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Preface

This Environmental Statement (ES) has been prepared on behalf of Amwaj Property Limited (hereafter referred to as 'the Applicant') in accordance with the statutory procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (SI 2011/1824) (the EIA Regulations).

This ES relates to residential-led mixed use redevelopment proposals for the eastern part of the former North Westminster Community School (NWCS) site (hereafter referred to as ‘Site 2’) which is located within the City of Westminster (CoW), and accompanies a full planning application (hereafter referred to as ‘the Application’) made by the Applicant to the Westminster City Council (WCC) in respect of the redevelopment proposals (hereafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Development’).

The NWCS site benefits from an extant planning consent granted in 2011 (10/10215/COFUL) for a residential led development. This consent has not been implemented on-site. The Applicant took ownership of the NWCS site in March 2012. Due to a number of changes that have occurred since the extant consent, the Applicant has, in consultation with WCC, prepared a revised masterplan and planning strategy for the NWCS site and has agreed the phased submission of full planning applications for two distinct phases (Site 1 and Site 2). As such, a full planning application for Site 1 was submitted to WCC in November 2012 (12/11911/FULL) and granted consent on 4th June 2013 subject to entering into a Section 106 Agreement, which is targeted for October 2013.

The Applicant recognises that the Application for Site 2 falls within Schedule 2, Category 10b of the EIA Regulations as an ‘urban development project’ which, owing to its nature, scale and location has the potential to give rise to significant effects on the environment. The Applicant has therefore commissioned an EIA for the development, the findings of which are presented within the ES.

The ES comprises four volumes:
- Volume 1: Non-Technical Summary (NTS);
- Volume 2: ES Main Report;
- Volume 3: Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact; and
- Volume 4: Technical Appendices.

This document comprises Volume 1 of the ES.

In summary, the Proposed Development would comprise two blocks of 6 - 20 storeys and would deliver:
- 42,642 m² gross external area (GEA) of residential uses (Use Class C3) with 335 residential units;
- 982 m² GEA of retail use (Use Class A1/A3);
- 2,745 m² GEA of community use (Use Class D1);
- 963 m² GEA of community use (Use Class D2);
- 580 m² GEA of office and affordable business uses (Use Class B1);
- 18,480 m² GEA of hotel use with 220 rooms (Use Class C1); and
- 5,923 m² GEA of serviced apartment use with 60 apartments (Use Class C1).
The Proposed Development that has been assessed within the ES is as described in Chapter 4: Proposed Development Description and Chapter 5: Demolition and Construction Environmental Management of ES Volume 2, and briefly described in Chapter 6 of this NTS.

Additional documentation that will accompany the Application is as follows:

- Covering Letter;
- Redline Site Location Plan - OS base;
- Planning Application Form;
- Ownership Certificate and Notice;
- Agricultural Holdings Certificate;
- Planning Drawings;
- Planning Statement (and appendices);
- Design and Access Statement (including Lifetime Homes Statement, Wheelchair Accessibility Statement, Public Realm Strategy and Play Space Strategy);
- Affordable Housing Statement;
- Draft Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Liability Form;
- Community Involvement Statement;
- Transport Assessment including Travel Plan and Servicing and Waste Management Strategy;
- Ventilation/Extraction Statement;
- Utilities Statement;
- Energy Statement;
- Lighting Concept Report;
- Sustainability Statement including Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment and BREEAM Pre-Assessment reports; and
- Employment Report.

The Application will be available for viewing at:

Westminster City Council
The Old Marylebone Town Hall
Westminster Council House
97-113 Marylebone Road
London
NW1 5PT

The ES comprising four volumes will be available for purchase (£250/paper copy and £10/CD copy) at:

ENVIRON UK Ltd
Artillery House
11-19 Artillery Row
London
SW1P 1RT
1 Introduction

This ES has been prepared to accompany the Application made by the Applicant for the residential-led mixed use redevelopment of Site 2.

In accordance with the EIA Regulations, the ES reports on the likely residual environmental effects of the Proposed Development during demolition and construction, as well as during its subsequent operation including those effects that may be considered significant. The ES takes into account mitigation measures integral to the Proposed Development to prevent, reduce and, where possible, offset significant adverse effects.

This document is Volume 1 of the ES and comprises the NTS. The aim of the NTS is to summarise the content and the main findings of the ES in a clear and concise manner to assist the public in understanding what the environmental impacts and significant effects of the Proposed Development are likely to be.

The NTS therefore provides:

- a summary of the key EIA process and methodology considerations;
- a summary of the planning context of the Site;
- a summary of the main characteristics of the physical, natural and built environmental of the Site and its surroundings;
- a summary of the Proposed Development, including mitigation measures; and
- a summary of the residual environmental effects likely to arise from the Proposed Development.

ES Volumes 2 and 3 and the supporting technical appendices in Volume 4 provide a more detailed description of Site 2, the characteristics of the Proposed Development and the findings of the ES.
2 EIA Process and Methodology

EIA is a process that must be followed for certain types of development before a decision is made on whether planning permission should be granted. The Site of the Proposed Development is in excess of 0.5 ha and the development proposals are considered to fall within the definition of an “urban development project” described in 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations. Accordingly the Proposed Development requires an EIA to be undertaken.

2.1 EIA Scoping and Consultation

Scoping is the term used in the EIA Regulations whereby the Applicant can request a formal EIA Scoping Opinion from the competent authority on the content of the ES and the extent of the information to be supplied for the technical assessments. The purpose of scoping is to focus the EIA on the environmental issues and potential impacts which need the most thorough attention; to identify those which are unlikely to need detailed study; and to provide a means to discuss methods of impact assessment and reach agreement on the most appropriate.

An EIA Scoping Report was submitted to WCC on 8th April 2013 in support of a formal request for an EIA Scoping Opinion under Regulation 13 of the EIA Regulations. The EIA Scoping Report is provided in Technical Appendix 2.1, ES Volume 4 and sets out a description of the emerging development proposals, the potential key environmental impacts and likely effects to be considered as part of the EIA, as well as the proposed scope of and methodology to be followed within each technical assessment of the ES.

WCC consulted with both statutory and non-statutory consultees during the course of the EIA Scoping Process including the Environmental Agency (EA) and Transport for London (TfL). WCC’s formal EIA Scoping Opinion was issued on 14th June 2013 and confirmed the key issues which needed to be assessed in the EIA as:

- Development Programme, Construction Activity and Effects Management;
- Socio-Economics;
- Transportation and Access;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Air Quality;
- Archaeology;
- Ground Conditions and Contamination;
- Water Resources and Flood Risk;
- Ecology;
- Wind;
- Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare;
- Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual; and
- Cumulative Effects.

WCC agreed to scope Telecommunications, Waste, Health and Light Spill out of the EIA as the Proposed Development was considered unlikely to generate significant environmental effects in relation to these issues. WCC also agreed that a number of existing baseline
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studies historically undertaken for the wider NWCS site and for Site 1 could be relied upon in undertaking the EIA for Site 2.

2.2 Approach to EIA

The EIA was undertaken in accordance with accepted best practice as set out within the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment's (IEMA) Guidelines for EIA and Government guidance. A consistent approach to the presentation of the EIA findings has been adopted for each of the technical areas, including:

- a review of policy and legislative requirements, as well as, planning standards of relevance to the specific technical area, on national, regional and local level;
- an explanation of the information gathering and assessment methodology, including the significance criteria used to assess residual effects;
- a description of the baseline conditions including the identification of sensitive receptors;
- a description of the mitigation measures that has been incorporated into the Proposed Development's design and other proposed measures and management controls;
- the identification of potential impacts during the demolition and construction works of the Proposed Development and once the Proposed Development has been completed;
- an assessment of the environmental effects these impacts are expected to cause, and an evaluation of their significance against defined criteria taking into consideration mitigation measures integral to the development proposals;
- a description of additional opportunities for mitigation to further reduce the significance of any adverse environmental effects, including the requirements for post-development monitoring, if and where considered appropriate; and
- the identification of cumulative impacts and effects.

As with EIA, good practice in the preparation of the ES is defined in a number of sources, with more specific issues covered by ES review checklists. Many of these checklists are very detailed and go to some length. In terms of widely applicable and practical guidance, the recent IEMA quality mark indicator check was referenced in producing the ES.

2.3 Basis of EIA

The Application is made in full. In accordance with the EIA Regulations and case law, the EIA has been undertaken based on the Proposed Development as described in the Application, detailed planning drawings, the area schedules and detailed components of the Proposed Development as described in Chapter 4: Proposed Development Description and Chapter 5: Demolition and Construction Environmental Management of ES Volume 2.

2.3.1 Baseline

The purpose of EIA is to predict how environmental conditions may change as a result of the Proposed Development. This requires that the environmental conditions now (or at least in the near future, before construction of the Proposed Development gets underway) and in the future assuming no development, are established.

This is referred to as the 'baseline' and is usually established through a combination of desk-based research, site survey and empirical studies and projections. Together, these describe the current and future character of a site and the value and vulnerability of key environmental resources and receptors.
The baseline for this EIA was taken as the ‘current’ brownfield Site and its immediate surrounds.

For the purposes of the Transport and Access, Air Quality; and Noise and Vibration technical assessments a ‘Future Baseline’ was considered for the anticipated year in which the Proposed Development would be complete (also referred to as ‘Year of Opening), namely 2018.

The Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare assessment also considered a ‘Future Baseline’ condition, as this was deemed a more realistic and appropriate reference for assessment purposes.

2.3.2 Mitigation Measures

One of the main aims of EIA is to identify and assist in developing mitigation measures to prevent, reduce and where possible, offset any potential significant adverse effects of a development. Mitigation measures can relate to design, construction or the activities associated with the completed development.

2.3.3 Impacts and Effects

As a general rule, the EIA assesses the outcome or residual effects that are likely to arise as a consequence of a potential impact/change to baseline environmental receptors following the application/consideration of mitigation measures.

A range of impacts are considered - direct, indirect (or secondary) and cumulative:

- Direct impacts are those which arise as a direct consequence of a project action, e.g. the loss of habitat or the run-off of surface water to a watercourse.
- Indirect impacts include the decline in the abundance of a species as a result of the loss of habitat or the damage to aquatic vegetation as a result of water pollution. Other common examples include the impact on air quality and ambient noise as a result of increased traffic movements.
- Cumulative impacts are those that occur at the same time and combine on a site to give rise to ‘impact interactions' or combine with other planned development on other sites to give rise to ‘in-combination effects’.

How the development might affect the environment relies on predictions about what impact a certain action would have. Some predictions can be made using mathematical or simulation models, particularly where there are well known relationships between cause and effect. For example:

- The degree to which noise levels may increase as a result of additional traffic flows can be predicted using a mathematical equation;
- The level of air pollution from a known traffic flow can also be predicted from a computer-based simulation model; and
- The visibility of a building can be predicted by accurately superimposing its outline and position over a photograph.

Other impacts are less easy to predict in quantitative terms; for example, whilst the loss of a habitat can be measured, the effect on the abundance of individual species is more difficult to predict. In such cases, the EIA attempts to qualify the anticipated scale of impact using professional judgement.
In all cases, the approach to predicting the likely nature and scale of impact was set out in each of the technical chapters. Where used, recognised specific predictive methods were referenced. Any assumptions or limitations to knowledge are stated. In either case the thought process leading to the conclusions is based on reasonably reliable data and so is considered to be legally robust unless otherwise indicated.

2.3.4 Cumulative Effects

The EIA Regulations require that, in assessing the effects of a particular development proposal, consideration is also given to the cumulative impacts and effects which might arise from the proposal in conjunction with other development proposals in the vicinity.

Two types of Cumulative Effect were considered within Chapter 16 of ES Volume 2, namely:

- Intra-project Effects: Combined effects of different types of impact or ‘impact interactions’, for example the multiplying effects arising from noise, dust and visual impacts during the construction of the development on a particular sensitive receptor; and
- Inter-project Effects: Combined effects generated from the development together with other planned developments and also referred to as ‘in-combination effects’. These other developments may generate their own individually insignificant effects but when considered together could amount to significant cumulative effects, for example, combined traffic flow effects from two or more (proposed) developments.

