(C)	Clarification is sought as to whether the noise from crushing activities on-site have been included for in the noise assessments contained within the ESA. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The construction noise assessment is based on the indicative plant and equipment list provided in Table 5.7 of Chapter 5, which includes concrete crushers.
W17(C)	Clarification is sought as to whether the traffic movements associated with the waste requiring removal from site have been accounted for in the transport assessment contained within the ESA. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The construction traffic movements assessed include those associated with the removal of the waste materials from site.
W18(C)	Table 6.17 of the ESA provides estimates of waste from construction materials. Clarification is sought from the Applicant on the basis for these volumes presented in Table 6.17. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The estimates of waste detailed in the ESA have been calculated by Avison Young. These have been assumed based on calculated material required by the quantity surveyor for the cost plan and professional experience from similar types and scale of schemes.
W19(R)	Paragraph 6.8.39 states that the magnitude of the predicted	"It is unclear how this assessment conclusion has been reached and further information on this is sought from the Applicant " - as discussed within paragraph 6.5.18, a "low magnitude of impact would be applied to

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>increase in waste generation from the proposed development is low. It is unclear how this assessment conclusion has been reached and further information on this is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>the sensitive receptor of the local waste management infrastructure should LBTH/LBH, along with other Boroughs within the GLA with which LBTH/LBH have an agreement with or is part of a waste authority, have the capacity to manage the waste generated by the Revised Scheme".</p> <p>The Proposed Development is anticipated to generate approximately 7,803 tonnes of waste per year as a result of its operation. This volume of waste is typical of a development of this scale and nature. From a review of the baseline information, it is anticipated that additional operational waste arisings can be managed within the existing LBTH and LBH/North London Waste Authority (NLWA) waste management infrastructure and framework.</p> <p>As discussed within paragraph 6.8.37, "All measures embedded into the design of the Revised Scheme, and its' operation, relating to the production, storage and servicing of waste and recycling are discussed within the OWM Strategy presented within ES Addendum Volume 4 Appendix B Waste. To avoid repetition, these measures have not been reiterated here, and this ES chapter should be read in conjunction with the OWM Strategy."</p>
W20(R)	<p>It is considered that the magnitude of the increase in waste volumes from the site should have regard to both waste volumes and the waste composition. The greater of these effects should then be used to determine the significance of any impact. Further information is sought from the Applicant as to why the magnitude of the increase in waste volumes from the site does not have regard to both waste volumes and the waste composition.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p><i>"It is considered that the magnitude of the increase in waste volumes from the site should have regard to both waste volumes and the waste composition."</i> – the magnitude of impact has been assessed with regard to both volume and composition of waste. Paragraph 6.8.39 identifies that <i>"The magnitude of impact in relation to waste volume is low"</i> and Paragraph 6.8.42 identifies that <i>"it is expected that there will be a very low magnitude of change with regards to waste composition compared to baseline conditions"</i>.</p> <p><i>"The greater of these effects should then be used to determine the significance of any impact."</i> – the greater of the two (low magnitude of impact) has been applied to the receptor sensitive to the increase in waste volume: the local waste management infrastructure (see Paragraph 6.8.44). The low sensitivity of this receptor and the low magnitude of change with respect to waste composition and waste volume (combination of the very low magnitude of impact regarding waste composition and the low magnitude of impact regarding waste volume) results in an effect which is negligible, and not significant.</p> <p><i>"Further information is sought from the Applicant as to why the magnitude of the increase in waste volumes from the site does not have regard to both waste volumes and the waste composition."</i> – as discussed above, the magnitude of impact does have regard to both waste volumes and waste composition, and was applied against the sensitive receptor of the local waste management infrastructure, which was the only receptor identified as potentially being directly affected by increases in waste volumes (see response to W2).</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
W21(C)	<p>Paragraph 21.6.6 of the ESA states that approximately 108,860 tonnes to construction wastes will be generated by the LDS scheme. This total exceeds the amount of construction wastes identified in paragraph 6.8.28 of the ESA of 94,935 tonnes of waste for the whole development. Clarification on this conclusion in Chapter 21 is sought from the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The figure quoted in Chapter 21 for volume of construction waste is incorrect, it should read 55,649 m³ as presented in Appendix M. The conclusions presented in Chapter 21 are based on a 55,649 m³ volume.</p>
W22(P)	<p>The CEMP should contain all aspects and mitigation measures as referenced in the ESA including a SWMP and the CEMP should be submitted to and approved by in advance of any commencement of development. The CEMP should be secured through a planning condition including for the implementation of the CEMP as approved.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
Review of Chapter 7: Socio-Economics		

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
SE1(C)	The Applicant is asked to clarify why the draft London Plan 50% Affordable Housing requirement has not been referenced within the Key Legislation, Policy and Guidance Considerations. Further comments: Acceptable	The below should be included in paragraph 7.3.22 which lists the emerging London Plan policies of relevance to the chapter. Policy H5: delivering affordable housing – The strategy target is for 50% per cent of all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable.
SE2(C)	Clarification is sought on which phase the GP surgery will be provided or how the provision of a GP will be secured. Further comments: Acceptable	The GP surgery would be delivered in Plot 5: the surgery space would therefore become available at the end of Phase 3. This is around the same time the first residential units are delivered through the scheme and in advance of the majority of the residential units. This will be secured as part of the s106 agreements.
SE3(C)	Clarification is sought on whether the Applicant is committed to contributing to local skills training and placements. Further comments: Acceptable	Commitments of the Applicant to contributing to local skills and training are provided in Section 1.4 of the Regeneration Strategy submitted in support of the Application in Paragraphs 1.4.10 – 1.4.14 and repeated below for convenience. <i>“The Applicant is committed to working with local partners such as JobCentre Plus, New City College, Hackney Works and Tower Hamlets WorkPath to deliver an Employment, Skills and Enterprise Strategy (see Appendix B). This includes opportunities for pre-employment training and recruitment roadshows. The Applicant has a community Manager who will lead on delivery of commitments related to employment and skills.</i> <i>The Applicant and their supply chains will use reasonable endeavours to ensure that a minimum of 25% of labour employed across the development is to be local during construction. Local in tis instance means LBTH, LBH and neighbouring boroughs. All construction site vacancies will be sent to LBH and LBTH brokerage (Hackney Works and WorkPath) in the first instance to ensure local residents are able to access roles.</i>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<p><i>Apprenticeships will be created during the construction phaser. Apprentices are either directly employed by the Applicant or by one of our sub-contractors. An apprentice working on this development would be working alongside industry experts who are dedicated to nurturing talent whilst providing opportunities to grow skills and help develop a career in construction. Applicant is committing to 150 apprentices working on the scheme during construction (this includes new and existing apprentices).</i></p> <p><i>As well as trade apprenticeships, the Applicant will provide opportunities for local young people to undertake higher Apprenticeships in various professions including Surveying, Construction Management and Design.</i></p> <p><i>The Applicant has extensive experience of working with LBTH on apprentice and pre-apprentice programmes. The Applicant was chosen to partner WorkPath and Tower Hamlets College to run a pilot Pre-Apprenticeship Programme to support local students move from fulltime education into employment. The programmes was a major success with the Applicant placing eight students into employment with its own supply chain.</i></p>
SE4(C)	<p>Clarification is sought as to why the effect relating to net jobs associated with the Revised Scheme has been changed within the LDS.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Chapter 21 is a summary of the LDS which is presented in Appendix M and Paragraph 1.5.13 of the Socio-Economic section of the LDS states that the magnitude of the impact is considered moderate, resulting in a "moderate-minor beneficial effect, which is significant". This is in line with the conclusions of the Socio-Economic chapter.</p>
Review of Chapter 8: Ground Conditions		
GC1(R)	<p>A site visit as requested in the Scoping Opinion from the GLA in April 2019 is recommended to be undertaken as part of supplementary investigations.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p>	<p>A site visit has been undertaken. The site conditions in terms of ground conditions remain broadly unchanged from the previous site visits undertaken in 2013 and 2015. The site will require further site investigations to support the enabling works and the detailed design, and it is assumed that this will form a condition on the planning permission.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
GC2(C)	Clarification is required as to whether groundwater in the Alluvium or River Terrace Deposits aquifers are considered a source of contamination. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Based on the data available, there is no evidence to suggest that either the Alluvium or River Terrace Deposits should be treated as a source of contamination. It is also noteworthy that the land quality of the Site will be re-assessed through a suitable pre-commencement planning condition as it is acknowledged that this has not occurred since 2008.
GC3(R)	Underground tunnels are identified below the site, and there is a railway cutting adjacent to the site, to the south. The chapter briefly states that earthworks including excavations for basements and foundations could adversely affect land stability, but states that any settlement would be of small magnitude and the effects negligible. The effects of demolition, construction and piling on tunnels and cuttings have not been assessed, and further information is required on potential effects and mitigation. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	With the exception of an outline foundation statement (WSP, February 2019), no further information is available at this stage. Further site investigation and assessment will be undertaken to inform foundation and basement design criteria but mitigation measures will include deep piled foundations which will transfer loads to below all tunnels and basements will be suitably propped to prevent land instability. Suitable consultation will be undertaken with all necessary stakeholders including Network Rail and TfL to ensure that settlement and land instability do not pose an issue as part of either temporary or permanent works. Consultations have begun with Network Rail and TfL (London Overground and central Line). Asset protection Agreements will be required in respect of any works that have the potential to impact upon the tunnels, existing structures and live running railways. Prior to the commencement of any such works full site investigations will be carried out which will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil investigations to determine and understand how the piling and foundations will interact with the existing tunnels and structures. • Desktop and structural investigations to understand the form and condition of the existing tunnels and structures. • Where necessary any areas requiring repair prior to the start of the works will be carried out in advance. • Dimensional surveys to establish and agree baseline conditions will be set up as well as monitoring procedures to check for any potential on-going movement of structures during the works. • A full Ground Movement assessment will be carried out to simulate and assess the impacts of the works on the existing tunnels and structures.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement monitoring procedures will be agreed with Network rail and TfL and set up prior to the commencement of the works (usually monitored for a 3-month period prior to the start of works). • Vibration monitoring equipment will also be set up to obtain baseline conditions against which vibration will be monitored during the works. • The process of design information release and discussions with NR and TfL will define any special protection measures required for the existing structures and tunnels. These measures will be agreed in principle during design approvals. • The physical items of protection be they non-working zones or temporary structures will be developed by the contractor(s) and will be subject to NR and/or TfL's approval processes. • During the above processes NR/TfL will set out their requirements and restrictions in terms of any works likely to impact upon the running of the railway. It will be the responsibility of the contractor(s) to draw up working plans to ensure that the works are carried out within the time windows available and agree the details with regard to working methods, access, and compounds where the works could impact on the working railways <p>Both Network Rail and TfL have detailed Asset Protection procedures which have approvals gateways which will be followed by the project's consulting engineers and contractors when appointed.</p>
GC4(C/P)	<p><u>Clarification</u> Clarification is required as to whether there are any potential effects arising from contaminated groundwater, for example associated with disposal of dewatering effluent, and whether mitigation is required.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p> <p><u>Potential Planning Condition</u></p>	<p>Significantly impacted groundwater has not been recorded at the Site during previous investigations. However, further investigation, sampling and assessment will be undertaken via a suitable planning condition which will determine the current groundwater quality and discuss the requirements for dewatering and groundwater discharge including permits (if required).</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>Planning conditions should require that supplementary site investigation and risk assessment is undertaken to update the 2008 site investigation and provide assessment of areas of the site that were not accessible during the previous investigation (e.g. the Sliver). Recent gas and groundwater data are required to verify the earlier report. A remediation method statement and verification plan should be submitted for approval by the Local Authority.</p>	
GC5(C/P)	<p><u>Clarification</u> Effects arising from re-use and/or disposal of excavation spoil are not discussed. Further clarification is required on how waste soils will be managed, for example by using to the CLAIRE Development Industry Definition of Waste Code of Practice.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p> <p><u>Potential Planning Condition</u> All the mitigation measures identified in Table 8.9 of the ESA</p>	<p>It is likely that a small amount of demolition and excavation material will be reused on site where possible or as back fill where appropriate. This will be undertaken in accordance with current best practice and under Duty of Care Regulations. The CoCP Part A has outlined the likely management which has been repeated below for clarification.</p> <p><i>“The Contractor will make provision for a waste storage area on the site that will include containers for the collection and segregation of waste and will be clearly labelled as per the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) colour coding. This is to facilitate re-use, recycling and recovery of waste. Containers will be covered with sheeting or lids. Plastic sheeting will be used where there is a need to store excavated materials and aggregates where these are not contained within a container. Liquid wastes will be stored on hard-surfaced areas with secondary containment systems to prevent spillages. Waste will not be stored within 10m of any controlled watercourse, borehole, well, spring, surface water drainage system or foul water drainage system. The Contractor will comply with approved guidance and procedures in the identification, handling, storage, and management of waste. The Contractor will also comply with the measures set out in section 10 regarding discharges to controlled waters and wastewater.”</i></p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	are to be secured through appropriately worded planning conditions.	
GC6(C/P)	<p><u>Clarification</u> Clarification is required regarding which structures will be provided with gas protection measures and on what basis.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p> <p><u>Potential Planning Condition</u> All the mitigation measures identified in Table 8.10 of the ESA are to be secured through appropriately worded planning conditions.</p>	Necessary gas protection measures will be designed and implemented on a building specific basis following additional site investigation and assessment undertaken via suitable planning condition.
GC7(C/P)	<p><u>Clarification</u> Clarification is required as to whether supplementary site investigations will be undertaken to confirm the previous findings and inform the CoCP and remediation method statement.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p> <p><u>Potential Planning Condition</u></p>	This will be undertaken to supplement/ confirm the previous works, inform the proposed development design and construction mitigation measures including the CoCP and CEMP.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>A planning condition should require that if unexpected contamination is found during demolition and/or construction, the Local Authority is informed and investigation, assessment, remediation and verification are undertaken with the approval of the Local Authority.</p>	
GC8(P)	<p>A planning condition should require that a CoCP is submitted for approval to the Local Authority, taking into account the results of supplementary site investigations. This should include measures to protect workers, the public and groundwater from effects during construction, and be informed by recent site investigation data.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	Agreed.
GC9(P)	<p>A planning condition should require that a Piling Risk Assessment is undertaken, and foundation construction methods agreed with the Local Authority and Environment Agency.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
GC10(P)	A planning condition should require that a UXO survey and mitigation method statement are submitted to the Local Authority for approval. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
Review of Chapter 9: Traffic and Transport		
T1(C)	Consider if the PERS audit, which is appended to the Transport Assessment, should be referenced in the baseline situation of the Traffic and Transport chapter.	Pedestrian conditions were set out in the Transport Assessment using a range of methods including counts of pedestrian flows as well as Pedestrian Comfort Level (PCL) calculations. In addition, the baseline pedestrian environment was evaluated by means of a PERS audit, the results of which are contained in Appendix F of the TA.
T2(C)	Include findings from a Cyclist Environment Review System (CERS) audit or provide a reasoned justification why it is no longer required. <u>Further comment:</u> Not Acceptable Insufficient clarification has been provided by the Applicant. This clarification request remains. <u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable	Discussions are taking place with the local authorities, TfL and GLA during January 2020 to define the proposed provision of cycle routes and infrastructure as part of the Proposed Development. It is considered that, once these have been agreed, the decision as to whether a CERS audit is required can be made jointly by all relevant parties. <u>Further response:</u> It is considered a CERS audit at this stage would not be appropriate due to proposed changes to streets surrounding the site. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed cycle and pedestrian improvements to the Shoreditch High Street / Great Eastern Street / Commercial Street junction. The proposed design would include improved facilities for cyclists in the form of a southbound cycle lane on Shoreditch High Street and turning movements reserved for cyclists; and • The Tower Hamlets Liveable Streets programme includes preliminary proposals to pedestrianise Brick Lane and Sclater Street.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>The clarification provided by the Applicant as a further response is sufficient.</p> <p>No further information is requested.</p>	<p>The planning application includes a detailed application for Plot 2, and listed building applications for Plots A, B, C and D. The remainder of the Plots form the outline application. The development proposals will not come forward for some time, therefore the street improvements may be in place by the time the development begins on-site. Reserved Matters Application will be required for the plots included within the Outline Application, therefore audits and assessment of existing cycle infrastructure would be more suitable at these stages, and will be discussed with TfL and the Boroughs once these plans come forward.</p>
T3(C)	<p>Consider if the findings of the Healthy Streets Check, as a tool designed to assist with determining the extent of change in the street environment, should be referenced in the baseline situation of the Traffic and Transport chapter.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Not Acceptable Insufficient clarification has been provided by the Applicant. This clarification request remains.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable</p> <p>In the circumstances, the clarification provided by the Applicant as a Further Response is considered sufficient.</p>	<p>Discussions are taking place with the local authorities, TfL and GLA during January 2020 to define the proposed provision of cycle routes and infrastructure as part of the Proposed Development. It is considered that, once these have been agreed, the decision as to whether a CERS audit is required can be made jointly by all relevant parties.</p> <p><u>Further response</u> A Healthy Streets Assessment is contained within Chapter 3 of the Transport Assessment; it is considered that this addresses this requirement.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																						
	It should be noted however that the Healthy Streets Assessment is contained within Chapter 5, not Chapter 3, of the Transport Assessment.																																																																							
T4(C)	Provide consistency in the approach adopted for the presentation of the impact of the scheme. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The pedestrian comfort level comparison tables 13.6 and 13.7 in the TA can also be used in the analysis within the ES chapter, as they compare the Future Baseline and Future Baseline Plus Development scenarios. These tables are referenced in response to point T14 below. TA Table 13.6 - 2033 Future Baseline (TfL growth rate) plus Proposed Development PCL Audit – Weekday <table border="1" data-bbox="891 852 2119 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="891 852 1234 895">Link</th> <th data-bbox="1234 852 1368 1007" rowspan="2">Baseline width (m)</th> <th data-bbox="1368 852 1496 1007" rowspan="2">Future width (m)</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1496 852 1816 895">Weekday AM peak</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1816 852 2119 895">Weekday PM peak</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="891 895 949 1007"></th> <th data-bbox="949 895 1234 1007"></th> <th data-bbox="1496 895 1666 1007">2033 Future Base</th> <th data-bbox="1666 895 1816 1007">2033 Future Base + Dev</th> <th data-bbox="1816 895 1966 1007">2033 Future Base</th> <th data-bbox="1966 895 2119 1007">2033 Future Base + Dev</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1007 949 1066">1 a</td> <td data-bbox="949 1007 1234 1066">Bethnal Green Road (north side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1007 1368 1066">3.6</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1007 1496 1066">3.6</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1007 1666 1066">B+</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1007 1816 1066">B+</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1007 1966 1066">B+</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1007 2119 1066">B+</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1066 949 1125">1 b</td> <td data-bbox="949 1066 1234 1125">Bethnal Green Road (south side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1066 1368 1125">4</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1066 1496 1125">5</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1066 1666 1125">B+</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1066 1816 1125">B+</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1066 1966 1125">B-</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1066 2119 1125">B-</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1125 949 1184">2 a</td> <td data-bbox="949 1125 1234 1184">Sclater Street (north side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1125 1368 1184">2.3</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1125 1496 1184">2.3</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1125 1666 1184">A+</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1125 1816 1184">A+</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1125 1966 1184">A</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1125 2119 1184">A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1184 949 1243">2 b</td> <td data-bbox="949 1184 1234 1243">Sclater Street (south side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1184 1368 1243">2.2</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1184 1496 1243">4.5</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1184 1666 1243">A</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1184 1816 1243">A+</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1184 1966 1243">A-</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1184 2119 1243">A</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1243 949 1302">3 a</td> <td data-bbox="949 1243 1234 1302">Brick Lane (east side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1243 1368 1302">2</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1243 1496 1302">2</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1243 1666 1302">A</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1243 1816 1302">A</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1243 1966 1302">B</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1243 2119 1302">B-</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1302 949 1361">3 b</td> <td data-bbox="949 1302 1234 1361">Brick Lane (west side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1302 1368 1361">2.1</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1302 1496 1361">18</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1302 1666 1361">A-</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1302 1816 1361">A+</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1302 1966 1361">B</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1302 2119 1361">A+</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1361 949 1401">4 a</td> <td data-bbox="949 1361 1234 1401">Quaker Street (north side)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1361 1368 1401">2</td> <td data-bbox="1368 1361 1496 1401">2</td> <td data-bbox="1496 1361 1666 1401">A-</td> <td data-bbox="1666 1361 1816 1401">A-</td> <td data-bbox="1816 1361 1966 1401">A-</td> <td data-bbox="1966 1361 2119 1401">A-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Link		Baseline width (m)	Future width (m)	Weekday AM peak		Weekday PM peak				2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev	2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev	1 a	Bethnal Green Road (north side)	3.6	3.6	B+	B+	B+	B+	1 b	Bethnal Green Road (south side)	4	5	B+	B+	B-	B-	2 a	Sclater Street (north side)	2.3	2.3	A+	A+	A	A	2 b	Sclater Street (south side)	2.2	4.5	A	A+	A-	A	3 a	Brick Lane (east side)	2	2	A	A	B	B-	3 b	Brick Lane (west side)	2.1	18	A-	A+	B	A+	4 a	Quaker Street (north side)	2	2	A-	A-	A-	A-
Link		Baseline width (m)	Future width (m)	Weekday AM peak			Weekday PM peak																																																																	
				2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev	2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev																																																																	
1 a	Bethnal Green Road (north side)	3.6	3.6	B+	B+	B+	B+																																																																	
1 b	Bethnal Green Road (south side)	4	5	B+	B+	B-	B-																																																																	
2 a	Sclater Street (north side)	2.3	2.3	A+	A+	A	A																																																																	
2 b	Sclater Street (south side)	2.2	4.5	A	A+	A-	A																																																																	
3 a	Brick Lane (east side)	2	2	A	A	B	B-																																																																	
3 b	Brick Lane (west side)	2.1	18	A-	A+	B	A+																																																																	
4 a	Quaker Street (north side)	2	2	A-	A-	A-	A-																																																																	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response							
		4 b	Quaker Street (south side)	2.3	2.3	A+	A+	A+	A+
		5 a	Commercial Street (north side)	2.2	2.5	A	B	A-	B
		5 b	Commercial Street (south side)	2.7	2.7	A+	A-	A	B+
		6 a	Shoreditch High Street (east side)	3.5	18	B+	A	B-	A
		6 b	Shoreditch High Street (west side)	3	3	A	B	B+	C+
		7 a	Middle Road (East of Braithwaite)	-	9.5	-	B+	-	B
		7 b	Middle Road (West of Braithwaite)	-	13	-	A-	-	A-
		8 a	Braithwaite Street (North of Middle Road)	8	8	A	A-	A	A-
		8 b	Braithwaite Street (South of Middle Road)	10	10	A+	A+	A+	A+
		9 a	Bishopsgate West side (lower walkway)	5	5	C+	D	C-	D
		9 b	Bishopsgate West side (upper walkway)	4.5	4.5	A	A-	A	A
TA Table 13.7 - 2033 Future Baseline (TfL growth rate) plus Proposed Development PCL Audit – Weekend									
		Link		Baseline width (m)	Future width (m)	Saturday peak		Sunday peak	
						2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev	2033 Future Base	2033 Future Base + Dev
1 a	Bethnal Green Road (north side)	3.6	3.6	A	A	A	A-		

