

Appendix 18.1 – Summary of Effects

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Air Quality | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Human Health and Property | High | Increase in suspended particulate matter and deposited dust generated by construction activities. | Mitigation measures related to communications, site management, monitoring, preparing and maintaining the site, operating vehicles/ machinery, construction operation, waste management, demolition, earthworks, construction and trackout. | Negligible | Not Significant |
| Ecological Receptors | Low | | | | |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Human Receptors | High | Increase in pollutant concentrations generated by vehicles during operation | No mitigation proposed. | Moderate to Negligible | Not Significant |
| Archaeology | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| SM1 | High | Change to setting | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|----------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| AR1 | Low | None | None | None | Not Significant |
| AR2 | Low | None | None | None | Not Significant |
| AR3 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR4 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR5 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR6 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR7 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR8 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR9 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR10 | No more than Medium | None | None | None | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| AR11 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| AR12 | No more than Medium | Physical impact through development | Programme of archaeological excavation, recording, analysis and reporting | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| As per construction phase | | | | | |
| Built Heritage | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| LB1 | Medium | Moderate Adverse | Sensitive design of any proposed changes of use. Listed Building Consent required. Historic Building Recording. | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB2 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB3 | High | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB4 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB5 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB6 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB7 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB8 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|----------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| LB9 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB10 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB11 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB12 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| LB13 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB14 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB15 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB16 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB17 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| LB18 | Medium | Negligible | None | Negligible | Not significant |
| RGB1 | High | None | None | None | Not significant |
| CA1 | Medium | Minor Adverse | None | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| CA2 | Medium | None | None | None | Not significant |
| BH1 | Low | None | None | None | Not significant |
| BH2 | Low | Negligible | None | Negligible | Not significant |
| BH3 | Low | None | None | None | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| LB3 | High | Minor Adverse | Programme of stabilisation and repair of the ruins. | Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| All other Receptors | As per construction phase | As per construction phase | As per construction phase | As per construction phase | As per construction phase |
| Climate Change & Greenhouse Gases | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Atmospheric concentration of GHGs (global climate) | High | Indirect GHG emissions from construction material use ('embodied carbon') and delivery, and direct emissions from on-site construction activity and land-use change with minor adverse (not significant) effect | Undertake carbon management using RICS guidance 'Whole Life Carbon Assessment (WLCA) 2nd Edition. Allowing for reduction target setting, lifecycle analysis to inform detailed design, and monitoring of as-built outcomes. | Could be reduced to minor adverse | Could be reduced to not significant |
| Construction programme and workforce | Up to high | Risks to the construction workforce health and safety, and to the construction programme, with some moderate (significant) risks | Good-practice measures for workforce health and safety, drawn from HSE guidance, to be incorporated in the CEMP | Could be reduced to low | Could be reduced to not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Atmospheric concentration of GHGs (global climate) | High | Indirect GHG emissions from energy consumption with moderate adverse (significant) effect | Implementation of highly efficient building fabric, use of heat pumps and on-site solar PV will provide embedded mitigation as set out in the Energy and Sustainability Statement. | Could be reduced to minor adverse | Could be reduced to not significant |
| Atmospheric concentration of GHGs (global climate) | High | Indirect GHG emissions from traffic generation with moderate adverse (significant) effect | Provision of high capacity EV charging for all parking spaces (which may be above the current Part S minimum requirement) as future-proofing to enable higher EV uptake. Travel Plan with measures to encourage modal shift. | Could be reduced to minor adverse | Could be reduced to not significant |
| Development buildings and users (climate risks) | Up to high | Risks to the physical integrity of buildings and to health and wellbeing of residents with some moderate (significant) risks | Flood risk and drainage management (see FRA); consideration of orientation, glazing, shading and ventilation in design; water demand reduction (see as set out in the Energy and Sustainability Statement); geotechnical investigation, civil and architectural design in line with Building Regulations | Could be reduced to low | Could be reduced to not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Ecology | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Thames Basin Heaths SPA | International | No impacts predicted | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Longmoor Bog SSSI & Bramshill SSSI | National | No impacts predicted | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Rushy Mead LWS | County | Loss of habitats | Woodland planting extension to St Johns Copse LWS | None | N/A |
| | | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| Additional LWS | County | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| River Loddon (& LWS) | County | Habitat degradation | Long-term habitat management under EMES | None | N/A |
| | | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| CFGM | County | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of habitats | Habitat enhancements Long-term habitat management under EMES | None | N/A |
| Hedgerows and Treelines | County/Local | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Loss of habitats | Habitat enhancements Long-term habitat management under EMES | None | N/A |
| Historic Floodplain Ditches and Modified Watercourses | County | Loss of habitats | Long-term habitat management under EMES | Permanent negative at the Zol level | Not significant |
| | | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Changes to water quality | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Rush Pasture | County | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| Swamp and Reedbed | County | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of habitats | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| Other Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland | Local | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of habitats | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| Wet Woodlands | Local | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Flora of Conservation Interest | National/County/Local | Damage to retained flora | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Loss of Flora | Implementation of Working Method Statement | None | N/A |
| | | Habitat Degradation | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| | | Changes in Water Quality | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Grasslands | Local | Damage to retained habitats | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of habitats | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| Veteran Trees | County | Damage to retained trees | Implementation of CEMP Implementation of buffers | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of veteran trees | Implementation of veteran tree mitigation strategy | Permanent negative at the Zol level | Not significant |
| Invertebrates | Local | Habitat loss/fragmentation | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| White-clawed Crayfish | Local | Changes to water quality | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Freshwater Fish | TBC | Changes in water quality | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Great Crested Newt | Local | Harm to individuals | Works to proceed under WLMS or appropriate licence | None | N/A |
| | | Habitat loss/fragmentation | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Breeding birds | County | Harm to individuals/destruction of nests | Pre-works nesting bird checks | None | N/A |
| | | Loss of foraging and nesting habitats | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP Skylark Mitigation Strategy | None | N/A |
| Wintering Birds | County | Disturbance | Implementation of CEMP | Temporary negative at the Local level | Significant |
| Bat Roosts | County | Harm to individuals | Works to proceed under WLMS or appropriate licence | None | N/A |
| | | Damage/destruction of roosts | Works to proceed under WLMS or appropriate licence Provision of replacement roosts | None | N/A |
| Bat Assemblage | Regional | Loss/Fragmentation of Foraging/Commuting Habitats | Long-term habitat management outlined in EMES, secured through EMEP | None | N/A |
| Otter | Local | Disturbance | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| | | Changes to water quality | Implementation of CEMP | None | N/A |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Thames Basin Heaths SPA | International | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG and SAMM contribution | None | N/A |
| | | Changes in air quality | N/A | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Longmoor Bog SSSI & Bramshill SSSI | National | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG | None | N/A |
| LWS | County | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Changes in air quality | TBC – to follow in addendum | TBC – to follow in addendum | TBC – to follow in addendum |
| | | Implementation of management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| River Loddon (& LWS) | County | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| CFGM | County | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County level | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Hedgerows and treelines | County/local | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County level | Significant |
| Historic floodplain ditches and modified watercourses | County | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County level | Significant |
| Rush pasture | County | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County level | Significant |
| Other Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland | Local | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Wet Woodland | Local | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | Access management | | |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Flora of Conservation Interest | National/ County/Local | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County/Local level | Significant |
| | | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| Veteran Trees | County | Increase in recreational pressure | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Urban edge effects | Provision of SANG Access management | None | N/A |
| Invertebrates | Local | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| White-clawed Crayfish | Local | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Freshwater Fish | County | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Disturbance | Access management Additional planting | None | N/A |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | Implementation of habitat management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Great Crested Newt | Local | Increased mortality | Provision of modified gully pots with recessed kerbs, wildlife tunnels/culverts | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Breeding birds | County | Disturbance | Implementation of lighting strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| | | Cat predation | N/A | None | N/A |