However in regard to inter-project effects, the Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment in ES Volume 3 followed the good practice guidance produced by the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, and therefore adopted an approach in which the additional effects of the Proposed Development over and above the cumulative future baseline, was assessed.

2.3.5 Significance

The assessment of environmental effects is important in that it informs the determination by the competent authority of the overall acceptability of the proposal. Determining significance relies on accepted thresholds and criteria where available or, for situations in which such are not available, expert interpretations and value judgments.

Significance is a function usually of the vulnerability or importance of the receptor affected and the scale (magnitude and duration) of the impact. Importance might be a function of international designation or local relevance. Thus, significance is a concept relevant to individual effects.

Throughout this ES the same terminology is used to describe these individual effects, unless specific alternative terminology exists in recognised issue specific guidance (for example in Chapter 9: Air Quality and Chapter 13: Ecology, ES Volume 2) or where informed by a particular assessment approach (for example in the Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment in ES Volume 3).

Within this ES, significance has been evaluated with reference to definitive standards, accepted/published criteria and legislation, where available. Where it has not been possible to quantify potential impacts and residual effects, qualitative assessments have been carried out, based on expert knowledge and professional judgement. Where uncertainty exists, it has been noted in the relevant assessment.
Specific conventions have been developed to define significance, wherever possible, defined and structured as transparently as possible using the criteria listed below:

- The sensitivity of the receptor to the change or impact, based on a scale of high, medium and low;
- The magnitude of the impact, based on a scale of high, medium, small, neutral and unknown;
- The likelihood of the effect occurring, based on a scale of certain, likely or unlikely;
- The duration of the effect, based on a scale of long, medium and short term (temporary); and
- The reversibility of the effect, being either reversible or irreversible.

In order to provide a consistent approach to the presentation of residual effects, the following terminology was used throughout the ES to define the nature of the effect:

- **Adverse** - detrimental or negative effect to an environmental resource or receptor;
- **Neutral** - an effect that on balance, is neither beneficial nor adverse to an environmental receptor or resource; and
- **Beneficial** - advantageous or positive effect to an environmental resource or receptor.

Predicted residual effects were classified according to the following semantic scale:

- **Negligible** - imperceptible effect;
- **Minor** - slight, very short or highly localised effect;
- **Moderate** - limited effect (by magnitude, duration, reversibility, value and sensitivity of receptor) which may be considered significant; and
- **Major** - considerable effect (by magnitude, duration, reversibility, value and sensitivity of receptor) which may be more than of a local significance or lead to a breach of a recognised environmental threshold, policy, legislation or standard).

Effects were predicted as either 'significant' or 'not significant'. Significant effects are considered material to the planning decision process. Based on the above, moderate and major effects may be considered significant.

The specific benchmarks were established by the project team using available national, regional and local policy together with other relevant guidance, recognised best practice and expert judgement. The development of these benchmarks is explained in more detail in each chapter or technical appendix.

Assumptions and limitations have been identified in undertaking the EIA.
3 Planning History and Site Context

3.1 Planning History

Site 2 was previously occupied by the NWCS between 2001 and 2008 and then temporarily occupied by the City of Westminster College. In January 2011 the City of Westminster College moved into their new premises located to the north of the NWCS site, adjacent to Paddington Green. The NWCS site has since ceased to be used for educational purposes.

In 2010 WCC adopted the NWCS Planning Brief which seeks to promote the sustainable and high quality residential-led mixed-use development of the NWCS site. In addition to residential uses, the Planning Brief promotes associated office accommodation, community space, retail units and publically accessible green space.

The NWCS site currently benefits from an extant planning consent granted on 20th December 2011 (ref 10/10215/COFUL) for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment comprising five individual buildings. The consented development includes residential units, commercial office space, flexible community space, affordable business units, retail, ancillary basement parking, energy centre, off-street ground floor service bay, highway works, new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, landscaping and a central public open space.

A number of changes in circumstances since these events have necessitated further consideration of the NWCS site’s development potential. The following changes are most pertinent:

- The NWCS Planning Brief was prepared prior to the final adoption of the WCC CS and the latest (2011) version of the London Plan;
- Planning Permission was granted for a revised development scheme on Merchant Square (immediately east of Site 2; reference 10/09756/FULL approved August 2011) and at Dudley House (west of Site 1; reference 11/06435/COFUL approved 30 March 2012);
- Affordable housing grant funding was removed with affordable rent and revised affordable quotas for the POA introduced; and
- The Mayor’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced.

In light of these changes, and following acquisition of Site 2 by the Applicant, a revised masterplan for the redevelopment proposals was prepared. This has been supplemented by a revised planning strategy, prepared by the Applicant’s Planning consultant in consultation with WCC and based and the phased submission of full planning applications for two distinct phases ('Site 1' and 'Site 2’). As such, a detailed planning application for Site 1 was submitted to WCC in November 2012.

3.2 Relevant Planning Policy

Planning policy of relevance to the Proposed Development operates at three levels:

- At national level, the National Planning Policy is set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which came into force on 27th March 2012;
- At regional level, the Greater London Authority’s (GLA’s) London Plan which was published in July 2011 and provides strategic planning guidance. In addition, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) notes, as well as the Alterations to the London Plan, which ensure conformity with the NPPF; and
At local level, the adopted development plan for WCC which comprises the Core Strategy (CS) and the 2007 saved policies of WCC’s Unitary Development Plan (UDP). It is noted that WCC has reviewed and revised its adopted CS to ensure consistency with the NPPF and to take account of the London Plan and other matters. These revisions have been recommended for adoption as the ‘Westminster City Plan: Strategic Policies’ on 13th November 2013. Given the advanced stage of preparation, the policies in this Plan would be afforded considerable weight for the purposes of considering planning applications.

WCC has confirmed that no real weight should be given to emerging policies in the City Management Plan (CM) revisions, as they are not sufficiently advanced.

In addition to the above, there is a range of local planning guidance that would be used to help determine the Application. Of particular relevance to the Proposed Development is the NWCS Planning Brief (2010).

As reported in the ES, the Proposed Development has evolved in accordance with these adopted and emerging development plan policies, and other relevant guidance. The development proposals have sought to make efficient use of previously developed land by maximising the redevelopment potential of Site 2 whilst delivering a raft of benefits to the Borough including much sought after residential accommodation, new high quality public open space and high quality architectural and urban design.

It is important to note that the aim of the EIA is not to assess the Proposed Development’s compliance/performance against planning policy as this is considered within the Planning Statement that accompanies the Application. Instead reference is made to national, regional and local policy to inform the scope of the assessment, the assessment methodologies applied and the existence of any sensitive receptors to be considered.
4 Site Description

4.1 Site Location and Context

As shown in Figure 1, Site 2 is located within Paddington in the CoW (W2) and centred on National Grid Reference (NGR) 526740, 181630.

![Site Location](image)

Figure 1: Site Location

More specifically, Site 2 is located along the northern boundary of the Paddington Opportunity Area (‘POA’) which has been identified in the London Plan and in WCC’s CS as one of the CoW’s most significant opportunities for large-scale regeneration.

As shown in Figure 2, the prevailing existing land use surrounding Site 2 are typical of the urban area around Paddington, comprising a combination of residential, commercial, transport, health related and community uses. Areas of recent and on-going redevelopment comprise contemporary buildings over ten storeys in height, whereas traditional residential and retail uses range from 3 - 4 storeys.
Further details of the surrounding land uses are provided in Table 1.

**Table 1: Site 2 Context and Existing Surrounding Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Aspect/Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>A404 Harrow Road and A40 Westway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beyond the road infrastructure, lies Paddington Green, St Mary's Church, residential, leisure and educational uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and South-East</td>
<td>North Wharf Road, with residential and commercial development currently under construction ('Merchant Square') to the east and south-east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beyond Merchant Square, lies the Hilton London Metropole Hotel, retail and commercial land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>North Wharf Road, with commercial properties including the Waterside (M&amp;S Head Office), Point and Carmine buildings to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beyond the commercial properties lies the Paddington Basin arm of the Grand Union Canal, retail, residential and NHS uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>North Wharf Gardens Site 1 with games courts, single storey portakabin style café and temporary car wash with valet service (Blocks G and H).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beyond Site 1 are Hermitage Street, a number of residential properties (including Paddington Walk, Montgomery House and Dudley House), commercial buildings and The Dudley Arms public house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further beyond and south-west is Paddington mainline and underground stations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Site Description

As described in Table 1, Site 2’s immediate boundaries are defined by:

- A404 Harrow Road to the north;
- North Wharf Road to the east and south; and
- North Wharf Gardens Site 1 to the west.

Site 2 occupies an area of 1.27 hectares (ha) and is roughly rectangular in shape, as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Site 2 Redline Boundary

Site 2 is situated on land that is generally flat, with the existing ground level at approximately 31 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and the northern boundary slightly raised at approximately 31.6 m AOD.

Site 2 was previously in educational use associated with the NWCS. Existing on-site development comprises four buildings set within hard standing and landscaped surrounds. Summary details of these buildings and their previous uses are provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Previous Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Eastern part of Site</td>
<td>Two storeys, Concrete, masonry and proprietary steel window cladding system</td>
<td>A mix of classrooms and studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Central part of Site</td>
<td>Seven storeys, Concrete, masonry and proprietary steel window cladding system</td>
<td>A mix of classrooms and studios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Site 2 Existing Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Previous Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Southern part of Site</td>
<td>• One storey&lt;br&gt;• Steel frame building with a mono-pitch roof with building board cladding</td>
<td>A server room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Western part of Site</td>
<td>• One storey&lt;br&gt;• Steel frame, masonry and light-weight GRP cladding panels</td>
<td>Gym and sport activities with changing facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are currently two vehicular access points to Site 2 as follows:

- from Hermitage Street, on the eastern boundary of Site 2, and via Site 1; and
- from North Wharf Road along the southern boundary.

A number of interim uses currently occupy some of the existing buildings and further uses are likely to be introduced ahead of the redevelopment of Site 2 to ensure that the buildings remain in active use and do not fall into a state of disrepair. These uses are subject to short term lease agreements, such that occupants would vacate buildings upon confirmation that Site 2 development works are due to commence.

A number of photographs of the existing Site 2 and its immediate surroundings are shown in Figure 4.

4.3 Site Sensitivity

A review of historical mapping confirms that Site 2 has previously been occupied by residential properties and a factory (unknown nature) from at least the 1860s until 1950s. By the late 1950s Site 2 had been redeveloped as a school.

The underlying geology of Site 2 comprises of man-made deposits (Made Ground), which is underlain by sandy clays (Langley Silt Formation) and sandy gravel (Lynch Hill Gravel). These in turn, are underlain by layers of fine, sandy clay (London Clay); clay with silt, sand, gravel and sandstones (Lambeth Group Clay); and fine-grained sands (Thanet Sands).

Site 2 does not lie within an area protected for groundwater; however there are 24 groundwater abstractions within 2 km of Site 2; the closest of which is located approximately 340 m south-west.

There are no surface water features on Site 2. The River Thames is the closest main surface river and is located approximately 4 km to the south of Site 2. The nearest surface water feature to Site 2 is the Paddington Basin (a branch of the Grand Union Canal), which is located approximately 70 m to the south of the Site 2 at its closest point.

Site 2 is located within the Environment Agency’s classified Flood Zone 1, which means there is a low (0.1 %) probability of flooding.

On-site habitats comprise primarily of buildings and hardstanding; however there are several small areas of vegetation, including mature and semi-mature broadleaved and coniferous trees; amenity grassland; poor semi-improved grassland; bare earth; and introduced shrub. These habitats are common and widespread in urban environments and are considered to be of ecological value at site level only.
Figure 4: Existing Site 2 Photographs
An inspection of on-site buildings for bats identified a bat roost in Block A on the eastern part of Site 2 in 2010; however the bat roost was not in use during subsequent inspections in 2012. Owing to the findings of the surveys and the limited opportunities which Block A provides for roosting bats, Block A is considered to be of value to bats at site-level only.