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response							
		1 b	Bethnal Green Road (south side)	4	5	A-	B+	B+	B
		2 a	Sclater Street (north side)	2.3	2.3	A	A	A	A-
		2 b	Sclater Street (south side)	2.2	4.5	A	A	A-	A
		3 a	Brick Lane (east side)	2	2	B	B-	A-	B+
		3 b	Brick Lane (west side)	2.1	18	B+	A+	A-	A+
		6 a	Shoreditch High Street (east side)	3.5	18	A-	A+	A-	A
		6 b	Shoreditch High Street (west side)	3	3	A	A-	A	B
T5(C)	Review the assessment of likely effects and their significance for the operational phase and re-order the section on impact assessment so that determination of the effects can be drawn from the findings of the assessment of impact.	Paragraph 9.8.16 refers to pedestrian delay whose impacts are calculated based upon analysis of the interaction between pedestrian and vehicle movements; see the response to point T6. The subsequent paragraphs refer to pedestrian amenity, principally with regards to the changes in pedestrian footfall and the effective widths of pedestrian links. While pedestrian amenity and delay constitute a single area for assessment, it is appropriate to analyse them separately, and the conclusion of the former was set out prior to the calculation of the latter. The overall impact on pedestrian amenity and delay was then reconciled at the end of the chapter.							
T6(C)	Performances of the sections of pedestrian thoroughfares to be presented separately. Further comments: Acceptable	Paragraph 9.8.8 of the ES chapter presents the findings of the anticipated effects with regards to pedestrian amenity and delay. The conclusion, that the impact is negligible, is calculated on the basis that no links experience journeys lengthened beyond the threshold of 30%. No pedestrian links are being closed as part of the scheme design, and therefore journey lengths will not increase with respect to the baseline. Similarly, during construction, the delays are similar across the entire pedestrian network insofar as there are a number of accesses which vehicles will cross, leading to brief pedestrian delays; these accesses are located on multiple links around the site perimeter, so the impacts are similar across all links assessed.							
T7(C)	Clarify the baseline traffic conditions against which	Table 11.1 in Chapter 11 of the TA, lists the cumulative schemes whose effects have been considered as part of the cumulative assessment.							

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																				
	cumulative effects are being considered. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The assessment of the cumulative schemes is based on the trip distributions presented in the documents accompanying each planning application. Where these trip distributions are not available, a directional assumption has been applied based upon the relative distribution of trip attractors and construction routes as applicable. LBTH and LBH have confirmed a number of committed and planned developments which are to be taken into consideration for the purpose of the Transport Assessment. When considering the future baseline conditions, these schemes have been accounted for in terms of the demand on the transport networks. For robustness, the Future Baseline includes not only the consented cumulative schemes but also those pending a decision and represents the future transport networks including full occupation of the cumulative schemes. It is anticipated that the cumulative schemes would reach full occupation by the future baseline year 2033.																				
T8(C)	Update Non-Technical Summary as appropriate. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The conclusions set out in the ES are not anticipated to change as a result of the clarifications set out elsewhere in this memo; consequently no changes are deemed necessary to the Non-Technical Summary.																				
T9(R)	Existing use of transport networks by pedestrians, cyclists, bus users or rail-based public transport as appropriate to be included. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Existing use of transport networks by road users is summarised in the following Appendices of the TA – Appendix C summarises 2018 Pedestrian Survey Data, Appendix D presents 2018 pedestrian flow diagrams and Appendix E summarises the PCL Assessment. Appendix H presents MCC traffic survey data. The table below summarises the existing loading on the rail corridors in the AM and PM peak hours. <table border="1" data-bbox="891 1209 1982 1401"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rail corridor</th> <th>Capacity</th> <th>Current Loading AM - IN</th> <th>Current Loading AM - OUT</th> <th>% Loading AM - IN</th> <th>% Loading AM - OUT</th> <th>Current Loading PM - IN</th> <th>Current Loading PM - OUT</th> <th>% Loading PM - IN</th> <th>% Loading PM - OUT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rail corridor	Capacity	Current Loading AM - IN	Current Loading AM - OUT	% Loading AM - IN	% Loading AM - OUT	Current Loading PM - IN	Current Loading PM - OUT	% Loading PM - IN	% Loading PM - OUT										
Rail corridor	Capacity	Current Loading AM - IN	Current Loading AM - OUT	% Loading AM - IN	% Loading AM - OUT	Current Loading PM - IN	Current Loading PM - OUT	% Loading PM - IN	% Loading PM - OUT													

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response										
		Shoreditch High Street (North)	840	293	126	35%	15%	187	171	22%	20%	
		Shoreditch High Street (South)	840	198	187	24%	22%	120	228	14%	27%	
		Old Street (North - Northern line)	862	512	394	59%	46%	676	715	78%	83%	
		Old Street (South - Northern Line)	862	957	924	111%	107%	485	606	56%	70%	
		Aldgate East (West)	1045	526	542	50%	52%	229	291	22%	28%	
		Aldgate East (East)	1045	318	193	30%	18%	661	653	63%	63%	
		Liverpool Street (Central - West)	1047	996	1009	95%	96%	333	505	32%	48%	
		Liverpool Street (Central - East)	1047	358	163	34%	16%	981	922	94%	88%	
		Liverpool Street (Circle/H&C/ Met - West)	1045	233	499	22%	48%	239	399	23%	38%	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
T10(R)	<p>There is no reference in the Traffic and Transport chapter to a future baseline, however this appears to have been used as a basis for assessing the effects of the scheme.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>It is assumed that there is no growth in baseline traffic flow for the future year of opening, excluding new trips generated by other cumulative schemes. This is a common approach across London as recent trends show no growth in traffic, in fact there has been a levelling off and a reduction in traffic in central London, and this is highlighted in TfL's Travel in London Report.</p> <p>LBTH and LBH have confirmed a number of committed and planned developments which are to be taken into consideration for the purpose of the Transport Assessment. When considering the future baseline conditions, these schemes have been accounted for in terms of the demand on the transport networks.</p> <p>For robustness, the Future Baseline includes not only the consented cumulative schemes but also those pending a decision and represents the future transport networks including full occupation of the cumulative schemes.</p> <p>This data has then been converted into 18-hour Annual Average Weekday Traffic (AAWT) and 24-hour Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) traffic flows and summarised in Table 16.1 the TA</p> <p>The future baseline is for informative purposes only and has been used only to assess the environmental effects of the Proposed Scheme in 2033.</p> <p>It is to be noted that the proposed development is car-free and therefore the number of additional car trips expected to be added to the network is minimal. The development will generate up to 62 and 27 servicing trips in the AM and PM peak hour respectively, across the site. These trips will be distributed across several service yards. The distribution of car and taxi movements on the network is based on the robust assumption that any drop-offs would occur on Bethnal Green Road or Sclater Street adjacent to the site, rather than on nearby roads which in practice is likely and which would reduce the traffic impact on streets adjacent to the site.</p> <p>This distribution/ redistribution of traffic represents the difference between the Future baseline and Maximum Build Out Scenarios.</p>
T11(R)	<p>Provide basis for qualitative assessment of severance and judgement of impact or alternatively refer to quantitative data available.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p>	<p>While the change in severance can be measured using changes in traffic flow, the measurement and prediction of severance is extremely difficult. The IEMA 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic' notes that the correlation between the extent of severance and the physical barrier of a road is not clear and there are no predictive formulae which give simple relationships between traffic factors and levels of severance.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	<p>The MEA, however, sets out a range of indicators for determining the significance of relief from severance. Changes in traffic flow of 30%, 60% and 90% are regarded as producing 'slight', 'moderate' and 'substantial' changes in severance respectively.</p> <p>Change in traffic flows is provided in Table 16.1 of the TA. The change in traffic flows demonstrate that except for Wheeler Street, the percentage increase in flows on each road due to the proposed development, points to a slight change in severance. The traffic flow change on Wheeler Street, which is an access route to the servicing yards, produces a moderate change in severance.</p> <p>However, the Revised Scheme will provide a positive contribution towards reducing severance, both in the provision of new pedestrian links such as the east-west connection as well as enhancements to existing links such as Braithwaite Street. There will be no through traffic using these links which will further reduce severance for pedestrians.</p>
T12(R)	<p>Provide basis for qualitative assessment of delay and judgement of impact or alternatively refer to quantitative data available.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Specific information on change in traffic flows is provided in the TA in Table 16.1. The principal links that would experience a significant increase in traffic flows are Wheeler Street and Sclater Street. However, the increase can be attributed to the links' role as access routes to the servicing yards at the northern and southern ends of the site.</p> <p>It is noted that, while the percentage increase in traffic on these links appears high, the absolute change is in the order of 300 - 400 vehicle movements across the day which is not considered to be a significant impact across the day. Sclater Street and Wheeler Street are accessed via priority junctions and experience a low increase in absolute traffic flow across the course of the day. On the other links, the increase in traffic flow is even lower.</p> <p>On the basis that the vehicle trips generated by the operation of the site are not considered to have a material impact on traffic flow on the network, it was agreed with TfL that traffic modelling will not be undertaken to estimate vehicle time and delay.</p> <p>The MEA does not suggest any thresholds for judging the significance of actual changes in levels of pedestrian delay and recommends assessors to use their judgements to determine whether pedestrian delay is a significant impact.</p> <p>Delay is therefore scoped out of the assessment, but a qualitative review is included to consider and confirm any potential changes to the previous assessment conclusions. The qualitative assessment includes delay and amenity for public transport users, the two being interlinked insofar as an increase in passenger numbers can lead to both delays in journey times and a loss of amenity for passengers.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																						
T13(R)	<p>Provide basis for qualitative assessment of amenity, fear and intimidation and judgement of impact or alternatively refer to quantitative data available.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>Pedestrian amenity is broadly defined as the relative pleasantness of a journey and is considered to be affected by traffic flow, traffic composition and pavement width/separation from traffic</p> <p>The IEMA guidelines suggest a tentative threshold for judging the significance of changes in pedestrian amenity would be where traffic flow (or its HGV component) is halved or doubled.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 639 2130 1369"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Links</th> <th colspan="3">Future Base - 18hr AAWT</th> <th colspan="3">FB+Dev WholeSite - 18hr AAWT</th> <th rowspan="2">Increase</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total vehs/hr</th> <th>HGVs/hr</th> <th>Total 18 Hr HGV Flow</th> <th>Total vehs/hr</th> <th>HGVs</th> <th>Total 18 Hr HGV Flow</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane</td> <td>1294</td> <td>133</td> <td>2392</td> <td>1325</td> <td>136</td> <td>2455</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street</td> <td>536</td> <td>123</td> <td>2221</td> <td>544</td> <td>125</td> <td>2247</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street</td> <td>670</td> <td>75</td> <td>1348</td> <td>718</td> <td>80</td> <td>1443</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street</td> <td>117</td> <td>17</td> <td>314</td> <td>139</td> <td>20</td> <td>366</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street</td> <td>150</td> <td>30</td> <td>539</td> <td>160</td> <td>31</td> <td>562</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street</td> <td>31</td> <td>12</td> <td>223</td> <td>48</td> <td>15</td> <td>271</td> <td>53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street</td> <td>1174</td> <td>150</td> <td>2696</td> <td>1214</td> <td>156</td> <td>2800</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Links	Future Base - 18hr AAWT			FB+Dev WholeSite - 18hr AAWT			Increase	Total vehs/hr	HGVs/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Total vehs/hr	HGVs	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane	1294	133	2392	1325	136	2455	2%	Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street	536	123	2221	544	125	2247	2%	Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street	670	75	1348	718	80	1443	7%	Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street	117	17	314	139	20	366	19%	Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street	150	30	539	160	31	562	7%	Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street	31	12	223	48	15	271	53%	Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street	1174	150	2696	1214	156	2800	3%
Links	Future Base - 18hr AAWT			FB+Dev WholeSite - 18hr AAWT			Increase																																																																	
	Total vehs/hr	HGVs/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Total vehs/hr	HGVs	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow																																																																		
Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane	1294	133	2392	1325	136	2455	2%																																																																	
Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street	536	123	2221	544	125	2247	2%																																																																	
Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street	670	75	1348	718	80	1443	7%																																																																	
Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street	117	17	314	139	20	366	19%																																																																	
Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street	150	30	539	160	31	562	7%																																																																	
Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street	31	12	223	48	15	271	53%																																																																	
Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street	1174	150	2696	1214	156	2800	3%																																																																	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response							
		Shoreditch High Street between Commercial Street and Folgate Street	734	186	3353	760	188	3391	3%
		Shoreditch High Street between Bethnal Green Road and Commercial Street	1142	204	3674	1198	211	3790	5%
		Bethnal Green Road east of Sclater Street	445	38	688	452	40	714	2%
		Brick Lane north of Sclater Street	150	30	539	154	31	562	2%
		Brick Lane south of Quaker Street	182	42	761	192	44	785	5%
		Holywell Lane	189	25	450	194	26	468	3%
		Braithwaite Street	0	0	0	21	4	73	-
<p>Sclater Street and Wheeler Street are not forecast to experience changes (doubling) in traffic flow of this magnitude; however, over the 18-hour period the AADT flows increase by 19% and 53%, respectively. Accordingly, development-related traffic will have a minor adverse effect on pedestrian amenity.</p> <p>There is neither formal guidance nor a consensus of thresholds for the assessment of the level of fear and intimidation experienced by pedestrians. However, the degree of fear and intimidation experienced is generally dependent on traffic volumes, composition and the presence of protection such as wide footways or guardrails. IEMA suggest the use of degree of hazard thresholds as set out in Table 9.5.1 of the ES, in order to assess fear and intimidation in the first instance.</p> <p>With the exception of one link, (Wheeler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street) all of the assessed links (13) are forecast to experience speeds between 15 and 20 mph over an 18 hour day in the Maximum build out scenario, hence the degree of hazard is deemed to be Great.</p> <p>When looking at the average traffic flow for the fear and intimidation assessment, 4 links experience no change in severity classification as a result of the Proposed Scheme. These links are classified as</p>									

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<p>Moderate. Wheeler Street (between Quaker Street and Commercial Street) is forecast to upgrade in severity classification from Moderate to Great in the Maximum Build Out scenario.</p> <p>Therefore, the overall magnitude of change is considered to be negligible to low.</p> <p>The sensitivity of the receptor (Highway Users- pedestrians and cyclists) is high and the magnitude of change, prior to mitigation, is negligible to low. Therefore, there is likely to be a direct, permanent, long-term effect on Highway Users of negligible to minor adverse significance prior to the implementation of mitigation measures.</p>
T14(R)	<p>Review significance criteria in relation to use of Pedestrian Comfort Levels.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>Baseline pedestrian comfort levels (PCLs) are set out in Tables 9.6.2 and 9.6.3; future with-development levels are listed in Tables 9.8.1 and 9.8.2. PCLs are quantified in a scale from A (best level of service) through to F (least).; each of these levels is further subdivided into three sub-levels, giving a total of 18 grades from A+ through to F-. It can be supposed that a change in level by one letter (e.g. from B+ to C+) can be considered a moderate impact, with any smaller change considered to be not significant. The only pedestrian link experiencing a decrease in PCL of significance is the Bishopsgate West lower walkway (link 9a) whose AM peak PCL decreases from C+ to D. However, as set out in the TA paragraph 13.3.6, pedestrian flow can be distributed between the two adjacent walkways, as a result of which no link would experience a decrease as great as one letter. Consequently there is not a significant impact on pedestrian comfort arising from the proposed development.</p>
T15(R)	<p>Review significance criteria in relation to effects on users of public transport.</p>	<p>The additional public transport trips generated by the Scheme are anticipated to generate additional journeys leading to a direct, permanent, long-term, minor adverse impact on comfort for rail and</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																						
	<p>Further comment: Not Acceptable Whilst the additional information provided by the Applicant is considered acceptable in respect of travel by rail/underground, the equivalent assessment of additional loading of buses is still required. Information is provided already in terms of numbers of additional bus passengers and this can be used as a tool for identifying services which require closer scrutiny, i.e., by reference to Tables 9.25 and 9.26 not all bus service directions need to be included. Further information is required.</p> <p>Further comment: Acceptable The Further Response provided in respect of the assessment of additional loading of buses is considered sufficient at his time. It is noted that bus ridership can be</p>	<p>Underground passengers as well as bus passengers. The tables below summarize the current and additional loading on rail corridors in AM and PM peak hours.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 571 2094 1383"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rail corridor</th> <th>Capacity</th> <th>Current Loading AM - IN</th> <th>Current Loading AM - OUT</th> <th>% Loading AM - IN</th> <th>% Loading AM - OUT</th> <th>Future Loading AM - IN</th> <th>Future Loading AM - OUT</th> <th>Future % Loading AM - IN</th> <th>Future % Loading AM - OUT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street (North)</td> <td>840</td> <td>293</td> <td>126</td> <td>35%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>300</td> <td>128</td> <td>36%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street (South)</td> <td>840</td> <td>198</td> <td>187</td> <td>24%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>218</td> <td>190</td> <td>26%</td> <td>23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Street (North - Northern line)</td> <td>862</td> <td>512</td> <td>394</td> <td>59%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>522</td> <td>395</td> <td>61%</td> <td>46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Street (South - Northern Line)</td> <td>862</td> <td>957</td> <td>924</td> <td>111%</td> <td>107%</td> <td>985</td> <td>925</td> <td>114%</td> <td>107%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aldgate East (West)</td> <td>1045</td> <td>526</td> <td>542</td> <td>50%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>536</td> <td>544</td> <td>51%</td> <td>52%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aldgate East (East)</td> <td>1045</td> <td>318</td> <td>193</td> <td>30%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>321</td> <td>193</td> <td>31%</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rail corridor	Capacity	Current Loading AM - IN	Current Loading AM - OUT	% Loading AM - IN	% Loading AM - OUT	Future Loading AM - IN	Future Loading AM - OUT	Future % Loading AM - IN	Future % Loading AM - OUT	Shoreditch High Street (North)	840	293	126	35%	15%	300	128	36%	15%	Shoreditch High Street (South)	840	198	187	24%	22%	218	190	26%	23%	Old Street (North - Northern line)	862	512	394	59%	46%	522	395	61%	46%	Old Street (South - Northern Line)	862	957	924	111%	107%	985	925	114%	107%	Aldgate East (West)	1045	526	542	50%	52%	536	544	51%	52%	Aldgate East (East)	1045	318	193	30%	18%	321	193	31%	18%
Rail corridor	Capacity	Current Loading AM - IN	Current Loading AM - OUT	% Loading AM - IN	% Loading AM - OUT	Future Loading AM - IN	Future Loading AM - OUT	Future % Loading AM - IN	Future % Loading AM - OUT																																																															
Shoreditch High Street (North)	840	293	126	35%	15%	300	128	36%	15%																																																															
Shoreditch High Street (South)	840	198	187	24%	22%	218	190	26%	23%																																																															
Old Street (North - Northern line)	862	512	394	59%	46%	522	395	61%	46%																																																															
Old Street (South - Northern Line)	862	957	924	111%	107%	985	925	114%	107%																																																															
Aldgate East (West)	1045	526	542	50%	52%	536	544	51%	52%																																																															
Aldgate East (East)	1045	318	193	30%	18%	321	193	31%	18%																																																															