| Wintering birds | County | Cat predation | N/A | None | N/A |
| | | Disturbance | Access management | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Bats | Regional | Disturbance | Implementation of lighting strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Implementation of habitat creation and management plans | N/A | Permanent positive at the County level | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Creation of new roosting opportunities | N/A | Permanent positive at the Local level | Significant |
| Otter | Local | Changes in water quality | Implementation of drainage strategy | None | N/A |
| | | Disturbance | N/A | None | N/A |
| Human Health | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Human receptors | Low | Health effects from changes in air quality due to construction dust | Implementation of dust mitigation measures within the DMP and CEMP | Negligible | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from construction-related noise | Adherence to the CEMP and good construction practice with regards to noise and vibration. | Negligible | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from construction-related traffic | CEMP | Negligible | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from construction-related job creation | N/A | Minor beneficial | Not significant |
| Human receptors | High | Health effects from changes in air quality due to construction dust | Implementation of dust mitigation measures within the DMP and CEMP | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from construction-related noise | Adherence to the CEMP and good construction practice with regards to noise and vibration. | Minor adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | Health effects from construction-related traffic | CEMP | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from construction-related job creation | N/A | Minor beneficial | Not significant |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Human receptors | Low | Health effects from air quality (NO ₂ , PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5}) impacts on existing and future receptors | N/A | Negligible | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from noise from ambient environment (internal and external), from road traffic, from fixed plant, and outdoor sports facilities | N/A | Negligible | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from operation-related traffic generation | N/A | Minor adverse (severance, NMU delay, and fear and intimidation) Minor beneficial (NMU amenity) Negligible (highway safety) | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from operation-related job creation | N/A | Minor beneficial | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Human receptors | High | Health effects from air quality (NO ₂ , PM ₁₀ , PM _{2.5}) impacts on existing and future receptors | N/A | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from noise from ambient environment (internal and external), from road traffic, from fixed plant, and outdoor sports facilities | N/A | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from operation-related traffic generation | N/A | Minor adverse (severance, NMU delay, and fear and intimidation) Minor beneficial (NMU amenity) Negligible (highway safety) | Not significant |
| | | Health effects from operation-related job creation | N/A | Minor beneficial | Not significant |
| Hydrology (including Flood Risk & Drainage) | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Flood Risk | | | | | |
| Construction workers and construction facilities | Medium | Potential flooding within areas of construction activities | Location of construction areas and facilities outside known | Minor adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | flood risk areas; implementation of a FMP | | |
| Construction workers and construction facilities | Medium | Temporary and short term changes to flooding regime (fluvial and/or pluvial) resulting from construction activities | Implementation of CEMP and a FMP | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Existing properties and residents within Site area | Medium | Temporary and short term changes to flooding regime (fluvial and/or pluvial) resulting from construction activities | Implementation of CEMP | Negligible | Not significant |
| WFD | | | | | |
| Superficial aquifers and surface water features which interface with them. | Low to Very High | Temporary dewatering to enable construction. | The construction of the Proposed Development will adhere to best practice guidance and risk assessment method statements, including measures to avoid and/or minimise disturbance of the water environment. Site investigation and monitoring will also be implemented before, during and after dewatering and excavation activities, to protect the integrity of nearby surface water features. | No anticipated residual effect. | Not significant. |
| The River Loddon and Barkham Brook | Medium to Very High | Footprint (e.g. the area of channel impacted by works in the vicinity of the channel) | The construction of the Proposed Development will adhere to best practice guidance and risk assessment | Works within and around the channel will result in loss and | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | method statements which include measures to avoid and/or minimise disturbance to the water environment. Works proposed within the channel which have the potential to impact the existing situation will have additional mitigation, including replanting of any lost habitat. | damage to habitat. However, mitigations will suitably reduce any impacts to be minor adverse in magnitude. | |