Though some of the buildings and trees on-site are considered to have a potential to support a small number of common nesting birds species, the surrounding area is densely developed with few nesting opportunities. The buildings and habitats are considered to lack sufficient resources to support nesting and foraging black redstarts.

Site 2 has a mixed population of trees varying from relatively small specimens like Rowan to large London Planes which line Site 2’s southern boundary with North Wharf Road, and Limes which form a row along the western edge of the old playground. A specialist tree survey of Site 2 identified 41 trees and 1 hedge, 19 of which were classified as trees of high quality, 9 trees of moderate quality, 13 trees of low quality and 1 tree considered to be of such low quality that it would be suitable for removal.

Site 2 is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations. However, a London Canals Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC) is located 70 m to the south of Site 2 at the Paddington Basin. St Mary’s Gardens and Paddington Green Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation (SBINC) (Grade II) is also located 100 m to the north of Site 2. The latter is separated from Site 2 by the A404 and A40. Furthermore, Hyde Park and Regents Park are designated as SMINCs at 1.7 km north-east and 1 km south of Site 2 respectively.

Site 2 is not located within a Conservation Area (CA); although a number of CAs surrounds Site 2, including Paddington Green CA to the north, Bayswater CA to the south-east and Maida Vale CA to the north-west.

None of the buildings on-site are listed; however the Grade II* listed St Mary’s Church is located 130 m north of Site 2, immediately north of the A404 Harrow Road / A40 Westway. The Church also includes three Grade II listed tombs (to the Chandless, Thrupp and Wood families) and a Grade II listed statue. Other listed buildings within 250 m of Site 2 include:

- a pair of Grade II listed K6 telephone kiosks;
- the Grade II listed St Mary’s Hospital and Clarence Memorial Wing;
- the Grade II listed buildings at 17 and 18 Paddington Green (a pair of 4-storey 1800s houses);
- the Grade II listed buildings at Paddington Green Children’s Hospital; and
- The Grade I listed Paddington Station which has been recommended for UNESCO World Heritage status.

Site 2 is not located within an area with known potential for archaeological remains (an Area of Special Archaeological Priority (ASAP)); however an ASAP associated with Paddington and Lillestone villages lies directly north of A404 Harrow Road and A40 Westway around Paddington Green. This designation exists on the basis of the possibility for remains from the period between approximately 900 AD and 1400 AD (Saxon, Anglo-Saxon and Medieval remains).

Site 2 would appear within the one of the protected views of the London View Management Framework (LVMF) from Primrose Hill (4A).
Site 2’s public transport accessibility is rated as ‘Excellent’, with the following public transport facilities available to Site 2:

- Paddington Railway Station and Underground station is located 200 m to the south-west;
- Edgware Road underground station is located 250 m to the north-east;
- Bus stops located on Bishops Bridge, Harrow Road and Edgware Road;
- Cycle routes along Praed Street, Craven Road and London Street to the south of Site 2, and Penfold Street and Warwick Avenue to the north. Currently there are no London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+) links within the vicinity of Site 2; and
- Good pedestrian facilities with footways bordering all of the surrounding and nearby roads.

The Paddington and Edgware Road stations give access to the District, Circle, Bakerloo and Hammersmith & City London underground lines, the Heathrow Express and rail links to the west and south-west, as well as the forthcoming Crossrail line.

Site 2 is also surrounded by a comprehensive highway network comprising the A40 Westway which is elevated above the A404 Harrow Road along the northern boundary of Site 2. North Wharf Road extends to the east and south of Site 2, and is mainly used by traffic accessing the commercial buildings along the road. Hermitage Street, which is located beyond Site 1, is a one-way road in the southbound direction extending between A404 Harrow Road and North Wharf Road.

Site 2 is located within an area designated for its poor air quality (Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)) due to high traffic flows which give rise to concentrations of pollutants (comprising nitrogen dioxide (NO\textsubscript{2}) and fine particles (PM\textsubscript{10})) which exceed national air quality targets.

Sources of noise in proximity to Site 2 comprise primarily of road traffic on A404 Harrow Road and A40 Westway to the north of Site 2 with further contributions from the ongoing construction of the Merchant Square development to the east of Site 2 and operation of building services plant associated with nearby commercial buildings to the south.

Site 2 lies within the Hyde Park ward of Westminster, and within the confines of the POA. Analysis shows that social and economic conditions and the health of CoW residents compare well to London and national averages. However, there are pockets of deprivation in the CoW which do not reflect these average figures and show broad underlying social and health inequalities.

There are a wide range of healthcare and education facilities within 1 km of Site 2. However, there is limited access to open space in areas immediately surrounding Site 2 due to the severance\textsuperscript{1} created by the A40 Westway. In light of the open space provision within CoW, Site 2 is considered to be located within an area of local park deficiency.

\textsuperscript{1} The perceived divisions that can occur within a community when it becomes separated by a traffic route.
4.4 Receptors

The immediate surroundings of Site 2 include the buildings, roads, uses within buildings and open areas, together with the people who reside in, access and use them, would be most at risk of being exposed to potential impacts and effects as a result of the Proposed Development.

Typically, occupants of residential properties, cultural and recreational facilities (such as children’s play equipment, seats and eating areas) and medical or health facilities are more sensitive than the occupants of commercial properties. Commercial occupants spend the majority of their time inside and they generally do not have responsibility for the maintenance and cleaning of the exterior, which is usually the responsibility of an off-site agent.

Based on the above, land uses and receptors that would be sensitive to potential environmental impacts on account of the Proposed Development, as identified in the ES, would be as follows:

- Existing residents surrounding Site 2, in particular residents of Paddington Walk and Montgomery House (in Hermitage Street), Dudley House (in North Wharf Road), and residential uses beyond Paddington Green and the A40;
- Existing community uses in close proximity to Site 2, in particular the Church of St Mary located 70 m north of Site 2, Paddington Green located 70 m north of Site 2 and St Mary’s Hospital located 100 m south of Site 2;
- Future residential occupiers of the Proposed Development;
- Future residential occupiers of consented or reasonably foreseeable schemes in the immediate surroundings;
- The settings of above ground heritage assets such as Grade II* listed St Mary’s Church and Grade I listed Paddington Station;
- The settings of surrounding CAs;
- Short, medium and long distance views to and from Site 2;
- Archaeological remains, if present on Site 2;
- On-site habitats and habitats at designated sites within 100 m of the Site;
- Protected species (such as breeding birds and bats) on-site and at designated sites within 100 m of Site 2;
- Water resources, in particular ground water and public potable water supplies;
- Transport infrastructure;
- Pedestrians and road users of the surrounding roads and footpaths; and
- Local air quality.

Of lesser sensitivity would be:

- Existing commercial occupants in close proximity to Site 2, in particular the Dudley Arms Public House, Hilton London Metropole Hotel, Waterside, Point and Carmine Buildings; and
- Future commercial occupiers of the Proposed Development, as well as consented or reasonably foreseeable schemes in the immediate surroundings.
5 Design Evolution and Alternatives

In accordance with EIA Regulations and guidance, ES Volume 2 includes a discussion of the alternative development options and various constraints and opportunities which influenced the ultimate design of the Proposed Development.

5.1 Development Objectives and Design Principles

The development objectives which guided the development proposals can be summarised as follows:

- Provide a massing that respects and integrates with the adjacent built and permitted developments;
- Offer a development of the very highest standards of sustainable and inclusive urban design and architectural quality;
- Offer landscaping and high quality open space carefully integrated with the buildings and pedestrian routes, including the retention of important mature trees;
- Provide a predominantly residential scheme with complementary uses such as a free school, social and community uses;
- Offer an energy efficient and sustainable development that can become part of a wider energy network within the Paddington Area;
- Create a development accessible to all;
- Offer affordable housing of comparable standards to market housing in terms of design, spatial layout and environmental quality; and
- Contain activities including parking and servicing underground to ensure minimum disturbance to occupiers and users of the public realm above.

5.2 Development Considerations

Development considerations for Site 2 are set out in the national, regional and local planning policy and guidance documents discussed in Chapter 3 of the NTS.

Of particular relevance was the NWCS Planning Brief which sets out a number of requirements and in particular that the Proposed Development should not be higher than 50 m (including plant) and that any element which exceeded this height would need to be justified as a visual termination or punctuation to the overall mass and form of development.

5.3 ‘Do Nothing’ Alternative

The ‘Do Nothing’ scenario is a hypothetical alternative conventionally considered in EIA, albeit briefly, as a basis for comparing the development proposal under consideration. Having instructed a professional team to promote the development of the Site, the Applicant did not seriously consider doing nothing with Site 2 and so strictly it is not an “alternative” as contemplated by the EIA Regulations. It is more relevant as establishing a baseline environmental situation, in which context it is used in this ES, but for completeness, it is also considered briefly as if it were an alternative to the Proposed Development.

The principle of redevelopment at Site 2 has been established by virtue of local policy, in particular by the NWCS Adopted Planning Brief SPD and the WCC CS, as well as the extant consent for the wider NWCS site.
In the event that the Proposed Development does not go ahead, Site 2 would remain in its current state until such time as a similar alternative proposal that is confirmed to be economically viable, can be implemented. A number of adverse effects and lost opportunities would result and Site 2’s regeneration potential would not be maximised contrary to the requirements of NPPF.

5.4 Site and Land Use Alternatives

The Applicant did not consider alternative sites for the following reasons:

- Site 2 is owned by Amwaj Property Ltd, and therefore the Applicant did not consider alternative sites which are the property of a third party;
- Site 2 is specifically identified in WCC’s CS as part of strategic site which would contribute to the regeneration of the POA;
- the Applicant is seeking to optimise Site 2’s potential in line with the NPPF; and
- Site 2 provides a key development opportunity to contribute to the on-going regeneration of the area and to provide greater and more varied housing, employment and community opportunities.

The proposed land uses were informed by prevailing policy and are therefore substantially in accordance with the WCC CS and the NWCS Planning Brief SPD. In response to the NWCS Planning Brief SPD, and to reflect the permitted scheme for the entire NWCS site together with the permitted Site 1 proposals, the Applicant focused from the outset on a residential-led mixed use scheme for Site 2, supported by complimentary community and employment space.

5.5 Layouts and Built Form Alternatives

Whilst the Proposed Development has been developed as a stand-alone scheme, it has also been conceived as part of a wider masterplan including the rest of the NWCS site (Site 1).

An extensive selection of alternative site layout; building heights and massing; façade and balcony options were considered throughout the design evolution process of the Proposed Development. The alternatives were explored in the context of Site 2 environmental constraints and opportunities, as well as in consultation with WCC, the GLA and the local community.

The iterative nature of the EIA assisted in the adoption of key considerations (i.e. daylight, sunlight and overshadowing; townscape, heritage and visual; noise; air quality; wind), the identification of potential environmental impacts and consequently the further refinement of scheme into its current form.

The preferred alternative for the Site evolved over an extensive period of time and represents the most appropriate response to all issues that were raised during the pre-application process.

By way of an example, at least five layout alternatives were considered during the process, areas shown in Figure 5. Option 4 was selected as the preferred option for further exploration in relation to building heights and massing.
Figure 5: Site Layout Options
The resulting massing ensures that the majority of the buildings fall below the 50 m building height level identified in the NWCS Planning Brief, with the exception of some elements that exceed this height as punctuations to the overall massing of the scheme.

The main characteristics of the preferred option are:

- improved permeability and accessibility with pedestrian links through Site 2 providing a connection between Paddington Green and Paddington Basin;
- integration of Site 2 with the wider urban context with improved public realm and animated ground floor uses;
- definition and articulation of edges and spaces by means of buildings and landscape;
- high quality architectural, amenity and landscape design; and
- appropriate building height and innovative massing.

The key environmental advantages of the preferred option are:

- good levels of daylight and sunlight to residential accommodation, amenity spaces and public realm;
- appropriate microclimate (wind conditions) within amenity spaces;
- protection of residential uses from sources of noise and poor air quality;
- generous ground level public open space and amenity space;
- balcony amenity space which meets or exceeds policy requirements;
- retention of valuable existing trees;
- biodiversity enhancements within the landscaping proposals; and
- an energy efficient and sustainable development that can become part of a wider energy network within the Paddington Area.