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response									
	reviewed as subsequent development phases come forward for detailed application. No further information is requested.	Liverpool Street (Central - West)	1047	996	1009	95%	96%	1015	1013	97%	97%
		Liverpool Street (Central - East)	1047	358	163	34%	16%	365	164	35%	16%
		Liverpool Street (Circle/H &C/Met - West)	1045	233	499	22%	48%	244	501	23%	48%
		Rail corridor	Capacity	Current Loading PM - IN	Current Loading PM - OUT	% Loading PM - IN	% Loading PM - OUT	Future Loading PM - IN	Future Loading PM - OUT	Future % Loading PM - IN	Future % Loading PM - OUT
		Shoreditch High Street (North)	840	187	171	22%	20%	188	177	22%	21%
		Shoreditch High Street (South)	840	120	228	14%	27%	122	242	15%	29%
		Old Street (North - National Rail)	Unavailable								
		Old Street (North -	862	676	715	78%	83%	677	722	78%	84%

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response													
		Northern line)													
		Old Street (South - Northern Line)	862	485	606	56%	70%	486	625	56%	73%				
		Aldgate East (West)	1045	229	291	22%	28%	230	299	22%	29%				
		Aldgate East (East)	1045	661	653	63%	63%	662	656	63%	63%				
		Liverpool Street (Central - West)	1047	333	505	32%	48%	337	523	32%	50%				
		Liverpool Street (Central - East)	1047	981	922	94%	88%	982	927	94%	89%				
		Liverpool Street (Circle/H&C/Met - West)	1045	239	399	23%	38%	241	408	23%	39%				
		Liverpool Street (National Rail)	Unavailable												
		The demand on the trains and station services is already significant, especially on the Northern Line at Old Street and Central Line at Liverpool Street. As demonstrated by Table, the Proposed Development is forecast to increase ridership on rail and Underground services by less than 1% during the AM and PM peak periods.													

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<p>There are existing capacity issues on infrastructure serving the stations, which is only made slightly worse overall by the development, when measured with background growth.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>A comparison of baseline and with-development bus loading has not been requested by TfL or the Boroughs in the Transport Assessment, and therefore has not been undertaken for the Transport chapter. The maximum additional loading is less than 4 people per bus, and bus capacity has not been raised as a concern by TfL or the Boroughs. When subsequent development phases come forward for detailed application, bus ridership can be reviewed. It is noted that there is greater flexibility to provide additional capacity on the bus network compared to rail-based modes, should this be identified as an issue in future.</p>
T16(R)	<p>Identify potential receptors of transport effects and their sensitivity criteria.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The potential receptors are all people making journeys within the study area using different modes who may be sensitive to changes in traffic conditions. The existing and the receptors introduced by the proposed development are detailed separately.</p> <p>Existing Receptors</p> <p>The receptors on the site and within the surrounds that may be affected by the Proposed Development are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car drivers; • Pedestrians; • Cyclists; • Bus passengers; and • Rail Passengers. <p>Introduced Receptors</p> <p>It is appropriate to consider the receptors that would be introduced on the site as part of the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents, Site employees and visitors (drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users); and • New retail visitors (drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users).

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		It is anticipated that among all groups identified, cyclists and pedestrians will have high sensitivity while public transport users will have medium sensitivity; among residents and employees, drivers will have low sensitivity; and among retail visitors, drivers will have medium sensitivity.
T17(R)	Include the basis for assessment of effects during the construction phase. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	<p>A peak of 48 two-way (96 total) vehicle movements per day associated with the construction stages is anticipated. All construction workers are anticipated to arrive at the site by public transport given its excellent connectivity.</p> <p>The demolition and construction forecast have been assessed against the future baseline traffic data for Shoreditch High Street, Bethnal Green Road, Sclater Street and Commercial Street in Table 17.3 in the TA. As vehicles are not currently permitted to travel through the site via Braithwaite Street, it has not been included in this assessment. However, pedestrians and cyclists have been accounted for as potential receptors of traffic effects on the road. Where the change in traffic flow is less than 30% (10% for sensitive receptors / road links), the environmental effects have been assessed to be negligible as the IEMA Guidelines recommend that these limits should be used as a screening process to define the scale and extent of the assessment.</p> <p>The traffic flows outlined in the TA, demonstrate that the percentage increase (less than 10%) in flows on each road during the construction phase of the development are not significant with a direct, reversible, temporary, short term, negligible effect on severance. The effect is not significant.</p> <p>During the construction of the Revised Scheme there is anticipated to be a direct, reversible, temporary, short term, minor adverse effect on bus delay, cyclist delay and driver delay arising from the movement of construction traffic on the road network around the site. Road closures would only be required in exceptional circumstances, and the majority of the site fronts onto minor roads with low traffic volumes. The volume of traffic generated by construction is low as a proportion of existing traffic volumes (including heavy vehicles).</p> <p>The turning movements of construction vehicles from Shoreditch High Street, Bethnal Green Road, Sclater Street and Commercial Street into and out of the construction site accesses present a direct, reversible, temporary, short term, minor adverse effect on cyclist safety since a conflict may arise when vehicles turn left into the construction site entrances. The effect is less severe upon exit since construction traffic will be stationary before pulling out of the construction site egress.</p>
T18(R)	Include cumulative impact assessment for the construction	The cumulative schemes are located on all the major highway network surrounding the site. However, a comparison of future baseline traffic flows with the construction phase's traffic flows demonstrates that no additional demolition and construction related significant effects are likely as a result of the proposed

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																															
	phase of the proposed development. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	development in conjunction with the cumulative schemes. None of them include substantial vehicular traffic impacts, and their impact on the network is spread over a long period and a wide network. <table border="1" data-bbox="896 600 2078 1393"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Links</th> <th colspan="2">Future Baseline - 18hr AAWT</th> <th colspan="2">Construction Phase - 18hr AAWT</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Total veh/hr</th> <th>Total 18 Hr HGV Flow</th> <th>Total veh/hr</th> <th>Total 18 Hr HGV Flow</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane</td> <td>1294</td> <td>2392</td> <td>1294</td> <td>2392</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street</td> <td>536</td> <td>2221</td> <td>536</td> <td>2221</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street</td> <td>670</td> <td>1348</td> <td>670</td> <td>1444</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street</td> <td>117</td> <td>314</td> <td>117</td> <td>314</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street</td> <td>150</td> <td>539</td> <td>150</td> <td>539</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street</td> <td>31</td> <td>223</td> <td>31</td> <td>223</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street</td> <td>1174</td> <td>2696</td> <td>1174</td> <td>2792</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street between Commercial Street and Folgate Street</td> <td>734</td> <td>3353</td> <td>734</td> <td>3353</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shoreditch High Street between Bethnal Green Road and Commercial Street</td> <td>1142</td> <td>3674</td> <td>1142</td> <td>3770</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bethnal Green Road east of Sclater Street</td> <td>445</td> <td>688</td> <td>445</td> <td>688</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brick Lane north of Sclater Street</td> <td>150</td> <td>539</td> <td>150</td> <td>539</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brick Lane south of Quaker Street</td> <td>182</td> <td>761</td> <td>182</td> <td>761</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Holywell Lane</td> <td>189</td> <td>450</td> <td>189</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Braithwaite Street</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>96</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Links	Future Baseline - 18hr AAWT		Construction Phase - 18hr AAWT		Total veh/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Total veh/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane	1294	2392	1294	2392	Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street	536	2221	536	2221	Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street	670	1348	670	1444	Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street	117	314	117	314	Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street	150	539	150	539	Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street	31	223	31	223	Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street	1174	2696	1174	2792	Shoreditch High Street between Commercial Street and Folgate Street	734	3353	734	3353	Shoreditch High Street between Bethnal Green Road and Commercial Street	1142	3674	1142	3770	Bethnal Green Road east of Sclater Street	445	688	445	688	Brick Lane north of Sclater Street	150	539	150	539	Brick Lane south of Quaker Street	182	761	182	761	Holywell Lane	189	450	189	450	Braithwaite Street	0	0	0	96
Links	Future Baseline - 18hr AAWT			Construction Phase - 18hr AAWT																																																																													
	Total veh/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow	Total veh/hr	Total 18 Hr HGV Flow																																																																													
Great Eastern Street west of Holywell Lane	1294	2392	1294	2392																																																																													
Shoreditch High Street north of Redchurch Street	536	2221	536	2221																																																																													
Bethnal Green Road east of Shoreditch High Street	670	1348	670	1444																																																																													
Sclater Street between Bethnal Green Road and Cygnet Street	117	314	117	314																																																																													
Brick Lane between Grimsby Street and Quaker Street	150	539	150	539																																																																													
Wheler Street between Quaker Street and Commercial Street	31	223	31	223																																																																													
Commercial Street between Quaker Street and Shoreditch High Street	1174	2696	1174	2792																																																																													
Shoreditch High Street between Commercial Street and Folgate Street	734	3353	734	3353																																																																													
Shoreditch High Street between Bethnal Green Road and Commercial Street	1142	3674	1142	3770																																																																													
Bethnal Green Road east of Sclater Street	445	688	445	688																																																																													
Brick Lane north of Sclater Street	150	539	150	539																																																																													
Brick Lane south of Quaker Street	182	761	182	761																																																																													
Holywell Lane	189	450	189	450																																																																													
Braithwaite Street	0	0	0	96																																																																													

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
T19(C)	<p>In terms of effects arising from the LDS it is considered that the overall impact will be similar to that of the proposed scheme albeit there may be areas where localised mitigation may be appropriate. The more targeted approach to assessing impact suggested above would be instrumental in determining if such additional mitigation would be required to offset impacts on pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	This is noted.
T20(P)	<p>The preparation and implementation should each be secured of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Logistics Plan; • Workplace Travel Plan; • Hotel Travel Plan; • Residential Travel Plan; and • Delivery and Servicing Plan. <p>Any public transport improvement measures required as a result of</p>	This is noted.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	the development should be secured by S106 agreement. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
Review of Chapter 10: Wind Microclimate		
WM1(C)	For item 10.8.17 further clarification is sought if the Completed development refers to Configuration 2 as described or Configuration 3 as per definition in item 10.5.19. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Item 10.8.17 (“ <i>Wind conditions during the construction works would...</i> ”) should reference Configuration 3 as the Completed Development, not Configuration 2, which would be the mid-construction scenario.
WM2(R)	The Applicant states that the embedded wind mitigation measures specified in 10.8.6 would result in wind conditions at the Revised Scheme suitable for the intended pedestrian uses with no significant effects. However, in item 10.8.59 the applicant states that for Terraces around the western corners of Building 2 a minor adverse (significant) effect is identified following the mitigation measures included in Configuration 3. Clarification is therefore requested why this effect was not	Item 10.8.6 (as well as 10.9.1, 10.10.11, 10.13.23) should state that there would no significant effects with the exception of at Building 2 western corner terrace levels where there would be a significant effect of minor adverse scale – this position and nature of effect is clarified in the residual effects tables, the text for Configuration 2 (10.8.21), Configuration 3 (10.8.39) and the Summary and Conclusions section (10.13.16 and 10.13.18). <u>Further response:</u> The references provided in the previous response were incorrect nevertheless the conclusion is accurate – all summaries of residual effects for Wind Microclimate should report non-significant conditions with the exception of a minor adverse effect around the western corner of Building 2. For clarity, there would be no significant effects with the exception of Building 2 terrace/balcony levels where there would be a significant effect of minor adverse significance. This is presented in the summary of the ES chapter in paragraphs:

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>classed as a significant residual effect.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u></p> <p>Not Acceptable In the reviewed document there are no items 10.10.11 (as section 10.10 only contains item 10.10.1), 10.13.18 and 10.13.23 (as section 10.13 only contains items 10.13.1 to 10.13.16). Further clarification is sought as to what information is contained within these items.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>For clarity it may be helpful to amend 10.8.6 and similar summaries to ensure it is made clear that with the exception of a minor adverse effect around the western corner of Building 2 all residual effects are non-significant.</p> <p>Further mitigation could be considered in a potential planning application to ensure wind levels are appropriate at all locations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10.13.8 (for the detailed permission only); • 10.13.10 (for the full Proposed Development); • 10.13.13 (for the cumulative schemes; • The table summary of residual effects (Table 10.6) <p>The location of the adverse effects are shown in Figure 10.21 (as well as in Figure 10.16 for the detailed design component only).</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	including the western corner of Building.	
WM3(P)	It was determined that mitigation measures are necessary in several instances to ensure the wind levels do not breach the levels suitable for the intended pedestrian use and to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Following iterative tunnel testing, a list of mitigation measures was determined (in item 10.13.5 of the present 2019 ESA) so that the wind conditions were acceptable at all measured locations. These mitigation measures should be secured through a planning condition. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.
Review of Chapter 11: Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing		
The review of this chapter has been undertaken internally by the GLA and comments will follow shortly.		
Review of Chapter 12: Air Quality		
AQ1(C)	In the Scoping Opinion a preference for the construction traffic fleet mix to be presented was raised. The Applicant acknowledges this has been considered and presented within Appendix H, however no	The EFT 'London – Central' fleet mix was used for all modelled scenarios.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>information could be found. Clarification on the construction fleet assumed should be provided. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
AQ2(C)	<p>Clarification should be provided on whether the suitability of Defra's background maps was considered, and if found to be unsuitable the applicant should provide commentary upon the assessment implications. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Defra background concentrations were used from two grid cells centred on 532500, 182500 and 533500, 182500 respectively. Given the highly urban nature of the surrounding area and the preponderance of kerbside and roadside monitoring sites used by LBH and LBTH, there were no background monitoring sites within either grid cell available for comparison with the Defra background concentrations.</p> <p>Five background diffusion tube monitoring sites are located in the neighbouring 533500, 183500 Defra background grid cell (which was not used in the assessment). These locations registered the following 2017 NO2 concentrations: 2 LBH – 32 µg/m3; 123 LBH - 30 µg/m3; 137 LBH - 32 µg/m3; 136 LBH – 32 µg/m3; 144 LBH – 37 µg/m3. The 2017 Defra background concentration for this area is 33.0 µg/m3. Defra background concentrations are therefore broadly consistent with monitored concentrations.</p>
AQ3(C)	<p>Clarification is required on whether the background concentrations were sector removed. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Sectors were not removed from any background concentrations used in the assessment. While this could potentially result in double-counting of certain sectors, this was considered a reasonable conservative approach.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
AQ4(C)	<p>The sensitivity test for future baseline concentrations assumes an ultra-low emission zone compliant fleet. Clarification is required on what the potential implications upon report conclusions are without a ULEZ compliant fleet i.e. Defra background concentrations pre-2019. This should be considered in both the LBTH only and LBTH and LBH scenarios.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p> <p>Not Acceptable The Applicant considers that the approach of using a pre-2019 baseline would be overly pessimistic and rejects this suggestion. The Applicant goes on to assert that its current approach of using a 2025 background to represent 2027, and a 2028 background to represent 2034 is “reasonably conservative,” but the basis for reaching this view has not been provided. The Applicant should explain why this approach is considered to be “reasonably</p>	<p>As highlighted by Paragraph 12.7 of the Review, Paragraph 12.5.30 of the report establishes a 2025 background concentration and emissions factors year for the 2027 construction scenario and a 2028 background concentration and emissions factors year for the 2034 operational scenarios.</p> <p>The Review correctly identifies that background concentrations and emissions factors for years post-2019 incorporate impacts associated with ULEZ. However, regardless of whether or not the ULEZ is implemented and/or has a tangible impact in terms of air quality and vehicle emissions, it is generally accepted that vehicle emissions are anticipated to reduce in future years. Use of pre-2019 background concentrations and emissions factors would therefore negate 8 years of vehicle emissions reductions in the case of the 2027 construction scenario, and 15 years of emissions reductions in the case of the 2034 operational scenarios. This is considered overly conservative and would likely result in overly pessimistic predictions at all assessed locations. The current approach is therefore considered a reasonably conservative way to account for the uncertainty in vehicle emissions reductions in future years.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>Justification for the approach has been provided in the applicant response. Regardless of ULEZ implementation and/or success, emissions factors and background concentrations are predicted to decrease in future as a result of newer vehicles entering the fleet mix and the anticipated uptake of electric vehicles. Use of a sensitivity test based on pre-2019 emissions factors and background concentrations would not account for these predicted reductions and was therefore considered excessively conservative.</p> <p>Adopting pre-2019 emissions factors and background concentrations would represent a pre-ULEZ scenario, not a future year without ULEZ scenario. As such, a pre-2019 sensitivity test is not considered representative of a future without the ULEZ, but rather a past before the ULEZ.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>Following further discussions with the reviewer and agreement of the methodology we have produced an air quality sensitivity test which has been appended to this document as Appendix J.</p> <p><u>Additional information requested in clarification to the Sensitivity test.</u></p> <p>AQ15</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																				
	<p>conservative,” as recent evidence² indicates that the ULEZ has not yet been fully effective in eliminating non-compliant vehicles within the zone. Further clarification is required.</p> <p>Further Comment: Not Acceptable</p> <p>The Applicant has not provided a substantive response to the question raised. The Applicant’s response reiterates the reasons why a pre-2019 sensitivity test is not considered reasonable, whereas the question asks for an explanation of why the Applicant considers that their approach is “reasonably conservative.”</p> <p>To explain the question further, it is agreed that there is likely to be some decrease in vehicle emissions when different phases of the development become operational (2027 and 2034). However, stating ‘emissions factors and background concentrations are</p>	<p>The table below lists 2018 NO₂ concentrations at background monitoring locations within the London Borough of Hackney (LBH) and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH). For most locations, including those closest to the Proposed Development site, it is the case that the corresponding 2018 Defra background concentration within the same grid square that the monitor is located is greater than the monitored concentration. On this basis, it is judged that determining air quality impacts based on Defra background concentrations represents a more pessimistic approach than using real-world 2018 monitored concentrations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 743 2132 1318"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location ID</th> <th>Local Authority</th> <th>2018 Measured NO₂ (µg/m³)</th> <th>2018 Defra Background NO₂ (µg/m³)</th> <th>Which is greater?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>33</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>38.9</td> <td>33.3</td> <td>Monitoring</td> </tr> <tr> <td>42</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>22.1</td> <td>34.5</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>43</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>21.8</td> <td>34.5</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>63</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>66</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>25.4</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>Monitoring</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TH5</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>26</td> <td>34.5</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TH6</td> <td>LBTH</td> <td>23</td> <td>25.1</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>LBH</td> <td>29</td> <td>33.7</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>LBH</td> <td>26</td> <td>28.7</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>LBH</td> <td>28</td> <td>29.9</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18</td> <td>LBH</td> <td>29</td> <td>27.9</td> <td>Monitoring</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>LBH</td> <td>28</td> <td>31.4</td> <td>Defra background</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Location ID	Local Authority	2018 Measured NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	2018 Defra Background NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	Which is greater?	33	LBTH	38.9	33.3	Monitoring	42	LBTH	22.1	34.5	Defra background	43	LBTH	21.8	34.5	Defra background	63	LBTH	22.5	25.1	Defra background	66	LBTH	25.4	25.1	Monitoring	TH5	LBTH	26	34.5	Defra background	TH6	LBTH	23	25.1	Defra background	2	LBH	29	33.7	Defra background	3	LBH	26	28.7	Defra background	7	LBH	28	29.9	Defra background	18	LBH	29	27.9	Monitoring	20	LBH	28	31.4	Defra background
Location ID	Local Authority	2018 Measured NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	2018 Defra Background NO ₂ (µg/m ³)	Which is greater?																																																																		
33	LBTH	38.9	33.3	Monitoring																																																																		
42	LBTH	22.1	34.5	Defra background																																																																		
43	LBTH	21.8	34.5	Defra background																																																																		
63	LBTH	22.5	25.1	Defra background																																																																		
66	LBTH	25.4	25.1	Monitoring																																																																		
TH5	LBTH	26	34.5	Defra background																																																																		
TH6	LBTH	23	25.1	Defra background																																																																		
2	LBH	29	33.7	Defra background																																																																		
3	LBH	26	28.7	Defra background																																																																		
7	LBH	28	29.9	Defra background																																																																		
18	LBH	29	27.9	Monitoring																																																																		
20	LBH	28	31.4	Defra background																																																																		