| Entire Water Environment | Low to Very High | Pollution risk and altered drainage patterns from general construction activities | Installation of suitable facilities to remove material (e.g., mud and dust) from wheels; use of sediment fences along the existing watercourses/waterbodies when working nearby to reduce sediment load into the water environment; covers for lorries transporting materials to/from Site to prevent releases of dust/sediment to watercourses/drains; | No anticipated residual effect. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers and surface water features which interface with them. | Low to Very High | Creating or altering of pathways along which existing poor quality groundwater can migrate | The only receptors for dewatered groundwater are Barkham Brook and the River Loddon. The drainage network will direct all groundwater that has been dewatered to these watercourses, maintaining overall flow. | Minor changes in the groundwater regime. | Not Significant. |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| All surface water features | Low to Very High | Changes to water body hydromorphology leading to changes in river processes and habitats upstream and downstream | The Proposed Development has sought to reduce hydromorphological impacts as far as reasonably practicable by minimising in-channel works. However, works are proposed within the channel which have the potential to impact the existing situation. To mitigate these, sediment and turbidity controls will be implemented to prevent WFD deterioration. | Works within and around the channel can result in mobilisation and deposition of sediments, controls will reduce impact to temporary, minor negative impact. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers, the River Loddon, Barkham Brook and wetlands surrounding the Loddon | Low to Very High | Mobilisation of pollutants through groundwater, particularly from the use of fuels or lubricants. | Development of a pollution prevention plan (PPP) to establish methods for controlling groundwater pollution risk. | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers, the River Loddon, Barkham Brook and wetlands surrounding the Loddon | Low to Very High | Reduction of groundwater recharge and therefore reduction in baseflow to rivers and groundwater dependant ecosystems. | Basic groundwater level monitoring with a response zone 1m below deepest excavation level. Management of groundwater in line with construction best practise. Required discharge or abstraction permits must be obtained prior to construction. | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Flood Risk | | | | | |
| Existing properties and residents within Site area | Medium | Changes to flooding regime (fluvial and/or pluvial) resulting from development | Mitigation strategy within FRA including floodplain compensation measures etc | Negligible | Not significant |
| Future properties and residents | Medium | Changes to flooding regime (fluvial and/or pluvial) resulting from development | Mitigation strategy within FRA including floodplain compensation measures etc | Negligible | Not significant |
| WFD | | | | | |
| The River Loddon and Barkham Brook | Medium to Very High | Footprint (e.g. the area of channel impacted by works in the vicinity of the channel) | The design of the Proposed Development has sought to reduce the length of impacted river channel as far as reasonably practicable. Some scheme assets must be located within or nearby the watercourses, causing a loss of channel length and / or riparian zone. Improved planting, widening of the watercourse/floodplain through WFD areas will mitigate for lost habitat. | Minor adverse impact anticipated, localised to asset locations. | Not Significant |
| The River Loddon and Barkham Brook | Medium to Very High | Shading due to the presence of a structure | A 10m buffer will be maintained between the banks of ordinary watercourses, water dependent ecosystems, Main Rivers and temporary and permanent built development associated with the Proposed Development. | Negligible adverse impact anticipated due to shading. | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Shading from water crossing points will be mitigated through widening of the floodplain, to provide better quality habitat. | | |
| All surface water features | Low to Very High | Changes to drainage patterns discharging to surface water body | The design of the Proposed Development will adhere to best practice method statements, including measures to appropriately manage surface water and sediment runoff prior to discharge to the watercourse. The drainage strategy will ensure the incorporation of suitable drainage systems (including attenuation basins) to intercept, attenuate and discharge runoff from the highway and other proposed infrastructure in a manner that will not significantly adversely impact upon the existing flow regime or water quality of receiving watercourse. | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers and surface water features which interface with them. | Low to Very High | Altering of groundwater processes | Whilst there may be minor changes in the existing groundwater regime as a result of the Proposed Development, due to passive dewatering of the River Terrace Deposits to facilitate construction, the only receptors for this groundwater are Barkham Brook and the | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | River Loddon. The drainage network will direct all groundwater that has been dewatered to these watercourses, maintaining overall flow and ensuring no sediment disturbance and scour due to the dewatering. | | |
| All surface water features | Low to Very High | Changes to hydrology leading to changes in processes and habitats upstream and downstream | The Proposed Development has sought to reduce hydromorphological impacts as far as reasonably practicable by minimising in-channel works. Where in-channel works are unavoidable, V-Cut ditch outfalls to minimise scour and maintaining existing catchment mechanics has been implemented to prevent deterioration. | Negligible minor adverse impact. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers, the River Loddon, Barkham Brook and wetlands surrounding the Loddon | Low to Very High | Reduction of groundwater recharge where hardstanding replaces permeable land cover and subsequent reduction of baseflow in rivers and groundwater dependant ecosystems. | Water re-routed from superficial aquifers by the drainage system will be discharged into the River Loddon or Barkham Brook where appropriate, preserving existing flows in watercourses and surrounding wetlands. | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |
| Superficial aquifers, the River Loddon, Barkham Brook and wetlands surrounding the Loddon | Low to Very High | Reduction in the volume of superficial aquifers and subsequent reduction of baseflow in rivers and | Where excavation and replacement must occur in water bearing superficial deposits, replacement material should preserve hydraulic | No anticipated residual impacts. | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | groundwater dependant ecosystems. | characteristics of the removed material wherever possible. | | |
| Landscape & Visual Impact | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Landscape Designations | | | | | |
| Draft River Loddon Valued Landscape | Medium | Removal of vegetation and construction of new bridge, spine road and housing in small part of the Valued Landscape | Inherent mitigation: Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation and integrate development with the landscape. | Minor indirect to Moderate adverse direct (depending on location) | Significant (in the parts of the construction is taking place) |
| Draft Barkham and Bearwood Valued Landscape | Low | Glimpsed views of construction to north of Mole Road. | Inherent mitigation: designed to minimise view of development from this area | Negligible adverse indirect | Not significant |
| Bearwood College Registered Park & Garden | Medium | Views of construction of new housing to north of Mole Road. | Inherent mitigation: Proposed Development designed to minimise view of development from this area | Negligible adverse indirect | Not significant |
| Trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders | High | No change. | Inherent mitigation: Proposed Development designed to avoid removal of trees covered by TPO. | No impact. | Not significant |
| Landscape Character Areas | | | | | |
| CA1 Loddon River Valley: M4 Corridor | Low | Removal of vegetation and construction of new bridge, spine road and housing in part of the area | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation | Minor adverse direct | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | and integrate development with the landscape. | | |
| CA2 Loddon River Valley: Loddon West | Medium | Construction of new spine road and bridge across the flood plain) | Inherent Mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation and integrate development with the landscape. | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| | | Distant views of new bridge/spine road construction | | Negligible adverse direct | Not significant |
| CA3 Arborfield River Terrace: Arborfield Hall Parkland | Medium | Construction of new buildings and infrastructure | Inherent Mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation and integrate development with the landscape. | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| CA4 Arborfield River Terrace: Loddon East | Medium | Construction of new buildings and infrastructure | | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| CA5 Arborfield and Barkham Settled and Farmed Clay: Mole Road | Medium | Construction of self-build/Gypsy & Traveller/Allotment areas in northern part of area. | | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| | | Retention of some existing fields. | | Not significant | |
| Landscape Features | | | | | |
| Land Use: Grassland | Medium | Land to be replaced by construction site for | None (at construction stage) | Minor adverse direct | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | proposed spine road and bridge. | | | |
| Land Use: Arable Farmland | Medium | Land to be replaced by buildings and associated open space and infrastructure | Incorporation of extensive areas of public open space, with potential for semi-natural landscape typologies. | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| Land Use: Built Form – Hall Place Farmhouse and adjacent cottages | High | Buildings to be retained. | Inherent mitigation. Buildings retained as part of Proposed Development | No change | Not significant |
| Land Use: Built Form – Twentieth Century Farm Buildings and Bungalows | Negligible | Buildings to be demolished. | None (at construction stage) | Negligible adverse direct | Not significant |
| River valley landform and water features | Medium | Route and characteristics of river retained. Culverting of some ditches and localised cut and fill. | None (at construction stage) | Minor adverse direct | Not significant |
| Trees – Ancient Woodland, Trees covered by TPOs, Category A Trees | High | No change | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development avoids all protected trees. | No change | Not significant |
| All other trees | Medium | Loss of small number of category A and B trees and groups of trees, 0.04ha of Rushy Mead and 0.17ha of other non-ancient woodland | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing trees wherever possible. | Minor adverse direct | Not significant |
| Hedgerows | Medium | Removal of 1.25km hedgerows. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing trees wherever possible. | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Access - PRowWs | Medium | Short-term closures when needed to allow adjacent construction/ pathway improvements. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing PRowWs. | Negligible adverse direct | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: North of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Cutbush Lane bridge over M4 (Footpath SHIN39) | Medium | Limited views of construction of new road bridge over M4. | No mitigation. | Negligible neutral | Not significant |
| Users of short stretch of Lower Earley Way parallel to proposed bridge and roundabout | Low | Limited views of construction of changes to existing roundabout and tree removal. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing vegetation wherever possible. | Negligible neutral | Not significant |
| Users of short stretch of southern end of Meldreth Way | Low | Limited views of construction of changes to existing roundabout and tree removal. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing vegetation wherever possible. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |
| Users of M4 motorway | Low | View of construction of new road bridge over M4. | No mitigation. | Minor neutral | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: East of the Site | | | | | |