The preferred option therefore:

- meets the Applicant's development objectives;
- responds to the requirements of the NWCS Planning Brief;
- responds to existing Site 2 conditions and environmental constraints; and
- responds to the comments received during the consultation process, particularly in relation to the maximum height of the buildings.

---

2. The extent to which an environment allows people a variety of access routes through it.
6 Proposed Development

The Proposed Development would comprise the demolition of all existing buildings and structures, and the construction of two buildings, hereinafter referred to as the ‘Eastern Block’ and ‘Western Block’, to provide a mixed-use scheme comprising residential, office, retail, hotel, serviced apartments and flexible community and affordable business space.

The description of the Proposed Development as stated on the Application form is:

“Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment comprising erection of buildings of between 6 and 20 storeys in height to provide 335 residential units (Class C3), a hotel and serviced apartments (Class C1), affordable business (Class B1), gym (Class D2), retail (A1/A3) and a primary school (D1), with associated landscaping and open space, highways works, off street ground floor service bay and basement comprising car, cycle and motorcycle parking and ancillary servicing space.”

6.1 Proposed Land Uses

The quantum of each land use within the Proposed Development is set out in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type and Use Class</th>
<th>Number of Units/Rooms</th>
<th>GEA (m²)</th>
<th>GIA (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (C3)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>42,642</td>
<td>39,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (A1/A3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Business (B1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (B1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (C1)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>17,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serviced Apartments (C1)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>5,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym (D2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Use (D1/D2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,745</td>
<td>2,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>72,315</td>
<td>67,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Excl. ancillary and basement levels

The Proposed Development would deliver 335 residential units of which 64 units (19 %) would comprise affordable housing (intermediate and social rented). The unit and tenure mix as proposed, is set out in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Proposed Development would comprise the following key components:

- A Western Block which would curve from the north-western corner of Site 2 (where it would border Site 1) to the south and would comprise Buildings A-D;
- An Eastern Block which would be located in the north-eastern corner of Site 2 (at the junction of North Wharf Road and Harrow Road) and would comprise Buildings E and G; and
- A landscaped public open space, which would be located south-west of the Western Block, located between North Wharf Road to the south and Site 1 to the west.

A number of pedestrian circulation routes would be delivered to enhance permeability and accessibility across Site 2, in particular a diagonal north-west to south-east route between the Western and Eastern Blocks, connecting Harrow Road and North Wharf Road.

A basement arranged over two levels (Sub-Basement and Basement Level) would cover the entire extent of Site 2, with the exception of the root protection zone of the London Plane trees which are proposed to be retained along the southern boundary. The basement would be accessed via a ramp along North Wharf Road. Access to the basement is also proposed along the Hermitage Street frontage of Site 1 via a vehicle ramp and through the Site 1 basement. It is proposed that the Site 1 and Site 2 basements would be connected upon completion.

A selection of floor plans for the Proposed Development is provided in Figures 6 - 10. These indicate that:

- non-residential uses, including retail and commercial units as well as the proposed gym would typically be provided at Ground Level and Level 01;
- residential uses would be provided within the Western Block at Level 02 and above, with all affordable units located in Building A;
- the proposed hotel would be located at the north-eastern extent of the Eastern Block from Sub-Basement Level to Level 19;
- the proposed primary school (catering from Reception to Year 6) would be located at the southern extent of the Eastern Block from Sub-Basement Level to Level 05; and
- the proposed serviced apartments would be located above the primary school from Level 06 to Level 19.

A service yard would be located at Ground Level in the north-western extent of the Eastern Block and would service the whole Site 2.

Private amenity space for residential occupants would be provided in the form of balconies and roof terraces. Balconies would only be provided to south-facing facades, whilst winter gardens would be provided to north-facing facades. In addition the hotel would provide a rooftop terrace incorporating a bar/restaurant for the use of guests.

Plant, photovoltaic (PV)\(^3\) panels and green/brown roofs would be located at roof level.

---

\(^3\) A method of generating electrical power by converting solar radiation into direct current electricity.
Figure 6: Proposed Development Sub-Basement Floor Plan
Figure 7: Proposed Development Ground Level Floor Plan
Figure 8: Proposed Development Level 01 Floor Plan
Figure 9: Proposed Development Level 05 Floor Plan
Figure 10: Proposed Development Level 12 Floor Plan
6.2 Building Form and Height

The scale of the Proposed Development seeks to respond to its surrounding context and maximise the regeneration potential of Site 2, whilst respecting key receptors and views. The Proposed Development is for two Blocks irregular in shape with heights ranging from 6 to 20 storeys, as outlined in Table 5 and shown in Figures 11 - 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>No. of Storeys*</th>
<th>Max. Building Height (m AGL**)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A-D****</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building E</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>79.535 - 95.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building G</td>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>50.810 - 95.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
* Includes ground level, excludes roof plant
** Above Ground Level
*** Above Ordnance Datum
**** The base building which is punctuated by four taller towers

6.3 Façade Detail

Although Site 2 is a standalone development, it has also been considered as part of the wider NWCS masterplan. Accordingly, it is proposed that the material palette used at the adjacent Site 1 would be extended to Site 2.

The material palette for the Site 2 Blocks would include limestone, brick, anodized/painted metal and curtain wall cladding systems. These materials have been specified to contrast with the finish at Ground Floor Level, aiding wayfinding and enabling people with visual impairments to identify building boundaries.

Figure 14 provides an example of the façade detail for Building C.
Figure 11: Proposed Development Building B Sections
Figure 12: Proposed Development Building C Sections
Figure 13: Proposed Development Buildings E and G Sections
Figure 14: Building C Façade Detail
6.4 Landscaping and Public Realm

Particular emphasis has been placed on the delivery of high quality landscape and public realm within the Proposed Development. There is currently no landscaping or public realm on-site or within the immediate surroundings. The landscape strategy aims to deliver an attractive and accessible urban realm that connects Site 2 with the wider Paddington Basin community whilst also providing biodiversity enhancement.

As shown in Figure 15, a number of landscaped amenity areas and public realm would be delivered at Ground Level. The principal Ground Level spaces within the Proposed Development would be as follows:

- Big Tree Street, comprising a diagonal pedestrian route connecting North Wharf Road and Harrow Road;
- North Wharf Road, comprising improved streetscape; and
- Public Open Space, comprising generous landscaped open space with raised landforms to offer opportunities for seating and play.

![Landscape Masterplan](image)

**Figure 15: Landscape Masterplan**

Soft landscaping would predominantly comprise native plant species and/or plants with wildlife value. The mix of planting would also be designed to provide seasonal and visual interest, and to improve foraging and nesting opportunities for invertebrates, bird and bats.

In total the following landscaping and biodiversity improvements would be delivered:

- 90 m² water features;
- 165 m² of recessed and raised planters;
• 245 m² of Ornamental planting;
• 340 m² of Gravel area;
• 500 m² brown roof;
• 675 m² green roof;
• 2,800 m² amenity grassland;
• 3,700 m² hard landscaping (excluding drop-off and lay-by areas); and
• 150 new trees (comprising 70 trees at ground level and 80 trees on roof terraces).

The Proposed Development would deliver 1,930 m² of dedicated children and young person’s play space. However, all of the open space and amenity space throughout the Proposed Development, and in particular the proposed landforms, would provide informal play and recreational opportunities for children and young people.

Private amenity space for residential occupants would be provided in the form of balconies and roof terraces. Balconies would only be provided to south-facing facades, whilst winter gardens would be provided to north-facing facades. In addition the hotel would provide a rooftop terrace incorporating a bar/restaurant for the use of guests.

6.5 Access, Car Parking and Cycle Arrangements

As indicated earlier, a diagonal north-west to south-east route would be delivered along the north-eastern edge of the Western Block of Site 2 between North Wharf Road and Harrow Road. This route would enhance movement through Site 2 and provide opportunities for further connections to Paddington Green in the north, as well as Paddington Basin and Praed Street in the south.

Direct and step free pedestrian access be provided throughout. In addition all footpaths on Harrow Road and North Wharf Road would be upgraded.

Vehicles would access Site 2 via the basement by means of ramps leading off from North Wharf Road, as well as Hermitage Street and via the Site 1 basement area. Emergency access would be via North Wharf Road.

All of the servicing for the Proposed Development would take place at basement levels. A service yard is also proposed at the Ground Floor Level of the Eastern Block. Vehicular access to this yard would be via an existing (but disused) access from Harrow Road.

To encourage cycling by both residents and visitors to the Proposed Development, 598 cycle parking spaces would be delivered. A London Cycle Hire Station would also be provided as part of the completed Proposed Development, providing 25 docking spaces at the eastern site of the Proposed Development that would be available to users of the Proposed Development and the wider local area.

A total of 217 on-site car parking spaces would be delivered within the Proposed Development as a whole. Parking allocation on-site would be as follows:

• 203 residential car parking spaces at basement level;
• 11 disabled car parking spaces for the hotel and serviced apartments;
• one disabled space for the commercial uses; and
• two car club spaces.

In addition, a new bus stand facility with associated driver welfare facilities would be provided on North Wharf Road.
6.6 Servicing and Waste Management

As mentioned above an off-street servicing yard would be provided at the Eastern Block which would cater for the servicing and waste collection needs of all land uses within the Proposed Development.

A Servicing and Waste Management Strategy has been prepared for the Proposed Development. The document identifies approximate weekly operational waste arisings for the Proposed Development, as well as details of storage arrangements. A Delivery and Servicing Management Plan would also be prepared and agreed with WCC prior to occupation of the Proposed Development.

Waste arising from residential, commercial, hotel and serviced apartments and school land uses would be stored within dedicated waste stores within the basement (with the exception of the retail units where dedicated waste stores would be located in each unit) and presented in the waste presentation area located within the service area on waste collection days.

An Operational Management Plan would be prepared and would establish the essential management and operating systems and the required performance standards for the services that would be provided at the Proposed Development.

6.7 Resource Use, Emissions, Residues and Sustainability

A standalone Energy Strategy has been prepared for the Proposed Development and accompanies the Application. The Energy Strategy for the Proposed Development has been developed in line with best practice guidance to reduce the energy consumption and Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) emissions of the development.

The Proposed Development aims to achieve an 'Excellent' and a 'Very Good' Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating for the office space and retail space respectively. It also aims to achieve a Level 4 rating under the Code for Sustainable Homes for the residential units.

Low carbon technology, energy-efficient equipment, and good design would be incorporated into the scheme. This would include use of a gas-fired Combined Heat and Power (CHP) unit located on Site 1 and incorporation of 130 m² PV panels on Site 2. On this basis, a reduction of around 39.4 % CO₂ emissions would be delivered, which represents an annual saving of approximately 997 tonnes of CO₂.

Water minimisation measures for the Proposed Development would comprise the adoption of a water consumption rate of less than or equal to 105 litres/person/day. Water efficient appliances in the residential units would be fitted, and external rainwater collection and recycling systems would be provided to irrigate the planted areas.

Surface water runoff from the Proposed Development would be attenuated through the provision of green roofs and within the central public open space. Four attenuation tanks with a combined attenuation capacity of 610 m³ would also be provided with the Basement Level to restrict surface water discharge from Site 2. The provision of these measures would reduce surface water runoff by 50 % when compared to the existing rate.

The Proposed Development is anticipated to generate approximately 219,707 litres of household and commercial waste volumes per week. As noted above, adequate dedicated storage space for non-recyclable and recyclable waste would be provided within each building and information packs provided to occupants to encourage recycling.
7 Demolition and Construction Environmental Management

The Proposed Development’s indicative development programme is based on the assumption that development works would commence early in 2015. For the purpose of the EIA, the development works are anticipated to be undertaken over a 42-48 month period, with completion targeted for late 2018.

Demolition and construction works have the potential to cause temporary environmental impacts, from noise, emissions to air, traffic movements, wastes and surface water runoff. Detailed demolition and construction method statements and specifications have not yet been prepared for the Proposed Development and construction contractors not yet appointed. However, the ES has established the potential broad environmental impacts associated with the works and a framework has been developed in Chapter 5 of ES Volume 2 for the management of these impacts to ensure that no significant environmental effects arise.