² https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/ulez_six_month_evaluation_report_final_oct.pdf

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																					
	<p>predicted to decrease in the future as a result of newer vehicles entering the fleet mix and the anticipated uptake of electric vehicles', does not provide satisfactory justification for why 2025 and 2028 would represent conservative emissions for the operational years of the scheme. This is a relevant concern because Defra's Emission Factor Toolkit assumes that all vehicles will be CAZ compliant, whereas emerging evidence shows that the ULEZ has not been fully effective at eliminating noncompliant vehicles.</p> <p>Further clarification is sought. The further clarification should either: a) explain the basis for concluding that 2025 and 2028 represent conservative emissions for the operational years of the scheme in the light of the likely performance of the ULEZ Or b) set out what the impacts are from a more fully justified sensitivity test (such as, including a proportion of non-compliant Euro standard from different vehicle</p>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>23</td><td>LBH</td><td>33</td><td>29.0</td><td>Monitoring</td></tr> <tr><td>56</td><td>LBH</td><td>31</td><td>31.4</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>60</td><td>LBH</td><td>27</td><td>31.4</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>65</td><td>LBH</td><td>31</td><td>31.3</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>74</td><td>LBH</td><td>29</td><td>28.7</td><td>Monitoring</td></tr> <tr><td>86</td><td>LBH</td><td>31</td><td>34.2</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>92</td><td>LBH</td><td>28</td><td>28.7</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>108</td><td>LBH</td><td>27</td><td>30.2</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>109</td><td>LBH</td><td>28</td><td>30.2</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>117</td><td>LBH</td><td>29</td><td>31.4</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>118</td><td>LBH</td><td>29</td><td>31.3</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>144</td><td>LBH</td><td>33</td><td>33.7</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> <tr><td>155</td><td>LBH</td><td>27</td><td>28.4</td><td>Defra background</td></tr> </table>	23	LBH	33	29.0	Monitoring	56	LBH	31	31.4	Defra background	60	LBH	27	31.4	Defra background	65	LBH	31	31.3	Defra background	74	LBH	29	28.7	Monitoring	86	LBH	31	34.2	Defra background	92	LBH	28	28.7	Defra background	108	LBH	27	30.2	Defra background	109	LBH	28	30.2	Defra background	117	LBH	29	31.4	Defra background	118	LBH	29	31.3	Defra background	144	LBH	33	33.7	Defra background	155	LBH	27	28.4	Defra background				
23	LBH	33	29.0	Monitoring																																																																			
56	LBH	31	31.4	Defra background																																																																			
60	LBH	27	31.4	Defra background																																																																			
65	LBH	31	31.3	Defra background																																																																			
74	LBH	29	28.7	Monitoring																																																																			
86	LBH	31	34.2	Defra background																																																																			
92	LBH	28	28.7	Defra background																																																																			
108	LBH	27	30.2	Defra background																																																																			
109	LBH	28	30.2	Defra background																																																																			
117	LBH	29	31.4	Defra background																																																																			
118	LBH	29	31.3	Defra background																																																																			
144	LBH	33	33.7	Defra background																																																																			
155	LBH	27	28.4	Defra background																																																																			
		<p>AQ16 and AQ17</p> <p>The differences between impacts predicted in the original ESA study and those predicted as part of the sensitivity test indicate that there is uncertainty about the impacts. In order to mitigate potential impacts at new receptors introduced by the Proposed Development, facades fronting onto roads can be sealed and buildings can be fitted with mechanical ventilation with air intakes away from roads. Aspects of the Proposed Development have been submitted as part of an outline planning application, and will be subject to a reserved matters application in future, at which point outline aspects will be detailed. It is therefore proposed that diffusion tube monitoring is completed ahead of this at new and existing receptor locations, as well as at background locations, ahead of the reserved matters application. This will enable the following:</p>																																																																					

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>types and the most polluting Euro standard for compliant vehicles), with the calculations clearly shown.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring at proposed new receptor locations (i.e. those introduced by the development) could determine whether concentrations are below the air quality objective or in exceedance of the objective. This monitoring will help to inform the likely mitigation measures required as part of the reserved matters application; 2. Further modelling will be required at the reserved matters stage to predict the impacts associated with the details defined within the application. Diffusion tube monitoring can be conducted at existing receptors currently identified as having adverse impacts, and this monitoring can be used to produce targeted receptor-specific model verification factors. This would improve the overall robustness of the modelling study and improve confidence in the impacts predicted at existing receptors. Mitigation measures can then be determined based on this assessment and detailed in the reserved matters application; 3. Diffusion tube monitoring at background locations representative of the Proposed Development site will improve confidence in background concentrations used within the updated assessment work. <p>Measures which mitigate road traffic emissions have already been designed into the Proposed Development. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited parking provision (20 spaces) which are restricted to blue badge holders with a commitment already for electric vehicle infrastructure; • Substantial provision of cycle storage, with provision for thousands of cycle spaces; and • A travel plan encouraging public transport use and active travel. <p>In addition to this, it is understood that a portion of the additional trips generated by the operation of the Proposed Development will include service and delivery vehicles associated with the commercial and office land use. It is therefore proposed that service and delivery vehicles associated with the operation of the Proposed Development are compliant with, and compliance kept up to date with, the current (at the time) Ultra Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) emissions standards.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
AQ5(C)	<p>The Applicant should clarify if phases 1, 2 and 3 trigger the IAQM assessment screening threshold. If so, these impacts upon local air quality should be quantified through detailed dispersion modelling. This is for the LBTH and LBH scenario only.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.8.20 of the ES states that the 2027 scenario represents a combination of operational traffic from the operational Phases 1, 2 and 3 as well as construction traffic associated with ongoing construction works. This scenario represents the greatest combined operational and construction traffic generation associated with the Scheme and therefore represents a worst-case construction/operational assessment, and any predicted impacts will be greater than if Phases 1, 2 and 3 are assessed in isolation.</p> <p>Furthermore, this assessment scenario considers new sensitive receptors introduced by Phases 1, 2 and 3. Assessment of Phases 1, 2 and 3 in isolation would only consider existing receptors. The 2027 scenario was therefore selected to assess the greatest potential impact.</p>
AQ6(C)	<p>Clarification is required on whether these roads were represented as street canyons in the dispersion model: Great Eastern Street and Old Street. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Street canyons were modelled on Great Eastern Street and on the stretch of Old Street modelled east of the Great Eastern Street junction. The segment of Old Street modelled between the Great Eastern Street junction and the Old Street roundabout was included without street canyons. The road width on this stretch is sufficiently wide, and building massing sufficiently low and porous, for street canyon effects not to be considered applicable at this location.</p>
AQ7(C)	<p>Clarification should be provided on why the following locations from table 12.6 of the ESA have been excluded from model verification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 LBTH • 12 LBH • 1 LBH • 11 LBH 	<p>3 LBTH: This site was initially considered for inclusion in the model verification. This site is on the junction of A1209 Bethnal Green Road and Brick Lane north of A1209. As no traffic data were available for Brick Lane north of A1209, it was not possible to accurately model concentrations at this location. This would compromise the accuracy of the model verification.</p> <p>12 LBH: This site is over 5 km north of the Proposed Development site and beyond the study area. If referring to 12 LBTH, this site is on the junction of Buckfast Street and A1209 Bethnal Green Road and was initially considered for inclusion. As no traffic data were available for Buckfast Street, it was not possible to</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively. Further comments: Acceptable	accurately model concentrations at this location. This would compromise the accuracy of the model verification. 1 LBH: This monitoring location is within 120 m of the junction between Old Street, Kingsland Road A10 and Shoreditch High Street. As traffic data were not available for Kingsland Road A10, it was not possible to accurately model concentrations at this location, which would compromise the accuracy of the model verification. 11 LBH: This monitoring site is close to Rivington Street. No traffic data were available for this road, which is also a street canyon. It was not therefore possible to accurately model concentrations at 11 LBH, therefore its inclusion would compromise the accuracy of the model verification.
AQ8(C)	Clarification is required on whether LBTH's 2016 measurement data has been used within the 2017 model verification. Should this be the case, commentary should be provided on the implications upon modelled results. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively. Further comments: Acceptable	Paragraph 12.13 of the Review correctly identifies that 2016 data for the LBTH has been misreported as 2017 data. Appendix H of the ES states that automatic monitoring site LBH HK6 and diffusion tube monitoring sites LBH 9, 10 and 45 were used for model verification. None of these sites are within LBTH. Therefore, the misreported data have no impact on the model verification.
AQ9(C)	Clarification is required on whether Plot 7a and Plot 3 are representative of short-term or long-term air quality objectives. If so detailed modelling of estimated concentrations at these locations should be provided to demonstrate that concentrations will be below air quality objectives. Failing	Plots 7 and 3 comprise of A1 retail, B1 office and D1-D2 land use. They do not include residential, hotels, educational or hospital land use. Consequently, there are no receptors within Plots 7 and 3 that are subject to short-term or long-term air quality objectives.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>compliance, the Applicant should suggest mitigation to ensure compliance with air quality objectives. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario only.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
AQ10(C/P)	<p>No assessment of the Limited development's construction phases impacts upon existing receptors has been undertaken. The Applicant should clarify if any phases' construction traffic triggers the IAQM assessment screening threshold. If so, these phases' impacts upon local air quality should be quantified through detailed dispersion modelling. This applies to the LBTH only scenario.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u></p> <p>Not Acceptable The construction phase assessed is for 2027, however construction is due to start in 2021. Consequently, other phases' construction traffic preceding 2027 will have a more polluting fleet. The Applicant should clarify if each phases'</p>	<p>The full scheme would result in greater construction traffic generation than the limited development construction phase. Consequently, the full scheme has been assessed in terms of construction traffic assessment. As a conservative approach, it has been assumed that the full construction phase is representative of the limited development construction phase. Impacts predicted in the existing construction phase assessment are therefore treated as reflective of impacts arising during the limited scheme construction phase.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>We have screened the construction traffic data for the limited development scenario (LBTH only scenario) against the EPUK/ IAQM screening criteria and the only year which triggers the need for detailed assessment is 2027. This aligns with the assessed construction scenario and therefore no further assessment is required.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>construction traffic could trigger IAQM's assessment criteria. If the phases' construction traffic triggers assessment criteria these should be assessed, e.g. via a detailed dispersion model using vehicle emissions profiles representative of earlier construction years. Further clarification is sought.</p> <p>Additional planning condition No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall follow 'The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition' SPG (2014) and aim to minimise the amenity, environmental and road network impacts of the construction activities and include the details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Telephone, email and postal address of the site manager and details of complaints procedures for members of the public; b. Measures to minimise the emission of dust and dirt during 	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>construction including but not restricted to spraying of materials with water, wheel washing facilities, street cleaning and monitoring of dust emissions;</p> <p>c. Scheme for recycling/ disposition of waste resulting from construction works;</p> <p>d. Ingress and egress to and from the site for vehicles;</p> <p>The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and the area generally in accordance with policies SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM25 of the Managing Development Document (2013).</p> <p>To minimise the adverse air quality impacts of the development, in accordance with policies 7.14 of the London Plan (2016), SP03 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM9 of the Managing Development Document (2013).</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Further clarification provided by the Applicant. No further clarification is required.	
AQ11(R)	Clarification is required on whether new receptors which are representative of short-term and long-term air quality objective will be introduced earlier than 2027. If so, further modelling will need to be undertaken to demonstrate that there will be no significant impact. If new receptors will be introduced in 2027, the Applicant should confirm whether the phased assessment in Table 12.12 could be used as a worst-case proxy. This applies to the LBTH only scenario. Further comments: Acceptable	The construction schedule indicates that Phases 1 and 2 will be completed in 2023 and 2025 respectively. A 2027 construction/operational scenario has been used in the assessment, which accounts for operational traffic from Phases 1, 2 and 3, and construction traffic from subsequent construction works. Assessment of Phases 1, 2 and 3 in isolation would account for likely smaller impacts, therefore the 2027 assessment scenario represents a worse-case scenario accounting for combined construction and operational impacts. Paragraph 12.8.46 of the ES chapter states that new receptors introduced by the Proposed Development were considered in the assessment scenarios. For the 2027 scenario, receptors within Phases 1, 2 and 3 were included. For the fully operational 2034 scenario, receptors at relevant locations across the entire site were assessed. Results are displayed in Table 13, Appendix H. It is not therefore necessary to use Table 12.12 as a proxy as modelling of new introduced receptors has been completed.
AQ12(P)	The recommended mitigation measures proposed within section 12.9 of the ESA should be secured through a planning condition. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively. Further comments:	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
AQ12(P)	Additional proposed planning condition (Air Quality): Construction Environmental Management Plan No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall follow 'The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition' SPG (2014) and aim to minimise the amenity, environmental and road network impacts of the construction activities and include the details of: e. Telephone, email and postal address of the site manager and details of complaints procedures for members of the public; f. Measures to minimise the emission of dust and dirt during construction including but not restricted to spraying of materials with water, wheel washing facilities, street cleaning and monitoring of dust emissions;	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>g. Scheme for recycling/disposition of waste resulting from construction works;</p> <p>h. Ingress and egress to and from the site for vehicles; The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents and the area generally in accordance with policies SP10 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM25 of the Managing Development Document (2013). To minimise the adverse air quality impacts of the development, in accordance with policies 7.14 of the London Plan (2016), SP03 of the Core Strategy (2010) and DM9 of the Managing Development Document (2013).</p>	
AQ13(P)	<p>The developer should undertake an odour assessment in respect of proposed A3 property uses with any identified mitigation measures being implemented in full prior to the occupation of any such units. This applies to the LBTH and LBH scenario in isolation and cumulatively.</p>	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																
	Further comments: Acceptable																	
AQ14(P)	A condition should be secured to ensure that the developer undertakes a further assessment prior to occupation of the development to confirm air quality mitigation measures. These to confirm the suitable location for air intakes and include the use of sealed facades and mechanical ventilation with NOx filters. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.																
Review of Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration																		
NV1(C)	Provision of a table summarising the predicted duration of construction noise effects at receptors and when they might occur. Further comments: Acceptable	Please find in the Table a summary of where significant impacts occur, the activity causing the impact and the duration. For the predictions only the loudest 4 activities were included which were enabling works, foundations, site clearance and super structure. Construction Noise Significant Effects <table border="1" data-bbox="891 1126 2085 1385"> <thead> <tr> <th>Receptor</th> <th>Rep Baseline Measurement</th> <th>LAeq,1 6hr (dB)</th> <th>Phase</th> <th>Activity</th> <th>Duration (Months)</th> <th>Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)</th> <th>Impact Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>UNM1</td> <td>63</td> <td>Phase 8</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>16</td> <td>76</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Receptor	Rep Baseline Measurement	LAeq,1 6hr (dB)	Phase	Activity	Duration (Months)	Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)	Impact Category	Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Foundations	16	76	Moderate Adverse
Receptor	Rep Baseline Measurement	LAeq,1 6hr (dB)	Phase	Activity	Duration (Months)	Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)	Impact Category											
Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Foundations	16	76	Moderate Adverse											

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																																
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>R1</td> <td>ANM3</td> <td>68</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>9</td> <td>77</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R10</td> <td>ANM1</td> <td>65</td> <td>Phase 8</td> <td>Super-structure</td> <td>16</td> <td>75</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R10</td> <td>ANM1</td> <td>65</td> <td>Phase 8</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>16</td> <td>79</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R10</td> <td>ANM1</td> <td>65</td> <td>Phase 8</td> <td>Site Clearance</td> <td>5</td> <td>76</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R11</td> <td>ANM4</td> <td>71</td> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>31</td> <td>75</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R2</td> <td>ANM3</td> <td>68</td> <td>Phase 3</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>18</td> <td>77</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R3</td> <td>ANM3</td> <td>68</td> <td>Phase 3</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>18</td> <td>75</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R4</td> <td>ANM3</td> <td>68</td> <td>Phase 5</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>6</td> <td>76</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R5</td> <td>ANM3</td> <td>68</td> <td>Phase 2</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>6</td> <td>75</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R9</td> <td>ANM1</td> <td>65</td> <td>Phase 8</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>16</td> <td>76</td> <td>Moderate Adverse</td> </tr> </table>	R1	ANM3	68	Phase 7	Foundations	9	77	Moderate Adverse	R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Super-structure	16	75	Moderate Adverse	R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Foundations	16	79	Moderate Adverse	R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Site Clearance	5	76	Moderate Adverse	R11	ANM4	71	Phase 1	Foundations	31	75	Moderate Adverse	R2	ANM3	68	Phase 3	Foundations	18	77	Moderate Adverse	R3	ANM3	68	Phase 3	Foundations	18	75	Moderate Adverse	R4	ANM3	68	Phase 5	Foundations	6	76	Moderate Adverse	R5	ANM3	68	Phase 2	Foundations	6	75	Moderate Adverse	R9	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Foundations	16	76	Moderate Adverse
R1	ANM3	68	Phase 7	Foundations	9	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Super-structure	16	75	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Foundations	16	79	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R10	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Site Clearance	5	76	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R11	ANM4	71	Phase 1	Foundations	31	75	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R2	ANM3	68	Phase 3	Foundations	18	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R3	ANM3	68	Phase 3	Foundations	18	75	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R4	ANM3	68	Phase 5	Foundations	6	76	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R5	ANM3	68	Phase 2	Foundations	6	75	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
R9	ANM1	65	Phase 8	Foundations	16	76	Moderate Adverse																																																																											
NV2(C)	It is not clear from the assessment whether the impact of later phases of construction on earlier occupants has been considered, further clarification is sought from the Applicant. Further comments:	This has now been incorporated in the table below whereby it shows all future sensitive receptors. Construction Noise Predictions at Future Receptors																																																																																