The framework would form the basis for a Demolition Method Statement (DMS) and a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be implemented during demolition and construction works. It is anticipated that the implementation of the DMS and CEMP would be secured by means of an appropriately worded planning condition.

The CEMP will be prepared in accordance with standard best practice and regulatory requirements, as well as guidance within the WCC Code of Construction Practise (CoCP). As such it will include a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), as well as a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP).

More specifically, the CEMP would define relevant policies, legislative requirements, thresholds/limits, procedures, roles and responsibilities for the implementation of environmental and management controls throughout the duration of the works. The CEMP would be discussed and agreed with WCC in advance of works commencing on-site.
8 Summary of Potential Impacts

The following sections outlines the methodologies used, baseline conditions, predicted effects and proposed mitigation measures identified in the technical assessments.

8.1 Socio Economics

The socio economic assessment undertaken for the Proposed Development focused on the following issues:

- Population;
- Ethnicity
- Education and Skills;
- Business and the Economy;
- Employment and Economic Activity;
- Housing;
- Community Facilities;
- Leisure, Culture and Recreation.
- Deprivation:
- Crime and Community Safety; and
- Wellbeing.

The assessment used a range of nationally recognised research and survey information to establish a baseline profile of the local, borough and regional economy and community, with the potential impacts of the Proposed Development assessed using standard industry ratios, data, assumptions and professional judgement.

Site 2 is located in Hyde Park Ward. There are approximately 12,400 residents in the Hyde Park Ward and approximately 219,400 residents in the CoW.

The Hyde Park Ward is characterised by a relatively young, multicultural and well qualified population.

Although the rate of economic activity amongst working age residents (66 %) is slightly lower than comparator areas (68 % across CoW and 72 % across London), rates of unemployment and income-related benefits are also relatively low. Residents of Hyde Park Ward are predominantly employed in the financial and professional, scientific and technical sectors (37 %).

Approximately 55 % of the residents of Hyde Park Ward report themselves to be of White British ethnicity. Asian/Asian British ethnic backgrounds constitute 17 % of the population; non-British White ethnicities make up 26 % of the population; and Arab ethnic groups make up 14 %.

Approximately a third of all jobs in Hyde Park Ward are in the professional, technical and scientific sectors; with management consultancy, activities of head offices, hotels and hospital activities being amongst the most significant local employment sectors.

Houses within Hyde Park Ward are predominantly flats and predominantly in the private rented sector.

There are nine primary schools within 1 km of Site 2, the nearest of which is Paddington Green Primary School. These schools have a combined surplus of 115 places or 4 % of total
capacity. There are ten secondary schools within CoW, within which there are currently a surplus capacity of 337 places, or 4% of capacity across all secondary schools in the CoW.

This is a wide range of healthcare facilities within 1 km of Site 2, including ten General Practitioner (GP) surgeries which are all currently accepting new patients, as well as dentists, pharmacies, opticians and St Mary’s Hospital.

There is limited access to open space in areas immediately surrounding Site 2. Although Paddington Green is located just to the north, the A40 Westway creates significant severance and limits access to it, especially for children. In light of the open space provision within CoW, Site 2 is considered to be located within an area of local park deficiency. Nonetheless, Hyde Park, Kensington Gardens and Regent’s Park are all located within 20-25 minutes’ walk of Site 2.

Although parts of northern CoW are deprived, Site 2 itself is not amongst the most deprived neighbourhoods in England.

Site 2 is not located within an area in the top 10% or 20% for crime deprivation; however Hyde Park Ward has comparatively high incidences of most notifiable offences.

The Proposed Development would act as a catalyst to the regeneration of Site 2 and the immediate surroundings. In particular it would:

- generate 162 permanent construction jobs, which, in the context of the size and mobility of the construction workforce would have a temporary and Negligible Beneficial residual effect at a Regional level.
- deliver 335 new residential units would represent 33% of the POA housing target for the Plan period which would result in a permanent Moderate Beneficial effect at the local level, Minor Beneficial residual effect at a Borough level and a Negligible Beneficial residual effect at all other spatial levels.
- deliver an on-site primary school which would provide in excess of the number of school places that would be required to accommodate the demand of the Proposed Development and would result in a permanent Major Beneficial residual effect at local level and a Moderate Beneficial residual effect at Borough level with respect to primary education.
- introduce a new residential population at Site 2 (631 people) which would create demand for approximately the equivalent of one third of a full time GP. The Applicant would make any necessary provisions by means of Section 106 Contributions, ensuring that the residual effect would be Neutral at all spatial levels. In terms of increased demand for secondary school places and leisure facilities, the new population would have a Neutral residual effect in the context of local surplus;
- deliver a gym on-site which would have a Minor Beneficial residual effect with regard to leisure provision at a local level a Negligible Beneficial effect at all other spatial levels;
- deliver playspace on-site which would meet the needs for all the children expected to be living on-site and would therefore result in a Moderate Beneficial residual effect at a local level and a Negligible Beneficial residual effect at all other spatial levels;
- deliver publically accessible open space on-site and an attractive urban realm that connects Site 2 with the wider Paddington Basin community which would have a Minor to Moderate Beneficial residual effect at a local level and a Negligible Beneficial residual effect at all other spatial levels;
increase local expenditure as a result of the residents, employees and hotel visitors, would have a permanent Minor to Moderate Beneficial residual effect at local level and a Negligible Beneficial residual effect at all other spatial levels;

- deliver affordable office space, retail space, a hotel, serviced apartments, a school and flexible, D1/D2 community space, all of which would create employment. Based on standard employment densities, this space would create approximately 308 jobs. In the context of the local economy, this would have a permanent Minor Beneficial residual effect at a local level and a Negligible Beneficial residual effect at all other spatial levels;

- have a Negligible Beneficial residual effect in respect to equalities at all spatial levels.
  The Proposed Development would be built to modern design standards taking into account accessibility regulations, thus increasing the provision of accessible built open space. The types of jobs created would include those that are particularly suitable for groups of people with protected characteristics and those otherwise disadvantaged in accessing employment such as the young, women (including those with dependent children), and ethnic minorities;

- have a Minor Beneficial residual effect at a local level, and a Neutral residual effect at all other levels in respect to crime and safety – and perceptions of crime. Features inherent in the public realm and building design would help to ensure that security is maximised and opportunities for crime are minimised;

- have a Minor Beneficial residual effect on well-being at all spatial levels as a result of the introduction of new homes into the local area, in addition to a range of commercial and community uses which would enhance well-being for current and future residents; and

- have a Minor Beneficial residual effect at a local level and a Negligible Beneficial effect at all other spatial levels with respect to retail provision.

The Proposed Development aims to deliver a scheme that appropriately responds to the immediate Site 2 context and Borough wide needs. To this end the Proposed Development includes a number of mitigation measures inherent in the design. These include (but are not limited to) to provision of new residential units, including affordable housing units and homes meeting Lifetime Homes Standards; the provision of a 2 form of entry primary school; and the provision of on-site open space and playspace for the leisure and recreation of residents and visitors.

As such it is considered that the Proposed Development would deliver on the regeneration aspirations of WCC. None of the residual effects as reported above would be significant.

8.2 Transport and Access

This assessment considered the potential impacts of the Proposed Development and likely effects on pedestrian movement and capacity, cycle movement and capacity, public transport and the local highway network. The assessment followed best practise methodologies defined in current national, regional and local policy and guidance; where guidance is not defined, professional judgement was applied.

The background traffic and trip generation associated with the existing Site 2, pedestrian and parking capacities and available public transport services, were defined in the first instance. Trip generation associated with the Proposed Development was then calculated, followed by an assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development, taking into consideration mitigation measures integral to the Proposed Development.
Site 2 currently benefits from an excellent public transport accessibility level, with access to public transport at Paddington station (National Rail and London Underground (LU) services), Edgware Road (LU) and local bus services within 250 m of Site 2. There is also a good provision of pedestrian and cyclist facilities in the vicinity of Site 2.

In terms of pedestrian severance, the roads immediately east, south and west of Site 2 experience low traffic flow and as such perceived divisions are low. However, the A404 Harrow Road to the north of Site 2 together with the A40 Westway significantly restricts movements and creates a high level of severance and intimidation to northbound pedestrian movements.

In advance of demolition and construction, a CLP and a CEMP would be prepared for approval by WCC. These documents would set out best practice management controls and measures to minimise potential impacts on surrounding sensitive receptors.

Given the low number of construction vehicles associated with the demolition and construction of the Proposed Development and the control measures that would be implemented, the residual effects of demolition and construction traffic on pedestrian and cycle movements and capacity would be temporary **Negligible Adverse**. Construction workers would travel to and from Site 2 using public transport. However, given the level of capacity available, the residual effect of these trips would be temporary **Negligible Adverse**.

The likely increase in additional AM and PM vehicle trips on the local road network during demolition and construction works would be low. Measures within the CEMP and CLP would be applied to manage the additional traffic flows to and from Site 2. The residual effect of demolition and construction traffic would therefore be temporary **Negligible Adverse**.

Following occupation, the Proposed Development is predicted to generate an additional 808 trips on the local transport network during the AM peak hour. This would comprise:

- 79 trips by car / taxi / motorcycle;
- 261 trips on National Rail / London Underground services;
- 90 trips on bus services; and
- 378 walk / cycle trips.

It is recognised that the main pedestrian desire lines from Site 2 are anticipated to be towards public transport interchanges at Paddington and Edgware Road stations. The existing good pedestrian facilities (pathways) would be further enhanced by the Proposed Development. In addition, new high quality pedestrian links and open spaces would be introduced to enhance permeability across Site 2.

In the absence of mitigation, the additional pedestrian demand that would be generated as a result of the Proposed Development would have a negligible adverse effect on the capacity of existing pedestrian facilities. However improvements to the pedestrian facilities and capacity that would be delivered by the Proposed Development would result in a **Moderate Beneficial** effect.

In addition, the Proposed Development would result in the following residual effects in respect of pedestrians:

- **Negligible Beneficial** on pedestrian severance given that the Proposed Development would facilitate improved permeability across Site 2;
- **Minor Beneficial** on pedestrian amenity given that the Proposed Development would provide improved pathways and public open space;
8.3 Noise and Vibration

A noise and vibration assessment was undertaken to consider the likely noise and vibration effects of the Proposed Development; specifically the effects of noise and vibration generated during the demolition and construction stage, and the effects of noise during the operation/occupation of the Proposed Development on surrounding properties, as well as to establish the suitability of Site 2 for the proposed residential uses.

The assessment was based on a series of environmental noise measurements undertaken at Site 2, predicted traffic flows, noise modelling and noise predictions carried out to identify any significant environmental effects that are likely as a result of the construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

Account was taken of a number of relevant national, regional and local planning policies, as well as published standards and recognised codes of practice. The methodologies applied were agreed with WCC’s Environmental Health Department.
A detailed environmental noise survey was undertaken at Site 2 in order to establish the existing noise climate across Site 2. The outcome of this survey was used as the basis for the noise modelling exercise and predictions. The survey identified that the existing noise climate at Site 2 is dominated by road traffic noise from the immediate road network around the Site, but predominantly from the A40 Westway dual carriageway and the A404 Harrow Road.

Noise levels associated with typical demolition and construction activities were predicted at varying distances, in order to represent the construction noise effect on different receptors rather than considering one specific noise receptor. Consideration was given to existing residential receptors, as well as those that would be introduced during the course of the construction works (occupants of Site 1 and completed plots of Site 2).

The assessment identified that there would be potential for significant adverse impacts to occur if appropriate mitigation measures are not implemented. However with the adoption of target noise and vibration criteria and best practice measures (to be set out within a CEMP), it is considered that the noise and vibration impacts would be controlled sufficiently to achieve acceptable levels at the sensitive receptors.

It remains inevitable that the effect of noise from demolition and construction activities would temporarily affect existing (and future) noise sensitive residential receptors, as such the resulting temporary residual effect from demolition and construction works and HGV moments would be temporary Negligible to Moderate Adverse.