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response							
	Acceptable	Receptor	Representative Baseline Measurement	LAeq,16hr (dB)	Construction Phase	Construction Activity	Duration (Months)	Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)	Impact Category
		Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Enabling Works	1	71	Minor Adverse
		Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Foundations	16	76	Moderate Adverse
		Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Super-structure	16	72	Minor Adverse
		Phase 1	UNM1	63	Phase 8	Site Clearance	5	73	Minor Adverse
		Phase 3	UNM4	57	Phase 5	Enabling Works	1	69	Minor Adverse
		Phase 3	UNM4	57	Phase 5	Foundations	6	74	Minor Adverse
		Phase 3	UNM4	57	Phase 5	Super-structure	10	70	Minor Adverse
		Phase 3	UNM4	57	Phase 5	Site Clearance	3	71	Minor Adverse
		Phase 4	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Super-structure	24	69	Minor Adverse
		Phase 4	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Foundations	9	73	Minor Adverse
		Phase 4	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Enabling Works	2	68	Minor Adverse
		Phase 4	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Site Clearance	41	70	Minor Adverse

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																																								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Phase 5</td> <td>UNM1</td> <td>63</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Site Clearance</td> <td>41</td> <td>66</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 5</td> <td>UNM1</td> <td>63</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>9</td> <td>69</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 5</td> <td>UNM1</td> <td>63</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Super-structure</td> <td>24</td> <td>65</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 6</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>9</td> <td>71</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 6</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Super-structure</td> <td>24</td> <td>67</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 6</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Site Clearance</td> <td>41</td> <td>68</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 6</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>Enabling Works</td> <td>2</td> <td>66</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>Site Clearance</td> <td>10</td> <td>68</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>Enabling Works</td> <td>1</td> <td>66</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>Foundations</td> <td>31</td> <td>71</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase 7</td> <td>UNM4</td> <td>57</td> <td>Phase 1</td> <td>Super-structure</td> <td>13</td> <td>67</td> <td>Minor Adverse</td> </tr> </table>	Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Site Clearance	41	66	Minor Adverse	Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Foundations	9	69	Minor Adverse	Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Super-structure	24	65	Minor Adverse	Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Foundations	9	71	Minor Adverse	Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Super-structure	24	67	Minor Adverse	Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Site Clearance	41	68	Minor Adverse	Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Enabling Works	2	66	Minor Adverse	Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Site Clearance	10	68	Minor Adverse	Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Enabling Works	1	66	Minor Adverse	Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Foundations	31	71	Minor Adverse	Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Super-structure	13	67	Minor Adverse
Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Site Clearance	41	66	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Foundations	9	69	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 5	UNM1	63	Phase 7	Super-structure	24	65	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Foundations	9	71	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Super-structure	24	67	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Site Clearance	41	68	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 6	UNM4	57	Phase 7	Enabling Works	2	66	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Site Clearance	10	68	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Enabling Works	1	66	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Foundations	31	71	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
Phase 7	UNM4	57	Phase 1	Super-structure	13	67	Minor Adverse																																																																																			
NV3(C)	A quantitative assessment of potential cumulative effects due to nearby committed developments. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	A cumulative construction noise assessment has been carried out taking into account the following schemes with reference 12, 17, 28 and 32. The schemes with reference 13 and 14 have not been included as construction has already started on the schemes. As the construction noise levels from other sites are unknown, a total sound power of 125 dB(A) for each construction site has been assumed in accordance with LBTH's EIA Scoping Guidance. The results show Moderate Adverse effects occur, however this is a result of the high level of construction noise assumed for																																																																																								

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																																																						
		<p>the cumulative schemes in the absence of available data. It is considered that with Best Practicable Means (BPM) being used at all sites, the resulting cumulative noise levels from construction would be lower than those currently predicted.</p> <p>Predicted Cumulative Construction Noise</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="896 638 1930 1396"> <thead> <tr> <th>Receptor</th> <th>Representative Baseline Measurement</th> <th>LAeq,16hr (dB)</th> <th>Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)</th> <th>Impact Category</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Phase 1</td><td>UNM1</td><td>63</td><td>80</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>Phase 3</td><td>UNM4</td><td>57</td><td>79</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>Phase 4</td><td>UNM1</td><td>63</td><td>81</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>Phase 5</td><td>UNM1</td><td>63</td><td>77</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>Phase 6</td><td>UNM4</td><td>57</td><td>77</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R1</td><td>ANM3</td><td>68</td><td>77</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R10</td><td>ANM1</td><td>65</td><td>82</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R11</td><td>ANM4</td><td>71</td><td>81</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R12</td><td>ANM4</td><td>71</td><td>83</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R13</td><td>ANM4</td><td>71</td><td>80</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R15</td><td>ANM3</td><td>68</td><td>78</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R16</td><td>ANM4</td><td>71</td><td>81</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> <tr><td>R2</td><td>ANM3</td><td>68</td><td>77</td><td>Moderate Adverse</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Receptor	Representative Baseline Measurement	LAeq,16hr (dB)	Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)	Impact Category	Phase 1	UNM1	63	80	Moderate Adverse	Phase 3	UNM4	57	79	Moderate Adverse	Phase 4	UNM1	63	81	Moderate Adverse	Phase 5	UNM1	63	77	Moderate Adverse	Phase 6	UNM4	57	77	Moderate Adverse	R1	ANM3	68	77	Moderate Adverse	R10	ANM1	65	82	Moderate Adverse	R11	ANM4	71	81	Moderate Adverse	R12	ANM4	71	83	Moderate Adverse	R13	ANM4	71	80	Moderate Adverse	R15	ANM3	68	78	Moderate Adverse	R16	ANM4	71	81	Moderate Adverse	R2	ANM3	68	77	Moderate Adverse
Receptor	Representative Baseline Measurement	LAeq,16hr (dB)	Predicted Sound Pressure Level at Receptor (LAeqT, dB)	Impact Category																																																																				
Phase 1	UNM1	63	80	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
Phase 3	UNM4	57	79	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
Phase 4	UNM1	63	81	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
Phase 5	UNM1	63	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
Phase 6	UNM4	57	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R1	ANM3	68	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R10	ANM1	65	82	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R11	ANM4	71	81	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R12	ANM4	71	83	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R13	ANM4	71	80	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R15	ANM3	68	78	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R16	ANM4	71	81	Moderate Adverse																																																																				
R2	ANM3	68	77	Moderate Adverse																																																																				

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response				
		R4	ANM3	68	78	Moderate Adverse
		R5	ANM3	68	78	Moderate Adverse
		R6	ANM1	65	78	Moderate Adverse
		R7	ANM1	65	79	Moderate Adverse
		R8	ANM1	65	82	Moderate Adverse
		R9	ANM1	65	83	Moderate Adverse
NV4(P)	Prior approval by LBTH/LBH of schemes for building services noise mitigation, noise and vibration controls in the CEMP and CoCP and glazing/ventilation strategy for meeting internal noise criteria. Mitigation measures to include all noise and vibration mitigation measures identified in the ESA and associated CoCP. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.				
Review of Chapter 14: Water Resources and Flood Risk						
WRFR1(C)	Clarification is sought as to whether the Applicant has had regard to the updated EA climate change allowances as set out in the GLA's Scoping Opinion in April 2019. Further comments:	The current government guidance on climate change allowances is used as shown on https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances , as stated in section 14.1.8 of the EIA Section 5 of the FRA. These are commonly referred to as the updated EA allowances, i.e. those issued February 2016 with subsequent additions. Note - both reports were written before the GLA scoping was issued in April 2019 but guidance did not change in that period.				

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
WRFR2(C)	Clarification is sought as to whether there are any assumptions and limitations with regards to use of publicly or privately (purchased reports) available data or data supplied by any authority, such as the Environment Agency. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	All data is considered to be a snapshot in time and the reports and data used in the EIA are publicly available.
WRFR3(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to the likely evolution of the baseline environment with regard to climate change without the implementation of the Proposed Development and indicate how the development may have an effect on the future baseline. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The site is located in FZ1 and has a less than 1 in 1000 risk of flooding from fluvial sources and a low risk of flooding from surface water when considering climate change. Therefore, the future baseline environment with regard to climate change is not expected to change from that presented in the ESA.
WRFR4(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to why the FRA does not appear to include information with regards to climate change. <u>Further comments:</u>	The Site is located in FZ1 and therefore, whilst climate change is mentioned, this is not deemed relevant to the FRA i.e. no level of climate change will cause flooding to the Site from fluvial sources. The FRA also links to the outline drainage strategy from WSP which considered the effects of climate change in terms of surface water run-off and potential flood risks from the Site (see below).

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
WRFR5(C)	Clarification is sought from the Applicant as to whether the climate change allowances referenced in the Outline Design Strategy have been agreed with all relevant local authorities. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Climate change allowances referenced as part of the Outline Drainage Strategy have been adopted based on Table 2: peak rainfall intensity allowance in small and urban catchments from the NPPF planning practice guidance on Flood Risk and Coastal Change. A potential central and upper allowance range between 5%-40% can apply to developments. For the Site, a 40% climate change allowance has been adopted (upper percentile) in favour of sustainability, and in accordance to the PPG, the London SuDS (Tower Hamlets) SuDS Proforma, and the Hackney Sustainable Drainage: Design & Evaluation Guide.
WRFR6/7(P)	The use of SuDS outlined for this location should be secured as a planning condition in the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
WRFR8(P)	The development should be conditioned to ensure that there is a reduction in surface water runoff rates and to ensure that excess runoff is captured at the site. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
WRFR9(P)	A robust CEMP should be developed and agreed with the relevant local planning authorities	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	prior to commencement of the development. The mitigation measures identified in the ESA should be contained in the approved CEMP. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
WRFR10(P)	A piling assessment should be made a planning condition to gain a greater understanding of the potential hydrological connections, practical mitigation measures and, where practical decommission any existing boreholes that may exist on site. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
WRFR11(P)	All mitigation measures identified in the ESA should be secured through appropriately worded planning conditions. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Agreed.
WRFR12 (C)	New clarification request in response to questions raised by the London Borough of Hackney	The drainage strategy outlines how the management of surface water runoff for the entire site is delivered following the Proposed Development. Catchment H is included to quantify the unrestricted rate of discharge, to assess what other drainage catchments require to compensate i.e. what further attenuation with a further restricted rate is needed. To compensate for Catchment H, further reduced rates are provided across all

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>In the FRA (Appendix J) there is some information with regards to the unattenuated/unrestricted Catchment H. Paragraph 5.1.2.4 states "Please note, specific areas are restricted spatially at the lower ground level, due to the extent of basement underlying a large proportion of the western side of the site, and the building envelope around the perimeter of the Site. In addition, a section of the platform level to the west of the site is constrained due to the levels design in that area, i.e. a drop within the Site exists in this area, which does not provide the necessary depth required for an attenuation layer). As a result, storing attenuation tanks in these areas is considered unfeasible. Therefore, a total catchment area of 3979m² is proposed to drain freely and without attenuation on site, thus discharging into the public sewer network at an unrestricted flow rate. The remaining attenuated areas will target further reductions to compensate these unrestricted Catchment H". Clarification is sought from the Applicant for the reasoning to include Catchment H</p>	<p>catchments by restricting to a rate of 2l/s, a flow rate set as low as practically possible before the risk of blockages associated with low flows can become an issue. Note: Catchment A has a restricted rate of 2.8l/s due to limited attenuation space available within the catchment. Table 8 within the drainage strategy shows the pre-development and post-development rates for the entire site and shows a reduction of at least 89%. Catchment H has also been included to satisfy and demonstrate to Thames Water, the Site's entire pre-development and post-development scenario, as part of our pre-planning enquiry.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>if no changes are to be undertaken to this area and it already freely drains to the public sewer. Furthermore, the applicant states that SuDS are not possible on this catchment, it aims to target further reductions to compensate – how the Applicant aims to achieve these further reductions across other catchments, should also be clarified.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u></p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>The Applicant has issued a revised NTS and SuDs proforma, which is welcomed. It should be noted that the Outline Drainage Strategy still states that Thames Water have not yet responded to the capacity check since December 2018. With regards to clarification for the inclusion of Catchment H, the Applicant’s response clearly states the reasoning behind this. This has been included in order to compensate for the flows from Catchment H that drain directly to the public sewer (shared by the other Catchments in the</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	development). The Applicant intends to make adjustments to further reduce flows from other catchments, to compensate for the total Catchment H flows. This is expected to be beneficial for the development and local utility infrastructure. The Applicant also states in the drainage strategy and SuDS proforma that hydrobrakes, blue roofs and on-site storage will be used to provide these reductions on site. Based on the understanding of SuDS hierarchy (infiltration techniques being unsuitable in this urban location), this is considered acceptable.	
Review of Chapter 15: Archaeology		
ARCH1(R)	EIA regulations require that the environmental statement is prepared by competent experts and that a statement outlining the relevant expertise of qualifications of these experts is included. However, no statement of expertise appears to be included in Chapter 1 Section 1.5 of the ESA in relation to archaeology. The Applicant is to clarify who has prepared the chapter and to ensure that all	The original ES Chapter and Technical Appendix was prepared by MOLAS, Paul Riggott (Senior Archaeologist) in 2015. This was reviewed and updated by Helen Hawkins, a chartered Archaeologist with 18 years experience from Pre-Construct Archaeology (PCA).

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	information provided is by a competent expert archaeologist. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
ARCH2(C)	The Applicant is to provide further information in relation to the potential for the decomposition/ damage of archaeology as result of dewatering and changes to groundwater drainage patterns. This should make clear that any such effects would arise as a result of construction activity but continue with the operation of the development, and therefore be considered as a constructional and operational effect. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	ES Addendum Chapter 14: Water Resources, has assessed the potential impact of dewatering and changes to ground water drainage patterns. Due to the complex nature of the site and the large amount of existing infrastructure already located on site, I.e. Central Line, BT Communication Tunnel, Overground Line and the main mainline into Liverpool Street Station, it was concluded that the supersuperficial groundwater in the Taplow Gravels is likely to be already in contact with disturbed ground and the resultant effects on groundwater are considered likely to be Minor. No archaeology that is significantly affected by dewatering (i.e. peat, alluvium, tanning or other waterlogged deposits etc) is known or likely to be on the site based on the results of previous investigations, which identified gravels sealed by brickearth. Therefore, dewatering should not be an issue. If deposits are identified that may be affected by dewatering the impact can be revisited though this is considered unlikely.
ARCH3(C)	The Applicant is to clarify the sources consulted for the baseline. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The report baseline includes a search of the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) carried out with a 150 m buffer in the original 2015 baseline and a 250 m buffer (as requested by the Archaeological Adviser to LBTH) in the January 2020 Addendum (PCA2020). The updated GLHER search results are given as an addendum to the Technical Appendix. The report also incorporates the results of previous investigations on the site, all carried out by the Museum of London Archaeology Service (MoLAS; now named MOLA). These comprise archaeological building recording of demolition of the Bishopsgate Goods Yard in 2003 (MoLAS2003, HEA 1A; site code BGY03); an archaeological evaluation and excavation on the northern half of the site for the East London Line Projecting 2005–8, and a subsequent watching brief on geotechnical investigations in the southern half of the site (MoLAS2008b; HEA 1B; site code BGX05). 2.1.4 In addition, the following sources were consulted: MOLA–Geographical Information System, the deposit

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		survival archive, published historic maps and archaeological publications; Historic England–information on statutory designations including scheduled monuments and listed buildings; The London Society Library – published histories and journals; Groundsure–historic Ordnance Survey maps from the first edition (1860–70s) to the present day; British Geological Survey (BGS)–solid and drift geology digital map; URS – Masterplan architectural drawings (Farrells/Dec 2013 and Jan 2014), detailed architectural drawings (PLP/December 2013 and Jan 2014), foundation design (WSP/November 2013). Internet -web-published material including LPA local plan, and information on conservation areas and locally listed buildings.
ARCH4(R)	The Applicant should request a new GLHER data search to ensure that their baseline and assessment of significance is up to date. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Appendix B of this response contains an updated GLHER data search. The conclusions of the Technical Appendix and ES chapter are not materially affected by the updated baseline and therefore have not been updated.
ARCH5(C)	The technical Appendix to the 2015 ES that includes the full archaeological and historical context for the site should be included in the new ESA, in order to aid understanding of the site context and baseline conditions. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The 2015 Technical Appendix to the 2015 ES and the updated GLHER (2020) are provided to support the ESA chapter and are therefore to be read in combination to aid the understanding on the site context and baseline conditions. It is not felt necessary that this information needs to be pulled into the main ES chapter.
ARCH6(C)	It is best practice to include a figure indicating the location of baseline receptors within the site and study area. No such figure has been included and the Applicant is asked to provide one. The assets	Please see Figure 1 included within Appendix B of this response.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>must be individually referenced (e.g. with the NHLE or HER numbers) and these must be included as labels on the figure, as well as where the assets are discussed in the text to allow for cross-referencing between the two. Alternatively, cross-referencing could be to a gazetteer of assets.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
ARCH7(C)	<p>A colour-coded map showing the potential for archaeological survival (e.g. high – low depicted via green to red) would also be helpful visual aid, given the nature of past impacts to the site. This could also show the plot divisions of the site to help aid the readers understanding of the later assessment of effects, which is described on a plot by plot basis.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Please see Figure 2 included within Appendix B of this response.</p>
ARCH8(C)	<p>It is unclear why the potential for later medieval remains is judged to be lower than that of the post-medieval remains when both have been identified during</p>	<p>Later medieval remains are considered moderate as a lot of it has been quarried away by brickearth quarrying in the 17th and 18th centuries and what has been identified to survive so far comprises pits and soil horizons rather than buildings which makes it of less interest. Post-medieval structural remains are</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>investigations. The Applicant is to provide clarification on this explaining whether it is due to the number of features found, post-depositional disturbance, etc.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>known to survive in good condition on the site and post-date the quarrying period and therefore they have a higher potential to be found.</p>
ARCH9(C)	<p>The Applicant is to clarify that the recent assessment was undertaken in accordance with the most up to date and relevant guidance and should provide a list of the guidance used.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>We can clarify that the assessment was undertaken in line with the most up to date and relevant guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIfA [Chartered Institute for Archaeologists], (updated Jan 2017); Standards and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment; and • Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS), (2015); Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London.
ARCH10(R)	<p>The Applicant is to provide further information on the heritage values and significance of the receptors identified, particularly clarifying the interpretation of the later medieval pits and horizons which are stated both to be agricultural, and indicative of settlement along Shoreditch High Street.</p> <p>Furthermore, in order to comply with current methods of assessment this is to include a statement on if, and how, setting contributes to that significance. In</p>	<p>The nature and survival of the below ground railway structures is currently unknown, although they could reasonably be expected to have a good survival based on their date and their relationship to the above ground railway structures. The below ground structures were constructed to be located underground and therefore it is not considered that they have a setting in regards to the other listed structures and landscape on the site. Their current setting remains the same as it was when they were constructed and the proposed development and removal of the structures will not materially affect this setting as they were not designed to be seen above ground.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>particular, the setting of the railway remains should be considered in relation to the above ground extant railway structures.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
ARCH11(C)	<p>Paragraph 15.7.15 is not complete and there is no explanation of how the minor demolition of both listed and unlisted structures would not affect archaeology. The Applicant is to clarify both of these points.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>In advance of any minor demolition occurring it is anticipated in line with the outline mitigation in paragraph 15.8.1 – 15.8.2 targeted archaeological excavation would take place. This would allow remains to be recorded prior to their removal and to enhance the understanding of the significance of the remains.</p> <p>An Archaeological watching brief in areas not affected by deep ground intrusions would ensure that localised surviving remains are recorded. Such work would normally be carried out in accordance with an approved Written Scheme of Investigation under the terms of a standard planning condition. Archaeological work would be the responsibility of LBH and LBTH under advice from archaeological advisers at GLAAS.</p>
ARCH12(C)	<p>It is stated at paragraph 15.7.1 that there is a potential impact on palaeoenvironmental deposits as a result of piling. The palaeoenvironmental potential of the site is not highlighted in the baseline or otherwise mentioned throughout the assessment. The Applicant is to provide further information on the palaeoenvironmental potential of the site, its significance and any effects to it (ARCH10).</p>	<p>There isn't a potential impact on palaeoenvironmental deposits from piling as none have been identified on the site or in the technical appendix.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
ARCH13(C)	Embedded mitigation is discussed at paragraph 15.7.1. Here it is stated that, if necessary, a geo-archaeological survey of the site could be undertaken. This would not constitute embedded mitigation, but additional mitigation. The Applicant should amend this. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Geoarchaeological survey of the site is not necessary at this stage, and is not appropriate for the type of archaeology potentially present on the site. GLAAS have agreed that the evaluation carried out so far is acceptable and the site can proceed to archaeological excavation in areas of proposed impact as additional mitigation. It is anticipated that this is required by planning condition.
ARCH14(C)	Embedded mitigation is discussed at paragraph 15.7.1. Here it is stated that, if necessary, a geo-archaeological survey of the site could be undertaken. This would not constitute embedded mitigation, i.e. something that is inherent in the design of the scheme, but additional mitigation. The Applicant is to amend the description of this piece of archaeological works. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	Geoarchaeological survey of the site is not necessary at this stage, and is not appropriate for the type of archaeology potentially present on the site. GLAAS have agreed that the evaluation carried out so far is acceptable and the site can proceed to archaeological excavation in areas of proposed impact as additional mitigation. It is anticipated that this is required by planning condition.
ARCH15(C)	The last sentence of paragraph 15.8.2 states that: 'Archaeological	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>work would be the responsibility of LBH and LBTH under advice from archaeological advisers at GLAAS.' It is assumed that this is a typographical error, but to be clear any archaeological work is the responsibility of the developer. However, GLAAS and the relevant local authorities would have to agree the Written Scheme of Investigation and ensure the planning condition is discharged to their satisfaction. The Applicant is advised to reword this accordingly.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
ARCH16(C)	<p>The assessment of residual effects does not appear to consider the fact that policy and best practice guidance indicate that preservation in situ is normally preferred for assets of archaeological interest and that the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted. Archaeology is a finite resource and preservation by record only partially offsets the loss of evidential value. Records are merely an interpretation of the</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that that preservation in situ is normally preferred for assets of archaeological interest and that the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted. Archaeology is a finite resource and preservation by record only partially offsets the loss of evidential value. Records are merely an interpretation of the resource at a given point in time and do not deliver either the understanding of context provided by the original heritage asset, nor the sensory experience. Therefore, please see updated residual effects table below. Please note this does not change the significant effects (i.e. Moderate – Major).</p> <p>Table 15.9 Residual Effects</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response			
	<p>resource at a given point in time and do not deliver either the understanding of context provided by the original heritage asset, nor the sensory experience. The Applicant should revisit their assessment of residual effects taking the above into account.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	Resource of Receptor affected	Significance of Potential Impact Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Residual Effect
		Remains of the 19 th century railway development of the area, including footings of Shoreditch Station and Bishopsgate Goods Yard. (High potential)	Permanent, direct, Major/moderate adverse	Mitigation through targeted archaeological excavation or watching brief to preserve by record any archaeological remains	Negligible Minor Adverse
		Remains associated with the post medieval development of the area in the 16 th to 18 th Centuries (High potential)	Permanent, direct, Major/moderate adverse		Negligible Minor Adverse
		Later medieval remains associated with agriculture or brickearth extraction (Moderate potential)	Permanent, direct, Moderate/minor adverse		Negligible Minor Adverse
		Possible, previously unrecorded remains dating from the prehistoric to early medieval periods (Low potential)	Permanent, direct, Uncertain adverse (low for isolated artefacts)		Negligible

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
ARCH17(C)	<p>The assessment of the limited development scenario (LDS) is broadly acceptable, but actioning of the clarifications/ potential Regulation 22 requests may lead to minor changes that need to be reflected in the LDS. Similarly, it may be that some minor edits are required to the NTS. This clarification is raised as a precaution only, and no action is initially required by the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>No changes are required to the NTS as a result of the clarification and potential regulation 22 requests.</p>
ARCH18(P)	<p>An appropriately worded planning condition will be needed to ensure all archaeology is investigated and recorded prior to the commencement of the development.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>Review of Chapter 16: Built Heritage</p>		
BH1(R)	<p>The Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) (Volume 4) identifies built heritage receptors that are assessed according to the sensitivity of their 'townscape</p>	<p>We disagree that there is any conflict with good practice or that assessing heritage assets in terms of the sensitivity of their townscape setting is inappropriate; such assessment is an integral part of the assessment of heritage effects. 'Townscape setting' is, obviously, a component of heritage significance.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>setting'. This not normal practice: in accordance with policy and best practice guidance 'heritage significance' is what is assessed in relation to heritage receptors. To prevent any confusion, it is recommended the Applicant remove the built heritage sections in the TVIA as they constitute duplicate assessment that does not conform with current methods of assessment.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
BH2(C)	<p>The Applicant is to clarify whether any consultation has been omitted and, if so, to provide further information on who the consultee was, what issue(s) they raised and how they have addressed the issue(s).</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>All relevant heritage consultees were consulted in preparation for the application, specifically Historic England and the local planning authorities. This is set out in the ESA in Section 16.4 which summarises discussions with LBTH, LBH and Historic England.</p>
BH3(R)	<p>The setting of scheduled monuments has not been considered. The Applicant is to provide further information on the potential for setting change to scheduled monuments as a result</p>	<p>The only relevant Scheduled Monument for the Proposed Development is the Priory and Hospital of St Mary Spital. It is not considered appropriate to provide an assessment of the setting of this SM because it is an entirely below ground asset. It should be noted that the setting of heritage assets immediately above the SM in Elder Street and Folgate Street has been provided in the ESA.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	of the Proposed Development (BH2). <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
BH4(C)	The scoping response requested that a rationale be provided for the study area and that in accordance with best practice guidance, it be informed by a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). The Applicant is to clarify whether a ZTV has informed the study area and to provide a rationale as requested. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	The rationale for the study area is provided in the text in Section 16.5.1 – 16.5.3 and, as explained, is based on a range of steps taken to understand the likely extent of the effect of the Proposed Development on the significance of heritage assets. These include field and desk research and assessment of the proposed development in relation to the nature and distribution of heritage assets. The use of a ZTV is not considered to be essential to achieve this understanding. The Heritage Statement (provided in Volume 4, Appendix K) and its appendices should be read with the ESA chapter.
BH5(R)	The scoping response also requested that the assessment be informed by Historic Environment Record (HER) data to both identify non-designated heritage assets and to understand the significance of the assets. This source is not listed in the sources consulted and a search of the Greater London HER (GLHER) should be made by the Applicant. This data should be reviewed to ensure that it does not	All relevant records and data concerning heritage assets have been referred to in preparation of the Built Heritage chapter, and it is entirely clear in the chapter that all heritage assets affected by the proposed development have been captured in the assessment. The HER is referred to in Paragraph 16.3.29 of the ESA chapter. Further reference to methodology and information sources is provided at Paragraph 16.5.3. The Heritage Statement (provided in Volume 4, Appendix K) and its appendices should be read in conjunction with the ESA chapter. <u>Further response:</u> The updated GLHER search (Appended) has been reviewed. We can confirm that it does not:

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>affect the assessment and findings presented.</p> <p><u>Further comment</u> Paragraph 16.3.29 states what a HER is – and that it is accessible via Heritage Gateway; it does not state that it has been reviewed and the paragraph that lists the sources used (16.5.3) does not reference the HER, or Heritage Gateway, which in any case is not appropriate for planning use as it is not maintained as a live database and, as such, may not include important information. Both the NPPF (para’s 187 and 189) and Historic England best practice guidance (e.g. GPA2 and GPA3) require that as a minimum the HER – a live historic environment database maintained by the local authority - is consulted to identify heritage assets and their significance. An up-to-date GLHER search has already been obtained for the archaeology assessment and it should be reviewed by the Applicant to ensure that:</p>	<p>a) identify any additional above-ground non-designated heritage assets; or</p> <p>b) include any relevant information on the heritage significance of assets that could change the built heritage assessment and findings presented.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>a) It does not identify any additional non-designated heritage assets. (If it does then these will need to be scoped in/out and assessed if required).</p> <p>b) It does not include any relevant information on the heritage significance of assets that could change the built heritage assessment and findings presented.</p> <p>This will ensure that the assessment accords with the scoping opinion and the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>(The lack of a clearly-labelled figure covering all assets in the study area – previously requested as BH6 – exacerbates this uncertainty.) Further information is sought.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Acceptable</p> <p>(Note that whilst it is considered acceptable that the GLHER contains no additional non-designated heritage assets that affect this assessment there remains an issue with the ES</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>chapter having not assessed non-designated heritage assets that are due to be demolished and with the heritage statement erroneously stating that parts of the listed structures on site are only curtilage listed and then treating them as non-designated heritage assets.)</p> <p>No further information required.</p>	
BH6(C)	<p>There is no single heritage asset plan that clearly details the location of all the assets discussed. This is highly problematic in terms of understanding the interaction of the assets and the scheme. The Applicant is to provide a figure showing the location of all the assets assessed; the assets must be individually labelled on the figure (e.g. with NHLE and HER numbers) so as to be cross-referenceable to the text.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The nature and distribution of heritage assets is entirely clear from the submission material when read in an integrated manner, and set out in detail in the ESA chapter, the Heritage Statement and the Heritage Statement appendices. However, we have provided the heritage and conservation identification plan submitted with the application, which shows the nearest heritage assets to the Site.</p>
BH7(R)	<p>The method by which heritage significance is assessed is not articulated in the ESA, or the supporting documents. In some</p>	<p>The methodology used in preparation of the ESA chapter is fully explained in Sections 16.3 and 16.5 of the ESA chapter, with reference to the Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K) and its appendices which,</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>documents it appears to be via comparison of designation criteria and in others via consideration of the values set out in HE's (2008) Conservation Principles. This inconsistency is unhelpful to the reader. The Applicant is to provide clarification on their method for determining the significance of heritage receptors.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>as is clearly indicated, should be read with the ESA chapter. This includes an explanation of how heritage significance is assessed. This has been repeated below for clarity.</p> <p>Heritage 'significance' has been assessed according to the criteria defined in the following guidance: NPPF defines significance as 'the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting'. The Historic England 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2' puts it slightly differently as 'the sum of its architectural, historic, artistic or archaeological interest'. 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment' (English Heritage, April 2008) describes a number of 'heritage values' that may be present in a 'significant place'. These are evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal value. These criteria have all been used in combination in assessing the significance of the identified heritage assets.</p>
BH8(R)	<p>The baseline articulation of significance is somewhat light touch and often fails to specify exactly what features of the asset underpin the heritage values identified, particularly when discussing setting. This is problematic for the assessment section as the effects need to be clearly understood in relation to the asset's heritage significance. This was requested in the scoping response in order to accord with policy and best practice. To ensure that there is the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment,</p>	<p>While it would perhaps be neat and convenient to try and isolate in a table 'specific attributes of the asset and its setting contribute to each heritage value that makes up its significance' this does not correspond to the reality of how multiple attributes and qualities create heritage significance in designated and non-designated heritage assets. In any event, the qualities that contribute to the significance of the heritage assets assessed are described in extensive detail in the ESA, Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K) and its supporting appendices, which, Clearly discuss the link between heritage value, setting and significance and have fully considered the remaining railway structures. As previously indicated the ESA chapter should be read in conjunction with the Heritage Statement and appendices.</p> <p>We do not agree that it is necessary to tabulate each and every element that makes up 'heritage significance' for each and every asset (see our response in BH7 above). These elements include aesthetic, architectural, evidential, communal and historical attributes. These have been covered extensively in the supporting documents and do not lend themselves to simple tabulation.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>the Applicant is to provide a table summary of the assets assessed, with additional information on what specific attributes of the asset and its setting contribute to each heritage value that makes up its significance. This information provided on setting also needs to include a consideration on the relationship of the remaining railway structures and the archaeological remains of the former railway station.</p> <p>In the summary table significance should be articulated in a single consistent way. It is suggested that this be in line with Historic England's (20018/ 2017) Conservation Principles as the existing baseline information articulated in this manner is clearer and has a better understanding of the contribution of setting, so less work is likely to required.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
BH9(R)	Sensitivity to change is discussed at paragraphs 16.5.11 to 16.5.12. It appears to be based on a combination of heritage	The ESA chapter assessment takes account of the contribution of setting to the significance of the asset. We feel that the methodology is wholly clear, complies with best practice and is set out in the ESA and is implicit in the work of the heritage statement as a whole. The Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K) and its appendices should be read with the ESA chapter.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>significance and proximity to the site rather than setting. This is problematic as an asset can have a setting that makes it highly sensitive to change, even if at a distance to the site. The Applicant is to clarify their method of determining asset sensitivity. If it does not take account of the contribution of setting to the significance of the asset it will need to be revisited to ensure compliance best practice guidance (e.g. Historic England's (2017) guidance on setting).</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	
BH10(R)	<p>The criteria for the magnitude of impact is set out at paragraph 16.5.13. These appear to measure change to the fabric and setting of an asset, rather than its heritage significance which is what legislation, policy and guidance calls for. The scoping opinion explicitly stated that heritage significance was to be assessed and, accordingly, the Applicant is to revisit these criteria.</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The statement that '[The criteria for the magnitude of impact] appear to measure change to the fabric and setting of an asset, rather than its heritage significance' is inherently contradictory, in that these qualities contribute directly to heritage significance. This has been covered in detail in Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K) Appendix B of the Context Appraisal</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
BH11(R)	<p>There is a similar issue with the criteria for determining the significance of impacts, which is focused on improvement or degradation to the setting or structural condition of heritage assets. The criteria very clearly indicate a misunderstanding of setting, equating it to ‘visual amenity’ and discussing its ‘quality’. This does not accord with HE’s (2017) best practice guidance on setting, which was to be used in determining significance, as per the scoping opinion. These assessment criteria need to be revisited.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The reference to HE guidance on setting and the apparent inconsistency of the ESA chapter approach is unfounded and not accepted, we feel that the methodology is wholly clear, complies with best practice and is set out in the ESA and is implicit in the work of the heritage statement as a whole. This has been covered in detail in the Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K) Appendix B of the Context Appraisal.</p>
BH12(R)	<p>The impacts of demolition are unclear and a figure illustrating the proposed demolition relating to heritage assets is to be provided.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Extensive and detailed information concerning demolition is provided as part of the planning and listed building consent applications. The retentions and demolitions plan is provided in this response.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
BH13(R)	<p>Demonstrating the link between effect and significance is very important in order to substantiate the assessment findings and demonstrate that the EIA regulations have been met. As such, the Applicant is to revisit their assessment of effects and residual effects and provide additional information on what aspect of the receptor's heritage significance is affected and how. The additional information needs to consider the full range of construction and operational effects, as well as include the following: It must state the magnitude of impact and significance of effect for the construction effects to assets in the wider area. It must explain the reasoning behind how the construction of the scheme will have a minor adverse to moderate beneficial effect on the two listed structures on site. It must clarify the status of the structures to be demolished and whether they are part of the listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets. If the latter then they must be assessed accordingly. A consideration of vibration effects must be included,</p>	<p>This request is at odds with the fact that the assessment provide in the ESA chapter is wholly clear , and refers to 'what aspect of the receptor's heritage significance is affected and how' in a way that seems more concerned with tabulation than a useful assessment of effects on heritage significance. The link between the effect of the proposed development and the significance of heritage assets is clearly set out in the ESA chapter. Indicative vibration levels for piling have been presented in the Noise and Vibration Chapter; which incidentally are not considered to be significant with regards to human receptors and therefore this would be the case with regard to any structural effect upon the heritage assets. The retentions and demolitions plan is provided in this response.</p> <p>All of the non-designated assets have been assessed as a group in the HS at 4.121 and their nature and location discussed in S4 of Appendix B of the Heritage Statement (Volume 4, Appendix K).</p> <p>The residual effects identified within the ESA chapter have been determined through normal EIA practice.</p> <p>Further response:</p> <p>The effects of the scheme on heritage assets that have a setting that contributes to their heritage significance and which interact with the proposed development is discussed at length and in detail in the Heritage Statement and its Appendices (Appendix A - Audit of Historic Structures and Heritage Assets; Appendix B – Context Appraisal and Appendix C - Heritage Fabric Assessment).</p> <p>(i) There are a number of non-designated heritage assets which form part of the curtilage of the site. These include the viaduct arches to the south of the Braithwaite Viaduct and the continuation of these to the west of Braithwaite Street. Also included are the remaining stretches of boundary wall of the former goods yard to the south, north, and south-west of the site and the former Mission Hall to the north. On Sclater Street there is a terrace of three Weaver's houses and the 'Victorian' building. These are to be retained and refurbished. The termination of the unlisted structures, in the form of a stock brick wall on Brick Lane also should be considered as part of the unlisted heritage structures on the site. The former Mission Hall Weavers' Cottages and Victorian building are elements of the Brick Lane and Fournier Street Conservation Area and as such form part of a designated heritage asset. The remains of the boiler house on the east side of Wheler Street houses the remains of the hydraulic accumulator (within arch V36 on the south side of London Road). This is the largest and most significant piece of existing engineering that remains on site. Remaining non-designated assets within the wider assessment area include locally listed (LBH and LBTH) domestic and retail premises along with and small scale warehouses. Non-designated assets are discussed in detail in the</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>since vibration could potentially result in significant structural damage to the listed and non-designated heritage assets on site. All adverse and beneficial effects must be separately listed and not balanced. For ease, it is suggested that this information be tabulated.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Not Acceptable This request has been raised to ensure that in accordance with EIA regulations there is an understanding of the significant effects of the scheme, the information for the reasoning behind those effects, and that that reasoning takes into account current knowledge and methods of assessment. To address this, it is requested that the Applicant provide further information on the effects of the scheme in relation to individual heritage assets, or groups of heritage assets that are functionally or otherwise related and have settings which contribute to their heritage significance in the same way (assets should not be grouped for assessment simply as a result of their proximity/ location).</p>	<p>Heritage Statement and its Appendices (Appendix A -Audit of Historic Structures and Heritage Assets (section 4); Appendix B – Context Appraisal (section 4) and Appendix C - Heritage Fabric Assessment: (section 2)).</p> <p>(ii) Please see Appendix G, appended to this response.</p> <p>(iii) The table showing the heritage receptors significance (Appendix G), the ESA Chapter and the Heritage Statement and its Appendices describe how the evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal values of heritage assets on and around the site will be affected by the proposed development, and the degree to which those values are affected. Where no intervention is made in the physical fabric of the asset, this will occur as a result of alteration in the setting of the asset caused by new built form that changes the physical context in which they are experienced and thus the way the heritage values they possess will be appreciated. In such instances, each heritage value continues to be present in the asset, particularly non-physical evidential, historical, and communal values. Aesthetic may be reduced by the visibility of the asset being limited by new intervening built form. Where direct physical intervention occurs in heritage assets affected by the proposed development, the works have been designed to minimise that intervention to that which is necessary to preserve special architectural or historic interest and heritage values. While non-physical evidential, historical, and communal values are also preserved in this instance some loss of fabric in the development will cause a certain reduction in aesthetic value.</p> <p>However, the proposed development will also cause the aesthetic value of the heritage assets within the Site to be a) repaired and b) better revealed – the Oriel and its associated structures and the Braithwaite Viaduct will, after many years, be restored and their heritage values will be readily appreciable.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>Please see Appendix H - Heritage Importance Sensitivity and Cumulative Effects which provides the further reasoning and information behind the classification of the effects on each heritage asset during both construction and operation of the Proposed Development.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>For their own ease and that of the reader, it is recommended that this information is tabulated. It is to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of non-designated assets, particularly those that are curtilage listed; • A breakdown of all construction and operational effects, their magnitude of impact, level of significance, and a (short) but explicit statement on what heritage values are being affected and how (e.g. the architectural interest of the asset as expressed through x, y, z, would be affected by the development as a result of x, y, z). <p>This will enable the reader to easily determine whether the effects are to an asset's heritage significance or not and understand the logic behind the argument. This information is only required in relation to heritage assets that have a setting that contributes to their heritage significance and which interacts with the proposed development.</p>	
BH14(R)	There is a further issue with the assessment of impacts as it is	The residual effects were arrived at by identifying adverse & beneficial effects according to normal EIA practice.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>unclear as to whether in some instances (e.g. Elder Street and Folgate Street listed buildings) a weighing of adverse and beneficial effects is being undertaken by the Applicant. If so, it is not acceptable. The Applicant is to provide clarification on whether effects have been weighed in the round, or not.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Not Acceptable The Applicant appears to have clarified that they have not weighed effects in the round. However, they have not presented a full breakdown of individual effects. This deficiency should be addressed by BH13.</p>	<p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>Please see response to BH13 above.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>Please see attached Appendix H which provides a breakdown of the individual effects.</p>
BH15(R)	<p>The Applicant needs to provide additional information on the cumulative developments (e.g. in terms of building heights and massing) and what receptors are being affected, and how. A location plan of the cumulative developments or signposting to such a plan is also needed. Comments above, regarding distance and effect, and setting should be borne in mind when providing this.</p>	<p>Cumulative effects are fully and adequately addressed at Section 16.11 of the ESA chapter. A location plan is provided in Chapter 3: EIA Methodology and the heights of these developments can be inferred from table 3.8 in this chapter. We have considered the cumulative effects in the light of our understanding of the site and the location & scale of each cumulative scheme & come to a view using professional judgment.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>(i) The effect analysed relates to the cumulative effects of the identified schemes upon the on-site designated heritage assets only, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braithwaite Viaduct;