Given the distance between Site 2 and the nearest sensitive receptors there is potential for barely perceptible levels of vibration at receptor locations, during piling operations. However, the adoption of best practice measures and the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, as defined within the CEMP, would ensure that the effects of any construction related vibration is adequately monitored and controlled. The associated residual effects would therefore be temporary Minor Adverse.

Noise prediction modelling was undertaken using the proprietary noise modelling software CADNA-A® to determine the effect of external noise sources on the Proposed Development and the effect of new noise sources on existing noise sensitive receptors.

In accordance with WCC policy, noise levels in accordance with British Standards, World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines and Building Bulletin 93 (BB93) were established as the noise criteria for proposed habitable rooms, outdoor amenity space and proposed school classrooms respectively.

The impact of the existing noise climate on the Proposed Development, once completed and occupied, was determined by predicting the likely day time and night-time noise levels at the location of proposed residential façades using the noise model.

The predicted noise levels identified that the Proposed Development façades facing the A40 Harrow Road would be exposed to higher levels of noise, reducing with increased height from this source. However the implementation of identified mitigation measures comprising façade treatments (building fabric and glazing) and the provision of winter gardens would ensure that WCC’s internal noise levels are achieved, resulting in Negligible residual effects.

The natural screening offered by the built form of the Proposed Development around the proposed open space would ensure that portions (approximately 40 %) of this space would
be within the recommended WHO outdoor amenity limit during the daytime. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Negligible to Moderate Adverse**.

Similarly, the natural screening offered by the built form of the Proposed Development and the 1.2 m high glazed balustrades designed around roof terraces would ensure that significant portions (approximately 70%) would be within the recommended WHO outdoor amenity level during the daytime. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Negligible to Moderate Adverse**.

The Proposed Development would comprise balconies on southern facing façades, which would meet the WHO noise limit during the daytime for a seated receptor. For a limited number of balconies (approximately 30 out of 223) overlooking North Wharf Road, minor exceedance of the noise limit are predicted for a seated receptor. It is considered unlikely that in the urban context of Site 2, noise would significantly impact upon their intended amenity use with similar balconies appearing to be well utilised on neighbouring schemes experiencing similar levels of noise exposure. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Negligible to Minor Adverse**.

Implementation of suitable façade treatments for the proposed primary school, including typical glazing constructions would ensure indoor ambient noise levels in accordance with BB 93. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Negligible**. Similarly, suitable balustrade heights would be provided which would ensure ambient noise levels within proposed external playgrounds are in accordance with the recommendations provided in BB 93. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Negligible**.

The impact of the Proposed Development on the noise climate to existing receptors was determined by predicting the likely noise effects due to increased reflections and screening.

The natural screening offered by the built form of the Proposed Development would ensure additional screening from road traffic noise to existing receptors, including residential receptors on Hermitage Street and commercial receptors on North Wharf Road. The associated residual effects would therefore be **Minor to Major Beneficial**.

Changes in the noise climate associated with traffic flow fluctuations attributable to the Proposed Development were assessed in accordance with the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) technical guide. Predicted changes in road traffic noise levels (including those from cumulative developments) on the existing road network as a result of changes to traffic flows would have **Negligible** effects.

Target noise criteria have been set for all static and building services plant, as well as emergency plant. Providing that the rating noise levels from the building services plant do not exceed the stated noise criteria, whether through the application of noise control techniques or otherwise, the impact of noise from such sources would have **Negligible** effects on existing and future sensitive receptors.

None of the residual effects as reported above are considered to be significant.

### 8.4 Air Quality

The air quality assessment examined the implications of the Proposed Development on local air quality. It predicted and evaluated the potential impacts of the Proposed Development arising from the demolition and construction works, as well as upon completion. The assessment was carried out following the latest best practice and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Guidance and was agreed with WCC’s Environmental Health Department.
A review of monitoring data from the air quality monitoring stations most representative of air quality at Site 2, indicates that existing air quality would be expected to meet all the objectives set by the Air Quality (England) 2000 Regulations and 2002 amendments with the exception of annual mean NO$_2$. This is the most stringent of all the air quality objectives and high concentrations are commonplace in heavily trafficked urban areas and predominate throughout much of London.

The Review and Assessment of Air Quality carried out by the WCC concluded that NO$_2$ would exceed the national air quality objective throughout much of the borough. As a result, the whole borough has been declared as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

During construction and demolition works, there is the potential that emissions of dust arising from Site 2 could result in nuisance soiling at properties both on Site 2 itself and on nearby streets. Typically, impacts are restricted to within 100 m of the Site boundary. There are existing residential properties adjacent to the west of Site 1 (Paddington Walk, Montgomery House and Dudley House), plus it is assumed that Site 1 would be built out and occupied whilst construction is underway on Site 2. It is also likely that some plots of the Proposed Development would be built and occupied whilst construction continues on the latter plots. All of these properties would be susceptible to dust impacts during the demolition and construction works.

Based on criteria set out in the Institute of Air Quality Management the demolition and construction works would present a high risk of resulting in dust impacts in the absence of appropriate mitigation.

However with the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, which would be set out within the CEMP and Construction Method Statements to be agreed with WCC, it is anticipated that dust effects could be mitigated to temporary Slight Adverse significance at existing and future receptors.

The maximum number of vehicles generated during the construction works has been estimated as 40 HGVs per day. This number of vehicles would result in temporary Negligible effects on local air quality based on the criteria set out in the EPUK guidance.

Air quality impacts once the Proposed Development has been completed would arise due to emissions from the Proposed Development's traffic and energy centre (located on Site 1). In addition, as the Development would introduce new residential receptors into an area where air quality may be considered of poor quality, the potential for air quality to impact these receptors was considered.

Using the EPUK/IAQM guidance, the predictive modelling indicated that traffic and energy centre emissions associated with the Proposed Development would have a Slight Adverse effect on annual mean NO$_2$ concentrations at off-site receptors close to the Proposed Development. At receptors located further afield the residual effect would be Negligible.

A Negligible effect is predicted on PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations at off-site receptors.

Once completed, residential units would not be located on the Ground Level or Level 01 where air pollutant concentrations would be at a maximum. Additionally, each residential unit would be provided with mechanical ventilation. Where external pollutant concentrations are most heavily influenced by existing low level traffic sources, i.e. on the façade fronting the A40 and at low levels throughout the Proposed Development, air for the residential units would be pulled from the facades, but would be passed through filters to remove NOx and particulates from the incoming air, thereby providing residents with a clean air source.
At on-site receptors the combined impact of emissions from traffic and the energy centre associated with the Proposed Development would result in a *Slight Adverse* effect on annual mean NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations at Ground Level receptors where there is relevant exposure.

**Negligible** effects are predicted on PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} concentrations at on-site receptors. Concentrations were predicted at the highest elevations within the Proposed Development to demonstrate that the stacks for the boilers and CHP that are located within the Energy Centre of Site 1, have been sized appropriately to allow adequate dispersion of polluting gases. In addition a catalytic convertor would be installed. This has shown that the residual effect of the Proposed Development would be *Slight Adverse* at elevated on-site receptors.

The Proposed Development would introduce residential receptors into a location where air quality is likely to exceed the annual mean NO\textsubscript{2} objective. A number of mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce potential exposure to poor air quality. None of the residual effects as reported are considered to be significant.

### 8.5 Archaeology

An assessment was undertaken to consider the potential impacts of the Proposed Development and likely effects upon any buried heritage (archaeology) assets likely to be present at Site 2. The assessment was undertaken in accordance with national, regional and local planning policy, together with appropriate industry guidelines.

Site 2 does not contain any nationally designated heritage assets, or any known undesignated heritage assets. In addition, Site 2 does not lie within an area with known potential for archaeological remains (ASAP) as designated by WCC.

From a review of the available datasets Site 2 has low archaeological potential for all past periods of human activity. Furthermore, a review of the cartographic sources at Site 2 together with site-specific geotechnical information indicates that previous development is likely to have had a severe adverse impact on any pre-existing archaeological remains.

On the basis of the above, archaeological mitigation has been proposed in the form of an archaeological monitoring exercise during the demolition and earthworks stages, secured by means of an appropriately worded planning condition. In addition a Written Scheme of Investigation setting out the methodology to be adopted during the monitoring exercise would be prepared and approved in writing by the WCC and Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service in advance of implementation.

Following implementation of the proposed archaeological mitigation, the residual effects associated with the demolition and construction stages of the Proposed Development would be **Minor to Negligible Adverse**, with **No** residual effect anticipated during the completed stage of the Proposed Development.

None of the residual effects as reported are considered to be significant.

### 8.6 Ground Conditions

A ground conditions assessment was undertaken for Site 2. This considered the geological and hydrogeological setting of Site 2, the potential for soil contamination associated with past uses and the potential risks arising during redevelopment. The principal objective of the assessment was to identify the potential risks associated with soil and groundwater contamination (if any) and how remediation (if required) would remove risks to allow the
development proposals to proceed in a manner that ensures risks to occupants, buildings and landscaped areas would be minimised to an acceptable level.

The assessment was undertaken with due consideration of relevant legislation and guidance, in particular Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 which provides the basis for the current UK contaminated land regime.

The assessment of ground conditions at Site 2 included a review of the following documents historically prepared for the wider NWCS site:

- a Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment, which comprises a review of relevant third party and regulatory information to assess the setting and sensitivity of NWCS site in respect of ground contamination; and
- a Generic Quantitative Environmental Risk Assessment which reviews the results of an intrusive site investigation undertaken across the NWCS site and compares these to assessment criteria and values to determine the potential for contamination.

Historically, Site 2 was occupied by residential properties and a factory (of an unknown nature); though by the late 1950s Site 2 had been redeveloped as the eastern part of a school. The school buildings remain on-site and are occupied by temporary uses at the present time to ensure that Site 2 remains in active use and does not fall into a state of disrepair ahead of the Proposed Redevelopment.

The surrounding area has historically included wharfs; a graveyard; timber yards; a saw mill; warehouses; depots; works; a tank of unknown use; garages; and commercial/office uses.

Based on the current temporary uses and former uses on Site 2, as well as the surrounding uses, there is a low to medium risk of potential contamination.

Investigation works conducted across the wider NWCS did not identify widespread or gross contamination in soils at Site 2 and indicated Site 2 would pose a 'low risk' in relation to ground gas to human health in both residential and commercial development areas across Site 2. Groundwater analysis at the NWCS site identified a number of marginal exceedances for some metals and non-metal contaminants.

Asbestos containing materials have been confirmed as being present within the existing buildings on Site 2. The risk of construction works coming into contact with asbestos containing materials would be mitigated through the implementation of a CEMP and appropriate safe working procedures, including the use of Personal Protective Equipment.

In addition, best practice control and management measures would be adopted and implemented at Site 2 to minimise the risk of accidental spillages and to ensure that no contaminant-pathway-receptor linkage is created during the demolition and construction works. Accordingly, the residual effects to soils and to construction workers during the demolition and construction stage would be temporary Negligible Adverse.

The effect on groundwater resources during the demolition and construction works would be mitigated through the storage of oil and chemicals on suitable surfaces with bunds and in suitable containers. Accordingly, the residual effect on groundwater resources is considered to be temporary Negligible Adverse.

The piling of foundations has the potential to introduce new contaminant sources and pathways creating possible links to sensitive receptors such as groundwater resources. The implementation of a suitable piling strategy approved prior to the works commencing, would
ensure that no contaminant-pathway-receptor linkage is created. Accordingly, the residual effect would be temporary *Negligible Adverse* effect.

Japanese knotweed was previously identified on the adjacent Site 1. The demolition, excavation and construction works could introduce Japanese knotweed onto Site 2 or off-site. Should any Japanese knotweed be found on Site 2, it would be controlled through excavation, appropriate treatment and disposal off-site. Accordingly, the residual effect would be temporary *Negligible Adverse*.

Based on a review of historical mapping, there is a low to moderate risk of unexploded ordnance\(^4\) to be present at Site 2. Implementation of standard precautionary mitigation measures and awareness training of on-site workers during the demolition and construction works would result in a temporary *Negligible Adverse* residual effect.