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																
	<p>Further comment: Not Acceptable The Applicant has provided no information on cumulative effects. The ESA provides a list of cumulative schemes (i.e. other developments, consented or in planning, that should be considered in parallel with the proposed development). No information on heritage assets, or the anticipated level of effect, has been included. The previous request stands. The Applicant is requested to provide additional information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assets potentially subject to cumulative effects • Their significance, particularly the contribution made by setting; and • The anticipated level of effect. <p>Further comment: Not Acceptable</p> <p>The applicant has clarified that the cumulative effects reported relate to two listed structures on site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forecourt Wall and Gates to Old Bishopsgate Goods Station ('Oriel Gateway'). <p>(ii) The significance of the Braithwaite Viaduct relates to its being 'a rare and early structure with a design and use of materials that render it distinct from both later railway architecture and the neighbouring viaducts to the south' (HE List description). The significance of the Oriel Gateway' lies in its function as a key entrance to the later Goods Yard complex. The setting of these two designated assets is enhanced by the encompassing boundary wall which designates the curtilage of the site and by the accretions that were part of the later development of the goods yard over the ensuing 100 or so years.</p> <p>(iii)The effects that have been considered are (a) direct physical impact or (b) impact upon the setting of designated asset. The anticipated level of effect has been provided in table 16.11 of the ESA Chapter. The anticipated level of effects are considered to be:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="925 911 2063 1412"> <thead> <tr> <th>Map Ref:</th> <th>Scheme Name and Reference Number</th> <th>Status</th> <th>Residual Cumulative Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 (LBTH)</td> <td>Land within former Truman's Brewery site, (LPA Ref. PA/12/00090)</td> <td>Application permitted (12 April 2012). Permission has lapsed without implementation.</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 (LBTH)</td> <td>London Fruit Exchange Brushfield Street And Multi Storey Car Park Whites Row, Brushfield Street, London (LPA ref: PA/16/03266)</td> <td>Application permitted (11 October 2017)</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 (LBH)</td> <td>Art Otel - east of Old Street roundabout at the junction of Old Street, Rivington Street and Great Eastern Street. (LPA Ref: 2009/2405)</td> <td>Granted (7 January 2011)</td> <td>Negligible</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Map Ref:	Scheme Name and Reference Number	Status	Residual Cumulative Impact	1 (LBTH)	Land within former Truman's Brewery site, (LPA Ref. PA/12/00090)	Application permitted (12 April 2012). Permission has lapsed without implementation.	Negligible	2 (LBTH)	London Fruit Exchange Brushfield Street And Multi Storey Car Park Whites Row, Brushfield Street, London (LPA ref: PA/16/03266)	Application permitted (11 October 2017)	Negligible	3 (LBH)	Art Otel - east of Old Street roundabout at the junction of Old Street, Rivington Street and Great Eastern Street. (LPA Ref: 2009/2405)	Granted (7 January 2011)	Negligible
Map Ref:	Scheme Name and Reference Number	Status	Residual Cumulative Impact															
1 (LBTH)	Land within former Truman's Brewery site, (LPA Ref. PA/12/00090)	Application permitted (12 April 2012). Permission has lapsed without implementation.	Negligible															
2 (LBTH)	London Fruit Exchange Brushfield Street And Multi Storey Car Park Whites Row, Brushfield Street, London (LPA ref: PA/16/03266)	Application permitted (11 October 2017)	Negligible															
3 (LBH)	Art Otel - east of Old Street roundabout at the junction of Old Street, Rivington Street and Great Eastern Street. (LPA Ref: 2009/2405)	Granted (7 January 2011)	Negligible															

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response			
	<p>The assessment is presented incorrectly and provides only one level of effect in relation to each scheme rather than in relation to each asset considered.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether cumulative effects to other heritage assets in the study area have been considered; and even if they were, their assessment would be undermined by the Applicant's misunderstanding of setting.</p> <p>A robust assessment of cumulative effects is required.</p> <p>This potential regulation 22 request still stands.</p>	4 (LBTH)	Black Lion House, 45 Whitechapel Road (LPA Ref. PA/13/02162)	Application permitted (26 November 2013)	Negligible
		5 (LBTH)	Aldgate Place (LPA Ref. PA/13/00218)	Application permitted (18 October 2013)	Minor adverse
		6 (CoL)	Bevis Marks House, 24 Bevis Marks (LPA Ref: 14/00433/FULMAJ)	Application validated (17 July 2014)	Negligible
		7 (LBTH)	Fakruddin Street and Pedley Street (LPA Ref. PA/12/02228)	Application permitted (13 December 2012)	Negligible
		8 (LBTH)	11-31 Toynbee Street and 67-69 Commercial Street, London (LPA Ref: PA/16/02878/A1)	Application permitted (18 October 2017)	Negligible
		9 (LBTH)	Site At 3-11 Goulston Street And 4-6 And 16-22 Middlesex Street (LPA Ref: PA/18/01544)	Decision pending	Minor adverse
		10 (CoL)	9-13 Aldgate High Street (LPA Ref: 13/00590/FULMAJ)	Application permitted (8 April 2014)	Negligible
		11 (LBTH)	Site at 2-6 Commercial Street, 98 and 101-105 Whitechapel High Street, carpark to the rear of 95-97 Whitechapel High Street (known as Spread Eagle Yard) and Canon Barnett Primary School (LPA Ref: PA/18/02615/A1)	Registered	Minor adverse
		12 (LBTH)	Huntingdon Industrial Estate (LPA Ref: PA/13/01638)	Application permitted; permission has lapsed without implementation	Minor adverse
		13 (LBH)	Principal Tower (Principal Place / Bishops Place) (LPA Ref: 2016/2044)	Under Construction	Moderate adverse

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response			
		14 (LBH)	The Stage (Plough Yard) (LPA Ref: 2015/3453)	Under Construction or Complete & Unsold	Moderate adverse
		15 (LBH)	5-29 Sun Street 8-16 Earl Street & 54 Wilson Street (LPA Ref: 2015/0877)	Under Construction or Complete & Unsold	Minor adverse
		16 (LBTH)	120 Vallance Road 2-4 Hemming Street (LPA Ref: PA/15/01231)	Under Construction or Complete & Unsold	Negligible
		17 (LBH)	201-207 Shoreditch High Street (LPA Ref: 2015/2403)	Permission Granted	Moderate adverse
		18 (LBH)	13-14 Appold Street (LPA Ref: 2015/1685)	Permission Granted – Not Started	Minor adverse
		19 (LBH)	84-86 Great Eastern Street (LPA Ref: 2015/1834)	Permission Granted – Not Started	Negligible
		20 (LBH)	1-13 Long Street (LPA Ref: 2012/2013)	Under Construction	Negligible
		21 (LBTH)	114-150 Hackney Road (LPA Ref: PA/17/00250)	Permission Granted – Not started	Negligible
		22 (CoL)	100 Liverpool Street & 8 - 12 Broadgate (LPA Ref: 15/01387/FULEIA)	Under Construction	Negligible
		23 (LBH)	97-137 Hackney Road (LPA Ref: 2015/3455)	Under Construction	Negligible
		24 (LBI)	70-100 City Road (LPA Ref: P101833)	Under Construction	Negligible

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response			
		25 (LBI)	Speedfix House and Monmouth House, 19 – 23 Featherstone Street (LPA Ref: P2015/3136/FUL)	Permission Granted – Not Started	Negligible
		26 (CoL)	150 Bishopsgate (LPA Ref 17/00623/FULL)	Granted	Negligible
		27 (CoL)	(100 Bishopsgate) 61 St Mary Axe, 80-86 Bishopsgate, 88-90 Bishopsgate, 12-20 Camomile Street, 15-16 St Helen's Place And 33-35 St Mary Axe (North Elevation Only) (LPA Ref: 12/00129/FULL)	Granted	Negligible
		28 (LBTH)	Silwex House, Quaker street (LPA Ref: PA/16/00392/A1)	Granted 2016	Negligible
		29 (LBH)	Shoreditch Village (183-187 Shoreditch High Street, bounded by Holywell Lane, New Inn Yard and rail viaduct) (LPA Ref: 2017/0596)	Granted 2018	Negligible
		30 (LBH)	168-178 Shoreditch High Street (LPA Ref: 2015/3316)	Granted 2016	Negligible
		31 (LBTH)	281-285 Bethnal Green Road, (LPA Ref: PA/17/00299/A1).	Granted (16 June 2017).	Negligible
		32 (LBTH)	Land bounded by Elder Street, Folgate Street, Blossom Street, Norton Folgate, Shoreditch High Street and Commercial Street, (LPA Ref: PA/14/03548).	Granted (3 May 2016).	Negligible
		33 (LBTH)	Sainsbury Foodstore, 1 Cambridge Heath Road,(LPA Ref: PA/17/01920).	Appeal pending.	Negligible
		34 (LBTH)	Former Beagle House now known as Maersk House, Braham Street, (LPA Ref: PA/18/00971).	Granted (29 March 2019).	Negligible

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response			
		35 (LBH)	49-51 Paul Street, (LPA Ref: 2018/2104).	Decision pending.	Negligible
		36 (LBH)	Development House, 56-64 Leonard Street, (LPA Ref: 2017/4694).	Decision pending.	Negligible
		37 (LBTH)	Enterprise House, 21 Buckle Street, London, (LPA Ref: PA/16/03552).	Granted (17 December 2018.)	Negligible
		38 (LBTH)	Land Adjacent to 20 Bury Street ('The Tulip'), (LPA Ref: 18/01213/FULEIA).	Decision pending.	Negligible
		39 (LBTH)	Land bounded by 2-10 Bethnal Green Road, 1-5 Chance Street (Huntingdon Industrial Estate) and 28-32 Redchurch Street (LPA ref: PA/19/00294)	Not yet submitted.	Negligible.
		<p>Further response:</p> <p>Please see attached Appendix H which provides a full detailed assessment of the cumulative effects.</p>			
BH16(C)	<p>The Applicant is asked to provide clarification on the protective measures that will be undertaken in relation to construction effects.</p> <p>Further comment:</p> <p>Not Acceptable It is fully appreciated that the scheme is a complex one that will require a detailed CEMP and be</p>	<p>The ES chapter refers to the fact that protection measures will be put in place in respect of construction effects. It would be unusual for the precise measures to have been designed or agreed at this point, prior to the determination of a large and complex application, where such proposals would require considerable time and work to refine. It is fully to be expected that such measures would be the subject of a condition to planning permission and listed building consent when granted.</p> <p>Further response:</p> <p>It is usual that measures designed to protect retained heritage structures during demolition and construction at the site would be expected the subject of a condition to planning permission and listed building consent when granted.</p>			

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>subject to planning condition. However, it is concerning that there is no outline of preventive measures and no mention of historic building recording in relation to the demolition of the non-designated heritage assets on site, some of which are considered curtilage listed. As EIA regulations 1 require that measures to prevent, reduce and offset significant adverse effects are described. The Applicant is requested to provide an outline of the risks of physical harm arising from the scheme and the type of protective measures that may be undertaken, including whether historic building recording is being proposed in relation to the assets to be demolished.</p>	<p>In summary, risks of physical harm arising from the scheme might be described as those arising from the use of heavy plant and machinery in close proximity to a structure which may result, as a function of operator error or accident, in damage which could range from superficial to total destruction and all levels between. The type of protective measures that may be undertaken – in tandem with clear instructions to onsite operatives about sensitivities on site would include, protective wrapping of sensitive features or structures, clear signage and buffer zones around retained structures.</p> <p>In order to facilitate the scheme, a small number of structures or parts of structures have been identified for demolition. The proposed extent of demolition within the site is shown in plan which can be found in the Heritage Statement: Appendix C - Heritage Fabric Assessment (p56). A summary of items proposed for demolition is also given below.</p> <p>It is proposed that each of the items to be demolished is recorded according to best practice as described within Historic England guidance (Historic England, Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice, May 2016). Given the amount of information already in existence about the site and contained within the Appendices to the Heritage Statement, coupled with the type of structures to be demolished; it is recommended that recording to Level 1 would be sufficient.</p> <p>A summary of structures proposed for demolition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the western vaults from V1-V11 and to include the demolition of a 10m section of boundary wall to Commercial Street • the barrel vaults at V3-V11 and R1, R2 and R5; • two sections of northern boundary wall to allow for access to Cygnet Lane and Braithwaite Street; • the non-listed structures either side of the former Mission Hall (north) • opening up of the wall between the last arch and Brick Lane to provide access on axis with the Braithwaite Viaduct; • the arch over Wheler Street; • the 'Silver ramp' at the south-west corner of the site;

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Braithwaite Viaduct: the clearance of later structures from the western end of the viaduct and the insertion of a main access stair in the last vault to the east. • a number of new openings between the spine walls of the unlisted vaults.
BH17(R)	<p>The Applicant is to clarify their assessment of the LDS and to provide a more detailed assessment of all effects, including the moderate adverse effect to the listed Oriel Gate.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The LDS assessment states: This structure, a building at risk, will not be repaired or integrated into the wider scheme as part of the LDS and will continue to decay. Therefore, it will continue to be ‘at risk’ after works are complete.</p>
BH18(R)	<p>In Table 1 of the ESA chapter it is stated that the site lies partly within the Brick Lane and Fournier Street Conservation Area and that four other conservation areas are nearby. This is not explicitly stated in the technical chapter nor in the NTS section on Built Heritage (paragraph 1.7.96) which indicates that there are five conservation areas in close proximity to the site (paragraph 16.6.10). The Applicant is to reword both the technical chapter and NTS to make it clear that the site includes part of a conservation area.</p>	<p>The revised NTS has been reworded to make it clear that the site includes part of a conservation area.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
BH19(R)	<p>EIA regulations require that the NTS includes a description of the likely significant effects of the scheme. In case the additional information requested necessitates the updating of the NTS this potential Regulation 22 request has been made. However, no action is required by the Applicant until the responses have been reviewed.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Not Acceptable It is welcomed that the NTS has been updated to accurately reflect the findings of the assessment as it currently stands. However, the outstanding potential regulation 22 requests may result in changes that need to be reflected in the NTS so until they can be reviewed this request is left as unacceptable.</p>	<p>The NTS will be updated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To make it clear that the site lies partly within the Brick Lane and Fournier Street Conservation Area To indicate which sensitive receptors would be significantly affected as a result of the cumulative schemes. <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>There is no update to the NTS required.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p> <p>Please see the attached updated NTS (Appendix D) to reflect any changes made above.</p>
BH20(P)	<p>Historic building recording will be required of any heritage assets to be demolished. This will need to be undertaken by qualified professionals in accordance with industry best practice. To minimise</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	the potential for materials and final design details to exacerbate any adverse effects, the subsequent reserved matters application(s) relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale should be discussed and agreed in close consultation with the relevant local authority's conservation officers. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	
Review of Chapter 17: Ecology		
ECO1(C)	Black redstart and invertebrate populations were assessed in the Ecology chapter to be of borough importance; however, in the NTS the former is described as being of importance at the local level and the latter is not mentioned (which implies that it has been assessed to be of site importance only). Clarification is required. <u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable	These should both be reported as having metropolitan/borough importance.
ECO2(C)	In paragraph 1.7.107 of the NTS a minor adverse effect on invertebrates during the	The minor adverse effect on invertebrates is not considered significant. The summary in the ecology chapter incorrectly implies this. As it is not a significant residual effect it has not been included in Table 8 of the NTS.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	construction phase is noted, however, this is not reflected in Table 8. Clarification is required. Further comments: Acceptable	
ECO3(R)	Clarification is required as to whether the mitigation measures outlined in Section 17.9 are to be implemented, as these measures have been used to assess the likely significant effects on foraging and commuting bats, invertebrates and the Spitalfields City Farm and Allen Gardens Borough SINC. These measures are currently described in the section heading as "potential". Further comments: Acceptable	All additional mitigation measures outlined in Section 17.9 are to be implemented. We would expect them to be secured by planning condition.
ECO4(R)	It is stated in the Ecology chapter of the ESA and the survey reports provided in ESA Volume IV, Appendix L: Ecology that the underground archways have features with low and moderate Bat Roost Potential (BRP). Given the nature and location of these archways, it is likely that the BRP features are suitable for use by	A further bat survey was undertaken in January of the 2020 to assess the potential of the arches for hibernating bats. All of the accessible arches were surveyed by two surveyors with binoculars, endoscopes and appropriate temperature and humidity levels metres. No evidence of bat activity was discovered in all areas surveyed though it is still considered that the features represent a low and moderate Bat Roost Potential (BRP) which could equally be applied for hibernation. As a precautionary measure static detectors have been positioned on the site in appropriate areas to rule out the presence of hibernating bats, this has been undertaken in line with best practice. Further response