Upon completion, the Proposed Development would not introduce any potential contamination sources or create any new contaminant-pathway-receptor linkages on-site. Additionally, the creation of basement areas across Site 2 would remove a significant quantity of Made Ground (a potential source of contaminants) and the introduction of a layer of clean capped soil in landscaped areas (if necessary) to ensure that no contaminant-pathway-receptor linkages are created by the completed development. On this basis, the residual effects would be *Negligible Beneficial* to *Minor Beneficial*.

Surface water runoff into Site 2 drainage could introduce new contaminant sources and pathways creating possible links to groundwater. The installation of a suitable drainage system would mitigate this possibility and accordingly the residual effect on groundwater would be *Negligible Adverse*.

None of the residual effects reported above are considered to be significant.

### 8.7 Water Resources and Flood Risk

An assessment of water resources and flood risk was undertaken in accordance with current government guidance on EIA and is supported a flood risk assessment (FRA) for the NWCS site, as well as a FRA Addendum for Site 2.

The assessment considered the potential impacts on flood risk, water quality, hydrology and water quantity that could arise during development works (demolition and construction works) and once the Proposed Development is complete.

National, regional and local policies were considered to determine specific issues regarding the management of water resources, flooding and drainage at Site 2. These policies emphasise the need for new developments to protect and improve water quality; reduce and minimise water consumption; utilise sustainable drainage where practical; and prevent an unacceptable risk of flooding either on-site or elsewhere.

The assessment included:

- a review of baseline information;
- a review of the Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment and Generic Quantitative Environmental Risk Assessment undertaken for the wider NWCS site;

\(^4\) Explosive weapons (bombs, bullets, shells, grenades, land mines, naval mines, etc.) that did not explode when they were employed and still pose a risk of detonation.
a review of the development proposals, including the drainage and landscape strategies; and

an assessment of potential impacts.

Site 2 is located in Flood Zone 1 and is therefore considered to be at low risk of fluvial or tidal flooding.

There are no surface water features within Site 2. Paddington Basin (a branch of the Grand Union Canal) is the closest surface water body to Site 2, located approximately 70 m to the south. The River Thames is located approximately 4 km from Site 2.

There are three surface water abstractions within 1 km of Site 2. The closest is located 740 m west and is licensed to British Waterways for abstraction of water from a river for industrial cooling. There are no recorded pollution incidents attributable to Site 2.

The proposed basement would have a proposed finished floor level approximately 2.8 m above the observed groundwater level. Therefore, the risk of groundwater flooding during construction is considered to be low.

An appropriate piling strategy would be developed and implemented in order to mitigate the potential for the creation of pollutant migration pathways from building foundations. Furthermore, the construction of the basement is unlikely to cause significant displacement of groundwater and would be appropriately waterproofed during construction in line with current building standards to ensure no ingress of water. The residual effect on groundwater quality and displacement during construction would therefore be Negligible Adverse.

Mitigation against surface water flood risks during construction works would be provided through the implementation of a construction drainage system to ensure that residual effects are no more than temporary Negligible Adverse.

In addition, management controls to minimise the risk of accidents, ensure safe handling and storage of potentially hazardous materials and prevent pollution would be implemented as part of a CEMP to ensure that the residual, temporary effects on surface water runoff, would be reduced to no more than temporary Negligible Adverse.

The mitigation measures to be set out in the CEMP (including the preparation of a piling risk assessment) plus implementation of a construction drainage system would collectively ensure that pollution pathways are not created and residual, temporary effects on groundwater thus limited to Negligible Adverse.

Upon completion, the Proposed Development would manage surface water runoff using green roofs, landscaped areas and sub-surface attenuation tanks\(^5\) to deliver a 50% reduction of the existing runoff rate. The Proposed Development’s drainage network would comply with best practice guidance and would be designed with a total capacity to accommodate a 1 in 100 year storm, including an allowance for climate change. The network would ensure no increase in flood risk. The residual effect on surface water runoff would therefore be Minor Beneficial and the residual effect in terms of flood risk Negligible Adverse.

---

\(^5\) Systems designed to control water delivered as part of an extreme rainfall event; the control comes in the form of collecting the water from the ground or built structures and releasing it back into the local water course or drainage system in a controlled way.
Additionally to reduce the risk of surface water contamination by hydrocarbons, once the Proposed Development is complete, runoff from access roads, surface level parking/delivery bays would be routed through oil interceptors prior to discharge into the sewer. Accordingly, **No** residual effects on surface water runoff quality upon completion of the Proposed Development are anticipated.

The Proposed Development would increase the number of occupants using Site 2, and would therefore lead to an increase in mains water use and foul drainage requirements at Site 2. It is proposed that the increase would be offset by the adoption of water minimisation and efficiency techniques and measures in order for the Proposed Development to meet sustainability standards including Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method Excellent. In addition, foul drainage would be discharged into Thames Water sewers and would be treated accordingly to ensure no detrimental environmental impact on water resources. Furthermore, Thames Water is currently developing plans to secure mains water supply into the future. The residual effect of the Proposed Development on water supply and foul drainage is therefore considered to be **Minor Adverse**.

None of the residual effects reported above are considered to be significant.

**8.8 Ecology**

An assessment of the potential impacts to ecological and nature conservation receptors was undertaken according to guidelines produced by the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and in line with national and local planning policies.

The ecological baseline at and surrounding Site 2 was characterised by means of an Ecological Appraisal and Building Inspection, as well as a Bat Survey undertaken in 2012 and supplemented by two site visits in February and September 2013.

Site 2 comprises a range of habitats including buildings, hardstanding areas, individual trees, introduced shrub and amenity grassland, which are all common to urban environments and therefore only of site value. Of particular value are the trees along the southern boundary that would be retained as part of the development proposals.

The bat surveys identified that Block A is of site-level I value for bats because it was previously used as a roost in 2010. In addition, some of the buildings, trees and introduced shrubs have a potential to support a small number of common nesting birds species with several nests observed amongst the mature trees in 2012. However, none was observed in 2013. Site 2 also provides habitat for a low numbers of widely occurring species of invertebrate.

Site 2 is not located on, or immediately adjacent to, any statutory designated sites. The closest statutory designated site is St John’s Wood Church Grounds LNR located approximately 1.4 km north-east of Site 2. Site 2 is located within 70 m of the London Canals SMINC at the Paddington Basin and within 0.1 km of St Mary’s Churchyard and Paddington Green SBINC (Grade II). Hyde Park and Regents Park are also designated as SMINCs at 1.7 km north-east and 1 km south of Site 2 respectively.

A range of mitigation measures have been devised and incorporated within the development proposals to reduce, avoid and compensate for potential impacts during the demolition and construction stage of the Proposed Development. This would include the implementation of a CEMP which would set out the following measures to reduce the potential impacts to on-site receptors and to designated sites:
- A European Protected Species Licence would be obtained in advance of the demolition of Block A;
- A detailed method statement for building demolition and supervision during works would be prepared and implemented;
- The appropriate timing of demolition works and vegetation clearance to avoid impacts to breeding birds; and
- The appropriate protection of retained trees in accordance with best practice.

The demolition and construction works would result in the loss of trees, amenity grassland, semi-improved grassland and introduced shrub habitat. Though new soft landscaping and tree planting is proposed within the Proposed Development, this would take time to establish. Accordingly, the construction and demolition works are likely to result in a **Temporary Adverse** residual impact to habitats and species, significant at the site level only.

The demolition of Block A under an EPS Licence would result in the loss of a low value bat roost. Until new and replacement bat boxes have been installed, **Temporary Adverse** residual impacts are likely.

Following the implementation of demolition and construction mitigation **No Significant** residual impacts to designated sites or protected species are considered likely.

Upon completion, the Proposed Development would deliver a range of biodiversity benefits including large areas of landscaping, the introduction of native and beneficial species, green roofs and the installation of bird and bat boxes. Furthermore an appropriate lighting strategy would be developed and implemented to avoid light spill onto potential bat habitats.

The creation of habitats within the Proposed Development once complete would result, in the long term, in a **Permanent Beneficial** residual impact to species and habitats, significant at site-level.

The Proposed Development would have **No significant** residual impacts on designated sites.

Existing habitats on Site 2, including amenity grassland, semi-improved grassland, introduced shrub and tall ruderal vegetation, would no longer be present during the completed development stage and therefore **No** further residual impacts on these habitats as a result of the Proposed Development are predicted.

The retained trees on Site 2 are likely to be managed as part of the overall landscape strategy and therefore there is likely to be a **Permanent Beneficial** Impacts, significant at the site-level only.

Some of the effects as reported would be significant, but only at the site-level.

### 8.9 Wind

An assessment of the potential impacts and likely effects of the Proposed Development on the local wind microclimate was undertaken and considered the potential impacts of wind on pedestrian comfort and safety around the Proposed Development.

Wind tunnel testing of the existing Site 2 and Proposed Development was undertaken to consider the local wind microclimate conditions following the introduction of the new development.
The assessment provided a detailed quantitative assessment of the wind microclimate at key locations around the Proposed Development in terms of accepted, industry standard, Lawson criteria for comfort and safety. Consideration was given to the likely effect of the Proposed Development’s landscaping scheme (without leaf cover), although not finalised at the time of the wind tunnel test. The results as reported below, therefore represents a worst case.

Wind tunnel testing of the wind microclimate within the existing Site 2 was reported to be suitable for pedestrian thoroughfare and for ingress / egress at entrances.

The Proposed Development’s demolition and construction stage is unlikely to generate winds that are significantly worse for pedestrians along thoroughfares and in public amenity areas around Site 2 than those currently existing at Site 2. Therefore the likely effect was judged to be **Negligible**.

The wind microclimate at the completed Proposed Development was reported as acceptable for the intended pedestrian use. Accordingly, the likely effects of the Proposed Development on wind microclimate would be **Negligible**.

Conditions at the proposed public open space would be suitable for a mixture of recreational activities, from more active recreational uses such as a play space to sedentary uses such as long-term sitting. Accordingly the residual effects upon ground level amenity spaces within Site 2 would be **Negligible**.

Building entrances throughout the Proposed Development would be suitable for short periods of standing (or better) and sitting throughout the year and thus for comfortable pedestrian ingress / egress. Accordingly the residual effects upon entrances within Site 2 would be **Negligible**.

Likewise, conditions at thoroughfares within Site 2 would be suitable for strolling, and as such would be acceptable for comfortable pedestrian movement, with an associated **Negligible** effect.

From spring to autumn, wind conditions upon the hotel terraces would be suitable for prolonged periods of outdoor seating and as such, these locations would be suitable for an outdoor café, bar or restaurant as proposed, with an associated **Negligible** effect.

The children’s play space within the proposed primary school would be suitable for long-term sitting throughout the year and would thus be suitable for its intended use. Accordingly the effect upon this area would be **Negligible**.

A majority of private residential balconies and terraces would be suitable for long-term sitting during summer (13 of 28 assessed locations) in excess of 95 % of the time. Where this occurs, the likely effect would be **Negligible**. Where balconies and terraces are suitable for outdoor seating between 90 % and 95 % of the time during summer (6 of 28 locations), this is considered to represent a **Minor Adverse** effect. A small number of balconies and terraces (9 of 28) are suitable for outdoor seating less than 90 % of the time (but no less than 74 %) during summer. At the latter locations, further shelter in the form of screens or soft landscaping (in the case of the terraces) would be considered at the detailed design stage to ensure that sitting and viewing conditions are delivered. In the absence of this further mitigation, the effect would be **Moderate Adverse** effect of the Proposed Development.

All locations tested would be suitable, in terms of safety, for all users throughout the year. Accordingly the effect would be **Negligible**.
None of the residual effects reported above are considered to be significant.

8.10 Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare

Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Solar Glare assessments were undertaken of the Proposed Development and considered the potential impacts and likely effects on identified sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors were defined as the existing and emerging surrounding residential properties; the proposed residential accommodation within Site 2; existing and proposed amenity space; as well as road users of the A40 Westway.

Reference was made to the relevant planning policies at national, regional and local level, together with the NWCS Planning Brief. These have all informed the method of assessment and in particular the guidance provided by the Building Research Establishment (BRE).

The BRE Guidance is specific in its confirmation that the Guidance does not contain mandatory requirements.

The NWCS Planning Brief sets out WCC’s planning aspirations and expectations for Site 2. The Council wishes to see a development that complements the existing and permitted schemes in the Paddington Special Policy Area also known as ‘Paddington Waterside’ and the Paddington Opportunity Area.

The relatively open nature of the existing Site 2, with school buildings covering a small part of the Site, means that existing daylight and sunlight availability to neighbouring residential buildings is good.

The form and layout of the Proposed Development would ensure that daylight and sunlight availability is safeguarded as far as possible and that residual effects at surrounding residential receptors would be no more than Negligible to Minor Adverse.

Analysis confirms that the Proposed Development’s residential accommodation would benefit from daylight and sunlight availability with residual effects reported as Beneficial to Minor Adverse in respect of daylight and Negligible to Minor Adverse in respect of sunlight.

These outcomes reflect the careful consideration that has been given to Site 2 which, as required by WCC, complements the existing and permitted schemes in the immediate surroundings without creating significant adverse effects.

Similarly, the form and layout of the Proposed Development would minimise the effects of overshadowing and produce an outcome that provides the on-site public open space with a good proportion of shade free area that would be in compliance with the BRE Guidance criteria. The residual effect would be Negligible.

Similarly, overshadowing to Paddington Green would be Negligible.

Solar glare assessment reviewed the previous study undertaken for the wider NWCS site and concluded that no worsening of conditions would occur. The effect would be Negligible.

None of the residual effects reported above are considered to be significant.
8.11 Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact

The Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact assessment considered the potential townscape and visual effects of the Proposed Development on Site 2, surrounding townscape character areas, a selection of views and the settings of built heritage assets. Consideration was given to effects during construction and as a result of the completed development.

Site 2 in its existing state is occupied by buildings that are drab in appearance, and it makes no positive contribution in terms of urban design. There are some trees of high quality on Site 2. However overall, Site 2 detracts from the visual quality of local views and townscape character.

For the purposes of the assessment, the surrounding townscape was divided into townscape character areas which have readily identifiable characteristics, such as topography, natural characteristics, patterns of land use, urban grain and building form, in common. Site 2 was identified as being located in townscape character area A, ‘Paddington Basin and surrounding area’, the character of which is dominated by large scale modern buildings.

Built heritage assets, including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, and buildings of merit within Conservation Areas, were identified within the townscape study area around Site 2. The potential for the setting of each asset to be affected to a significant extent in townscape and visual terms was considered, following a site visit, and where such potential was identified, the heritage asset in question was considered in the assessment.

A selection of 31 viewpoints was agreed with WCC, including a range of local, medium and long range views, views identified in planning policy, and representative townscape views.

For each of the identified views, images of the view as existing, the view as proposed with the Proposed Development in place, and the view as proposed with other cumulative developments were prepared.

Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) of each view as proposed and the view as proposed with cumulative development were prepared for each view. AVRs are produced by accurately combining images of the Proposed Development (typically created from a three-dimensional computer model) with a photograph of its context as existing. AVRs were prepared as ‘rendered’ images, showing the detailed form of the Proposed Development, or as ‘wireline’ images, showing its form in outline. Existing views and AVRs of the Proposed Development are shown in Figures 16 - 21.
Figure 16: Viewpoint 1 - Primrose Hill [LVMF 4A.2] – View as Existing
Figure 17: Viewpoint 1 - Primrose Hill [LVMF 4A.2] – View as Proposed
Figure 18: Viewpoint 16 - Bishop's Bridge Road, east of Eastbourne Terrace – View as Existing
Figure 19: Viewpoint 19 - Bishop's Bridge Road, east of Eastbourne Terrace – View as Proposed
Figure 20: Viewpoint 25 - Paddington Green, by junction of Paddington Green and Church Street Panorama – View as Existing
Figure 21: Viewpoint 25 - Paddington Green, by junction of Paddington Green and Church Street Panorama – View as Proposed
The assessment concluded that there would be temporary **Adverse** effects as a result of demolition and construction activities which would be **Moderate** in significance with regard to Site 2; and **Minor to Moderate** in significance overall, with regard to surrounding townscape character areas, the settings of built heritage assets and views.

The assessment concluded that the completed Proposed Development would introduce buildings and spaces of high quality design. It would provide good quality architecture, significant urban design benefits and a high quality new public open space. Although some trees of high quality would be lost, others of high quality would be retained and new trees would be planted.

Furthermore, the assessment concluded that the overall scale of the Proposed Development would be comparable with nearby developments. Although it would have some elements taller than nearby buildings, they would not be taller by an order of magnitude. The manner in which taller elements would be located within a base formed by lower linking buildings within the Western Block would help to break up the scale of this element within the Proposed Development. The overall form and appearance of the Eastern Block, with extensively glazed floors set within largely stone-clad elevations, would similarly help to break up the scale of this element.

The manner in which the taller elements within the Western Block step up in height towards Building C would create a sense of coherence and would locate the tallest element in a position that would relate well to the existing and proposed skyline of the surrounding area.

The assessment concluded that the overall form of the Proposed Development is well considered. The alternating taller and lower elements within the Western Block would create a visually interesting rhythm. The form of Buildings E and G within the Eastern Block would strongly define the corner of North Wharf Road and Harrow Road. The architecture of the Proposed Development would be appropriately crisp and modern.

Accordingly, the Proposed Development would have a **Beneficial** effect of **Moderate** significance with regard to the townscape character area within which it is located (Area A – Paddington Basin and surrounding area) in terms of adding good quality architecture and providing urban design benefits within an overall form and scale which is consistent with the existing character of the area. It would have a **Beneficial or Neutral** effect, ranging from **Minor to Moderate** significance, with regard to other nearby townscape character areas.

The most noteworthy effect with regard to the setting of a built heritage asset would be with regard to the Church of St. Mary, located to the north of Site 2. The Proposed Development would provide a coherent backdrop for this listed building that would be **Beneficial** and of **Moderate to Major** significance on its setting overall. The Proposed Development would have a **Neutral or Beneficial** effect of **Negligible to Moderate** significance overall with regard to other listed buildings, conservation areas and buildings of merit within CAs in the wider area around Site 2 (other than cases where there is no effect). In most cases, these heritage assets are experienced in a wider context which includes tall and large scale post-war and modern buildings, and the Proposed Development would be consistent with this.

In a range of views, the Proposed Development would appear as a suitably scaled building of good architectural quality, relating well to existing buildings and patterns of development evident in such views. In many views, including some medium to long range views from Bayswater, Hyde Park and Regent’s Park, the Proposed Development would not be visible or would be a minor or negligible visual presence. It would be a beneficial addition to the short range views, particularly those from the north, in which it would be most visible and its
effect would be most significant. The assessment concludes that, where visible, the Proposed Development would have a **Neutral or Beneficial** effect, ranging in significance from **Negligible to Major**.

The Proposed Development would be consistent with national, regional and local policy that requires development of high design quality design and that respects the local context. It appropriately responds and contributes to the policy aspiration of the NWCS Brief and the POA for a large scale regeneration.

### 8.12 Cumulative Effects

#### Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

There is potential for some Intra-Project cumulative impact interactions to occur during the demolition and construction works. The majority of the interactions would arise from activities such as dust and noise from construction plant and vehicles; the visual impact of the works; and passing HGVs. However these impact interactions would generally be restricted to short term peak periods and not all receptors would experience impact interactions during this time.

The implementation of a CEMP would reduce the magnitude of any adverse impact interaction so that overall, it is considered that any Intra-Project effects that occur would be temporary and Minor Adverse, albeit there may be some peaks of Moderate Adverse effects when works are occurring immediately adjacent to receptors for extended periods.

Upon completion, Intra-Project cumulative impact interactions are unlikely to arise.

#### Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

In terms of Inter-Project cumulative impacts, consideration was given to nine schemes within the study area. The assessment concluded as follows:

- **Major Beneficial** cumulative effects at a Local Level in terms of job creation, local economic development and the delivery of housing, at a local level, subject to the implementation and provision of amenity space, educational and healthcare contributions; **Minor to Moderate Beneficial** at the borough level; and **Negligible** at all other spatial levels;
- Temporary **Negligible** cumulative effects on all modes of public transport, cycling and pedestrian movement during demolition and construction works;
- Temporary **Minor to Moderate Adverse** cumulative transport and access effects on the local road network and traffic flows during demolition and construction works, subject to the implementation of best practise traffic management measures for each site;
- **Minor to Moderate Beneficial** cumulative effects on pedestrians and cyclists upon completion;
- **Negligible to Moderate Adverse** cumulative effects on local road network and traffic flows and the public transport network once the Proposed Development is completed.
- **Negligible to Minor Adverse** cumulative noise and vibration effects during the demolition and construction works; and **Negligible** to **Moderate Adverse** effects from construction traffic;
• **Negligible** cumulative noise effects on on-site and off-site receptors from cumulative road traffic noise levels;
• Temporary **Slight Adverse** cumulative air quality effects during demolition and construction works;
• **Negligible** to **Slight Adverse** cumulative NO\textsubscript{2} effects on air quality at off-site receptors, and **Slight Adverse** to **Moderate Adverse** effect at on-site receptors as a result of the cumulative operational traffic flow and energy centre emissions;
• Negligible cumulative PM\textsubscript{10} effects on air quality at off-site receptors, and **Negligible** to **Moderate Adverse** cumulative effects at on-site receptors as a result of the cumulative operational traffic flow and energy centre emissions;
• Negligible cumulative PM2.5 effects on all receptors;
• **No** cumulative effects anticipated in respect of archaeology at either the demolition and construction stage or the completed development stage of the Proposed Development;
• **No** cumulative effects anticipated in respect of ground conditions during demolition and construction stage;
• Minor **Beneficial** cumulative effects on ground conditions should remediation occur at the Proposed Development and cumulative developments;
• **No** cumulative effect on contamination arising from construction drainage, due to all construction activities associated with the cumulative development being subject to relevant legislative requirements and best practise guidance;
• **Negligible Beneficial** cumulative effect on surface runoff management in the area, due to all schemes being required to comply with the mayor’s essential surface water runoff standard and to ensure that surface runoff is attenuated in comparison with the pre-development rate prior to discharge into the sewer network;
• **Negligible Beneficial** cumulative effect on flood risk in the local area;
• **No** effect to temporary **Adverse** effect on ecology and biodiversity (designated sites, habitats, bats, birds and invertebrates) during demolition and construction works;
• **No** effect to permanent **Beneficial** effect on ecology and biodiversity upon completion of the Proposed Development;
• **Negligible** cumulative wind microclimate effects at ground level with the conditions in the context of the future surrounds considered suitable for or calmer than the target conditions required for the Proposed Development.
• **Negligible** to **Moderate Adverse** cumulative wind microclimate effects at residential balconies and terraces with conditions in the context of the future surrounds considered suitable for outdoor seating for no less than 82% of the time during summer;
• **Negligible** cumulative wind microclimate effects at hotel terraces and children’s play space with conditions in the context of the future surrounds considered suitable for intended use;
• **Negligible** to **Minor Adverse** daylight and sunlight cumulative effects on Site 1 and Merchant Square during the completed development stage; and **Minor Adverse** cumulative daylight and sunlight effects on the Proposed Development;
• **Negligible** cumulative effect of overshadowing on the ground level public open space would during the completed development stage; and
• No cumulative solar glare effect on users of the A40 Westway during the completed development stage.

In addition, the temporary cumulative demolition and construction townscape, built heritage and visual effects would be:

• of Moderate significance and Adverse in nature with regard to the townscape character of Site 2;
• of Minor to Moderate significance and Adverse in nature with regard to views; and
• of Minor to Moderate significance and Adverse in nature with regard to surrounding townscape character and the setting of built heritage features

Upon completion the cumulative townscape, built heritage and visual effects of the Proposed Development in the context of cumulative developments would be of Moderate significance and Beneficial in nature with regard to all receptors.