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>bats during the hibernation period. This is reflected in the 2013 bat surveys, which were extended into October and November to look for swarming activity and bats entering hibernation. These surveys are no longer considered to be valid, due to the length of time that has elapsed; and the 2017 update bat surveys did not include surveys in October and November. According to the reports, no surveys have been conducted during December to February inclusive, which is considered to be the most appropriate time of year to detect hibernating bats.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Not Acceptable The response outlines further bat surveys which have been/ are being undertaken to assess the potential of the arches for hibernating bats. These surveys are welcomed and are considered acceptable in principle; however, more information is requested in order to determine if sufficient survey effort has been applied to draw robust conclusions. The Applicant is requested to provide</p>	<p>Hibernation Bat surveys were conducted in January and February 2020 on three separate occasions, and static monitors were installed on site. The main findings are as follows:</p> <p>No bats or evidence of hibernating bats were recorded during the inspection of the railway arches / tunnels. However, features were present on the structures with potential to support hibernating bats.</p> <p>Two static detectors were deployed in two areas of the site, Area A and Area B. Bat activity was recorded during the survey by the static detectors for Area B only, with common pipistrelle bats recorded on four nights in January.</p> <p>The microclimatic conditions of the structures were reviewed to assess the suitability of the features to support roosting bats during hibernation. The temperature and relative humidity readings indicated that the railway arches / tunnels and their features were suitable to support hibernating bats.</p> <p>The nature and scale of the works is varied and specific to each area and the archways / tunnels within them. There is potential for the works to result in both direct and indirect impacts to roosting bats. In light of the findings, a precautionary approach is recommended, and the mitigation hierarchy must be implemented, and any potentially disturbing works should be avoided in the first instance.</p> <p>Pre-construction check - Where the works proposed have potential to impact the potential roost features of a structure, a precautionary method of works should be undertaken in accordance with a method statement, whereby the potential roost features are checked by a bat licenced ecologist immediately prior to the works and a toolbox talk completed by a suitably qualified ecologist with regards to roosting bats should be completed to inform all contractors working on the structure.</p> <p>Timings - it is recommended that works are undertaken under ecological supervision outside the sensitive hibernation season i.e. completed during April - end October.</p> <p>Lighting strategy - In accordance with the EclA and Bat Survey report (The Ecology Consultancy, 2019b & AECOM, 2017) a lighting strategy should be designed to avoid directly illuminating commuting routes and habitats suitable for foraging bats. See Appendix 5 for lighting recommendations.</p> <p>Recommendations as to ways in which the value of the site can be enhanced for bats such as through the provision of planting and bat boxes should also be provided in accordance with national and local planning policies.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>information on the following, supported by maps and photographs if appropriate: which archways were accessible and which archways were not accessible for survey; how much of the accessible archways were surveyed (for example was height of the Bat Roost Potential (BRP) features a restriction); the locations of the static detectors in relation to the archways; and the dates and weather conditions during the static detector surveys.</p> <p>If any archways were not subject to either an inspection or a static detector survey, the Applicant is requested to provide justification for this. Further information is required.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Not Acceptable</p> <p>The Bat Hibernation Survey Report (The Ecology Consultancy, February 2020) confirmed that the tunnels and archways contain features with suitability to support hibernating bats and these</p>	<p>The full hibernation survey report is appended to this response as Appendix E.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u> A Bat Mitigation Strategy has been produced and attached to this response as Appendix I, to outline in further detail the complexities of the site and the potential mitigation suggested.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>structures are located adjacent to a railway line which provides connectivity with the wider landscape. Tunnels and archways of this nature are a rare feature in the area and have the potential to be a valuable hibernating resource for bats, in an urban landscape where hibernating opportunities are already limited. It appears that there are parallels between this site and tunnels elsewhere in London, which support important hibernation roosts. Given the extent of the tunnel systems/archways within the site, there is a high probability that at least one of these structures is used to some extent as a hibernation roost.</p> <p>Hibernating bats are often under recorded because they can be well concealed within crevices¹⁷ and can be difficult to record using static detectors; particularly in a large site such as this with numerous suitable features and areas with limited access. Currently we consider that insufficient survey effort has been applied to draw firm conclusions on use of the site by hibernating bats;</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>and therefore, there is insufficient evidence available for the GLA to reach an informed conclusion on the potential for the proposed development to result in significant effects on bats.</p> <p>Area D is of most concern, as the Bat Hibernation Survey report states that no internal or external inspections have been undertaken and no static detectors were deployed in this area. This is considered unacceptable. The Bat Hibernation Survey Report also states that in other areas of the site, features with potential to support hibernating bats could not be inspected due to the height of the archways/tunnels and some underground areas which had restricted access. Despite this significant limitation, static bat detectors were deployed to supplement the inspections in only two locations, as shown in Figure 1 of the Bat Hibernation Survey Report. The locations of these two static detectors has not been described and it is not clear from Figure 1 (which is a ground surface-level map) in which underground structures these detectors were placed. Given the</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>survey limitations, the size of the site and the number of features with potential to support hibernating bats, we would expect to see considerably more static detector locations used during the optimal period for bat hibernation surveys.</p> <p>The static detector survey indicated that the site may be utilised by a small number of common pipistrelle bats and as such, a precautionary approach to the works must be applied. However, in the absence of further survey information to address the limitations noted above, a worst-case scenario would need to be assumed, in line with the Precautionary Principle. This scenario would be that the site supports at least one important large hibernation roost for a range of bat species. Given the limited availability of similar structures in London, there is potential for this site to be of importance at the metropolitan level.</p> <p>As such, robust mitigation would be required for the loss of hibernation roosts and features which have the potential to be used for hibernation</p>	

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>in the future. We do not consider bat boxes, placed in areas of green space within the revised scheme, as sufficient or appropriate mitigation, given the urban nature of the scheme and the type and extent of potential roost features that currently exist within the site. For the same reason, bat boxes cannot be considered as enhancement for bats, as suggested in the applicant's most recent response. If mitigation cannot be achieved on site, then off-site mitigation will be required. This is not considered to be 'further information' under Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations. This will be advertised/consulted upon by the GLA as required.</p>	
ECO5(R)	<p>Hibernating bats are not mentioned in the ESA and the site is described as being of negligible importance for roosting bats. It is considered that insufficient evidence has been provided to support this conclusion. It is therefore recommended that further surveys are conducted during the bat hibernation season, in order to draw robust conclusions on the value of the site for roosting</p>	<p>Response as above to ECO4 (R).</p> <p><u>Further response:</u> Response as above to ECO4 (R).</p> <p><u>Further response:</u> A Bat Mitigation Strategy has been produced Appendix I, which looks in detail at the mitigation to be applied.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>bats and whether significant effects on roosting bats are likely to occur.</p> <p><u>Further comment:</u> Not Acceptable Response as above to ECO4.</p>	
ECO6(P)	<p>Submission, approval and implementation of a Construction Management Plan (CMP), which should be worded to make specific reference to the protection of ecological receptors; including nearby designated sites, breeding birds and refuge habitat provided or retained during the construction phase. If possible, a single CMP should cover the entire site.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	Agreed.
ECO7(P)	<p>To mitigate for the loss of suitable black redstart breeding opportunities, bird boxes are to be provided. As noted in paragraph 17.8.4, these bird boxes should be of a suitable design and placed at a suitable location to support black redstart.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u></p>	Agreed.

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	Acceptable	
ECO8(P)	Provision of a lighting strategy, to minimise light-spill onto retained and newly-created habitat features, as outlined in paragraph 17.9.1.	Agreed.
ECO9(P)	Provision of full details of the mitigation, habitat creation, landscaping design and enhancement measures outlined in Chapter 17 of the ESA. These should be secured through appropriately-worded planning conditions. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.
ECO10(P)	Submission, approval and implementation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), describing full details of the long-term management and monitoring of habitats within the site. If possible, a single LEMP should cover the entire site. Further comments: Acceptable	Agreed.
Review of Chapter 18: Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation		

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
CC1(R)	<p>The Applicant is requested to clarify why there is a difference between the significance of effects written within Table 18.6 and the preceding text set out in Section 18.7.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The text in Section 18.7 set out the impacts based upon quantified estimates as far as possible to establish a level of effect. Although the mitigation measures specified in CC2 are either not possible to commit to at this stage, or their effectiveness is unknown, Table 18.6 was based on the successful and effective implementation of these measures to provide a realistic set of residual effects. However, it is understood that residual effects should only take into account known and committed mitigation and therefore Table 18.6 has been revised as stated for CC2.</p>
CC2(C)	<p>The Applicant should clarify what mitigation measures; and how these mitigation measures are to be secured and implemented and with whom the responsibilities for their delivery lies for:</p> <p>a. climate change adaption and; b. climate change mitigation.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>For climate change mitigation, the assessment estimates emissions from different activities at construction, operational and end of life stages of the project and then describes a potential set of measures in paragraphs 18.7.6-18.7.9, 18.7.12, 18.7.15, 18.7.19-18.7.21, 18.7.23, 18.7.26-18.7.28, 18.7.30, 18.7.34-18.7.36.</p> <p>In terms of embodied carbon of construction materials, it is clearly stated that the identified measures are only opportunities and that it is not clear how effective it would be. There is no specific target/policy required to reduce this (until the new London Plan is adopted), and therefore any measures would be voluntary and at the discretion of the Applicant.</p> <p>Construction traffic emissions would be mitigated through a Construction Traffic Management Plan/CLP that is expected to be secured through a Planning Condition, although it is not expected to include any specific targets related to carbon emissions.</p> <p>Construction plant emissions were not identified, although it is expected that selection of efficient/electric plant and facilities could be described through a CEMP or similar, to be required through a Planning Condition.</p> <p>Operational regulated energy use will be mitigated through measures set out in the submitted Energy Strategy. This is usually implemented as part of the permission and updated as necessary through the RMA.</p> <p>Operational unregulated energy includes white and other electrical goods, which cannot be understood at this stage and therefore there can be no commitment by the Applicant to select only certain types, as this will generally be up to the future occupants and outside the control of the planning system.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response																																
		<p>Operational traffic will be mitigated through a Travel Plan, to be produced by Planning Condition prior to occupation. The TP would generally focus on reducing the need to use private cars, thereby reducing associated emissions.</p> <p>End of life phase emissions can be most effectively mitigated by designing for disassembly and following circular economy principles. There is no specific target/policy required to apply this thinking to the proposed development (although it is a requirement of the new London Plan), and therefore any measures would be voluntary and at the discretion of the Applicant.</p> <p>On the basis that mitigation should not be taken into account in a residual effect unless it is committed and has some certainty, Table 18.6 should be revised as highlighted below</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="891 834 1955 1423"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="891 834 1144 911">Description of Effect</th> <th data-bbox="1144 834 1370 911">Potential impact including significance</th> <th data-bbox="1370 834 1673 911">Mitigation</th> <th data-bbox="1673 834 1955 911">Residual Effect including significance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="891 911 1955 938">Construction</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 938 1144 1042">Embedded carbon in building materials (across project lifespan)</td> <td data-bbox="1144 938 1370 1042">Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)</td> <td data-bbox="1370 938 1673 1042">Consider using lower embedded carbon materials</td> <td data-bbox="1673 938 1955 1042">Minor-adverse (not significant) Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1042 1144 1123">Carbon emissions from construction traffic</td> <td data-bbox="1144 1042 1370 1123">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> <td data-bbox="1370 1042 1673 1123">Consider using more efficient vehicles and sourcing products locally</td> <td data-bbox="1673 1042 1955 1123">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1123 1144 1204">Carbon emissions from construction plant</td> <td data-bbox="1144 1123 1370 1204">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> <td data-bbox="1370 1123 1673 1204">Consider using more efficient plant</td> <td data-bbox="1673 1123 1955 1204">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="891 1204 1955 1232">Completed Development</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1232 1144 1313">Operational regulated energy use</td> <td data-bbox="1144 1232 1370 1313">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> <td data-bbox="1370 1232 1673 1313">Consider using lean, clean and green energy principles</td> <td data-bbox="1673 1232 1955 1313">Minor adverse (not significant)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="891 1313 1144 1423">Operational unregulated energy use</td> <td data-bbox="1144 1313 1370 1423">Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine</td> <td data-bbox="1370 1313 1673 1423">Consider using more efficient equipment</td> <td data-bbox="1673 1313 1955 1423">Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description of Effect	Potential impact including significance	Mitigation	Residual Effect including significance	Construction				Embedded carbon in building materials (across project lifespan)	Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)	Consider using lower embedded carbon materials	Minor-adverse (not significant) Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)	Carbon emissions from construction traffic	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using more efficient vehicles and sourcing products locally	Minor adverse (not significant)	Carbon emissions from construction plant	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using more efficient plant	Minor adverse (not significant)	Completed Development				Operational regulated energy use	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using lean, clean and green energy principles	Minor adverse (not significant)	Operational unregulated energy use	Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine	Consider using more efficient equipment	Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine
Description of Effect	Potential impact including significance	Mitigation	Residual Effect including significance																															
Construction																																		
Embedded carbon in building materials (across project lifespan)	Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)	Consider using lower embedded carbon materials	Minor-adverse (not significant) Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)																															
Carbon emissions from construction traffic	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using more efficient vehicles and sourcing products locally	Minor adverse (not significant)																															
Carbon emissions from construction plant	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using more efficient plant	Minor adverse (not significant)																															
Completed Development																																		
Operational regulated energy use	Minor adverse (not significant)	Consider using lean, clean and green energy principles	Minor adverse (not significant)																															
Operational unregulated energy use	Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine	Consider using more efficient equipment	Negligible (not significant) Not possible to determine																															

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response				
		Operational traffic emissions	Minor adverse (not significant)	Encourage greater use of public and active travel modes	Minor adverse (not significant)	
		End of Life				
		End of life carbon costs (wastage)	Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)	Adopt circular economy principles	Minor adverse (not significant) Moderate-Minor adverse (significant)	
		<p>In terms of climate change adaptation, paragraphs 18.8.13-18.8.15 explain that effects from climate could be mitigated through an Outline Climate Change Adaptation Plan. Paragraph 18.10.1 identifies a number of measures that could be included in a Climate Change Adaptation Plan, although it is considered that there is no specific target/policy that would require this from Applicants, outside of the overheating assessment and flood risk assessment. It is therefore for the Applicant to decide whether these or other measures should be taken into account later in the planning and design process. This does not affect any of the assessment conclusions.</p>				
CC3(C)	Applicant to confirm if the NTS requires updating as a result of the clarifications above. Further comments: Acceptable	The NTS has been updated and is appended to this response.				
Review of Chapter 19: Effect Interactions						
EF1(R)	The Applicant is requested to provide clarification as to why the schemes listed within in section 19.6 of the ESA and as stated in	Section 19.6 doesn't exist. The cumulative schemes considered in the assessment are listed in table 3.8 of chapter 3. The 2019 scoping opinion included some additional cumulative schemes (as listed in section 4.35 of the 2019 scoping opinion). These were included with the cumulative assessment with the following exceptions:				

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>the EIA Scoping Opinion issued by GLA have not been included.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Not Acceptable Section 19.6 refers to the list of schemes detailed within Chapter 19 of the ESA review however it is recognised that this has been misinterpreted due to a typographical error. While the Applicant has addressed most of these schemes and provided sufficient justification for their exclusion, there is one outstanding scheme for which justification has not been provided. This is the scheme known as Curtain Road/Hewett Street/ Great Eastern Street/Fairchild Place/Plough Yard/Hearn Street (2012/3871). In line with the Scoping Opinion from GLA, justification must be provided for the exclusion of all schemes which subsequently includes the scheme listed above.</p>	<p>PA/17/01920 Sainsbury's Foodstore, Cambridge Heath Road – This was rejected between issue of the Scoping Opinion and submission of ESA therefore this has not been included within the assessment.</p> <p>PA/18/00917 and PA/18/00917 Site Bound by Raven Row, Stepney Way, Sidney Street – This falls outside of the 1km zone of consideration from the application boundary the scheme was reviewed and not considered to have a cumulative effect and was therefore excluded from the assessment.</p> <p>PA/16/00784 100-136 Cavell Street – This falls outside of the 1km zone of consideration from the application boundary the scheme was reviewed and was not considered of sufficient scale to have a cumulative effect and was therefore excluded from the assessment.</p> <p>PA/14/02817 South East block of Goodman's Fields – outside 1km of application boundary (just). This scheme has been built out and was incorporated into the baseline.</p> <p>2013/3567 Land Bound by King John Street – This scheme was superseded by the Shoreditch Village Development, which was included within the assessment.</p> <p>18/01065/FULEIA 1-2 Broadgate London – This scheme was considered within the cumulative assessment though was mistakenly absent from Chapter 3 EIA Methodology, Table 3.9 and Figure 3.4, the updated figure has appended to this response in Appendix A.</p> <p>Taking into the consideration of the above no changes are required to the existing cumulative assessment, which is considered valid in the context of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>Further response</u></p> <p>The scheme known as Curtain Road/Hewett Street / Great Eastern Street / Fairchild Place / Plough Yard / Hearn Street (Hackney: 2012/3871) has been considered in this ES. It is outlined in Table 3.8 and Figure 3.4 as cumulative scheme map reference number 14. The original 2012 planning permission (which is cited in Table 3.8) has been amended by the following non-material amendments 2015/3276 and 2015/3711 as well as the amendment 2015/3453 that is cited in the Table. All of these amendments have been considered in the assessment.</p>
EF2(R)	<p>The NTS presents a summary of the Type 1 and Type 2 cumulative effects which reflects the detailed findings in the main ES document.</p>	<p>No update is considered necessary to the NTS with regards to this point.</p> <p><u>Further response:</u></p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>This should be updated if any changes arise from the comments made in this review.</p> <p>Further comment: Not Acceptable Outstanding clarifications detailed within the reassessment of other technical topics still remain in relation to Type 1 and Type 2 cumulative effects. As these have not been addressed this may affect the information presented within the NTS. The Applicant should consider the wider responses set out within this table.</p>	<p>An updated Chapter 19 has been appended to this response.</p>
Review of Chapter 20: Residual Effects and Conclusions		
REC1(R)	<p>Should the potential Regulation 22 requests / clarifications result in any changes to the effects as currently reported, this chapter and the NTS would need to be updated.</p> <p>Further comments: Acceptable</p>	<p>The NTS has been updated and is appended to this response.</p> <p>Further response: An updated Chapter 20 has been appended to this response.</p>
Review of Volume 3: Townscape Visual Impact Assessment		
TVIA1(C)	<p>Clarify the approach to assessing sensitivity and the difference</p>	<p>Para 2.20 should have included reference to townscape in two of the bullet points.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>between the method for assessing sensitivity of townscape character areas and the method for assessing sensitivity of views (and/or visual receptors as appropriate). For example, it is assumed that paragraph 2.20 should not include the word 'townscape' (as townscape sensitivity criteria are set out in paragraph 2.28). This should be clarified by the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>'The sensitivity of a townscape or view is dependent on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the importance of the viewpoint or townscape character area; • the value and quality of the view or townscape character area; and • the nature and expectation of the viewer (for views).'
TVIA2(C)	<p>This assessment description section of the ESA refers to the Town and County Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011; the Applicant is requested to clarify this.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>This isn't a typographical error the application is being submitted in line with the 2011 EIA Regulations as it is an amendment to a live application submitted in 2015, though the ESA has been prepared in line with the scope of the 2017 Regulations.</p>
TVIA3(R)	<p>The adverse impact on VP49 is because <i>"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</i></p>	<p>The assessment of adverse effects is based on professional opinion. In this instance it is our view that the only adverse effect is on VP49.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p><i>existing view along this street, and the uniform townscape derived from the common elevation details, it is considered that on balance the effect on this view will be adverse” (para. 6.336). Could this be said for other viewpoints e.g. VP32 and 34?</i></p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	
TVIA4(C)	<p>Clarify the approach to the cumulative assessment (in particular whether the cumulative assessment reports on the ‘additional’ or ‘combined’ cumulative effects and what baseline is assumed for the cumulative assessment). Information about approaches to cumulative assessment including a definition of additional and combined effects can be found on page 124 of GLVIA3.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>The cumulative assessment was undertaken on the basis of the combined effect of the Proposed Development and any cumulative scheme in line with the wider ESA.</p>
TVIA5(C)	<p>The NTS does not report the adverse impact on the townscape character/ setting of listed buildings around Elder Street and Fleur De</p>	<p>This is an assessment of the effects on the townscape setting of heritage assets, which the TVIA considers as an aspect of townscape, as opposed to the effect on their setting that would affect their heritage significance.</p>

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>Lis Street that is reported in the main assessment at paragraph 10.54. However, it is not clear if this is a heritage impact or a townscape impact and therefore whether it should be reported in the townscape and visual section of the NTS, or if it is a heritage impact it should be reported in the built heritage chapter and the built heritage section of the NTS. This should be clarified by the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Not Acceptable The Applicant has confirmed that the adverse impact on the townscape character/ setting of listed buildings around Elder Street and Fleur De Lis Street that is reported in the main assessment at paragraph 10.54 belongs in the TVIA. Although the adverse impact is summarised in Table 8 of the NTS ('Conclusions'), it does not appear in Section 1.7 of the NTS. The Applicant is requested to clarify why this is.</p>	<p><u>Further response:</u> The Townscape and Visual Impact summary in Section 1.7 of the NTS has been revised to include effects on the settings of listed buildings from a townscape perspective.</p>
TVIA6(R)	Views 28 and 51 do not show the full height of height of the building	Millerhare can extend view images 28 and 51 to include a wireline outline of the remainder of the building on Plot 2. This will not provide a realistic images of how the viewer would see the scheme in this viewpoint as

DRR Reference C (Clarification) R (Regulation 22) P (Conditions)	Summary of Details Required (LUC Comments)	Response
	<p>which makes it difficult to judge the effect on these views – it would be helpful if the applicant could provide a model or image that includes the full height of the building to understand the height of the development from these viewpoints.</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>they would have to raise their head to see the top of the building. These have however been provided and appended to this response.</p>
TVIA7(P)	<p>The design of the new buildings and public realm to be subject to consideration by the local planning authority during the reserved detailed application(s).</p> <p><u>Further comments:</u> Acceptable</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Appendix D

Appendix E

Appendix F

Appendix G

Appendix H

Appendix I

Appendix J

Appendix K

Appendix L