| Users and Residents of Betty Grove Lane (Byway open to all traffic ARBO5) | Medium | Glimpsed views of construction of Gypsy & Traveller Site and Self-build homes | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of Julkes Lane, Carter's Hill, (ARBO 4A footpath) | Medium | Glimpsed views of construction of allotment to the north and housing to south of Carter's Hill to the south. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Users of Parkcorner Lane, Carter's Hill | Medium | Distant views of construction of self-build plots beyond existing hedgerows in the distance. Clear views of cultivation of new allotment plots in the middle distance. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of Mole Road to the south-east of the Site | Low | Glimpsed views of proposed allotments and Gypsy & Traveller Site near Betty Grove Lane and eastern edge of new housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of PRoW at ARBO9, north of Arborfield Waste Water Treatment Works | Medium | Site screened by existing hedgerows and trees. | No mitigation. | No change | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: South of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Mole Road to the south of the Site | Low | No change. Screening by existing roadside hedgerows. | No mitigation. | No change | Not significant |
| Users of ARBO3 Byway open to all traffic off Church Lane, Wokingham | Medium | Glimpsed views of construction of new housing. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Visitors to St. Bartholmew's Church yard, Arborfield | Medium | Glimpsed views of construction of playing fields and buildings from northern edge of the churchyard. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Users of A327 Arborfield Relief Road/Observer Way | Low | Partial view of new site access and housing construction beyond | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of A327 Reading Road, Arborfield immediately adjacent to the Site's southern boundary | Low | View of construction of new site access and housing construction beyond. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of A327 Arborfield Road, Shinfield | Low | Glimpsed view of new planting and paths in Lourde's Meadow SANG. | No mitigation. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: West of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Shinfield Eastern Relief Road | Low | No changes. | No mitigation. | No change | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: Within the Site | | | | | |
| Users of ARBO5A footpath (joining Betty Grove Lane with Julke's Lane Carter's Hill, to the south of Gravelpit Wood) | Medium | Views of construction of self-build units and cultivation of new allotment in the foreground. | No mitigation | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| Users of ARBO5 Byway open to all traffic (joining Betty Grove Lane with Julke's Lane Carter's Hill, to the north of Gravelpit Wood) | Medium | Views of self-build units under construction from short section of the northern part of the byway. The Construction of proposed spine road glimpsed in the middle distance from a short section to the north of the path. | No mitigation. | Moderate adverse | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Users of ARBO4A Byway open to all traffic (joining Carter's Hill with Mole Road) | Medium | Glimpses of proposed housing under construction to the west. | No mitigation. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of ARBO3 Byway open to all traffic (joining Julke's Lane, Carter's Hill with Church Lane, Arborfield, via CEDAR farm buildings) | Medium | Clear changes from arable fields to construction Site in all directions. | No mitigation. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| ARBO2 footpath connecting the CEDAR farm buildings with Hall Farm | Medium | Changes from arable fields to construction Site. | No mitigation. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| ARBO1 Footpath linking the River Loddon at Hall Farm with Arborfield | Medium | Foreground changes from arable fields to construction Site along the length of this path. | No mitigation. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| SHIN4 footpath, linking Oldhouse Farm with the River Loddon at Hall Farm | High | Views of construction of new pathways and fencing and planting of new trees within the SANG. | No mitigation. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |
| SHIN5 footpath, linking connecting A327 Arborfield Road with the footbridge over the River Loddon at Hall Farm. | Medium | Views of construction of new pathways and fencing and planting of new trees within the SANG. | No mitigation. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |
| SHIN6 footpath, connecting A327 | Medium | | No mitigation. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Arborfield Road with Cutbush Lane East | | | | | |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Landscape Designations | | | | | |
| Draft River Loddon Valued Landscape | Medium | Removal of vegetation and new bridge, spine road and housing in small part of the Valued Landscape | Inherent mitigation: Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation integrate development with the landscape and provide Eco Valley and associated open spaces. | Major adverse (road bridges/spine road/housing) to Moderate beneficial (Eco Valley) | Significant |
| Draft Barkham and Bearwood Valued Landscape | Low | Glimpsed views of new homes to north and west of Mole Road. | Inherent mitigation: designed to minimise view of development from this area | Minor adverse indirect | Not significant |
| Bearwood College Registered Park & Garden | Medium | Glimpsed views of new homes to north and west of Mole Road. | | Minor adverse indirect | Not significant |
| Trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders | High | No changes. | Inherent mitigation: Proposed Development designed to avoid removal of trees covered by TPO. | No impact. | Not significant |
| Landscape Character Areas | | | | | |
| CA1 Loddon River Valley: M4 Corridor | Low | New bridge, spine road and housing in small part of the Valued Landscape | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation and integrate development with the landscape. | Moderate adverse direct (new bridges and roads) to Minor beneficial direct (northern SANG) | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | Part of Eco Valley to south of M4 provides beneficial effect. | | | |
| CA2 Loddon River Valley: Loddon West | Medium | New spine road and bridge across the flood plain Extensive areas of enhanced natural habitats throughout built area and Eco Valley. | Inherent Mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of important landscape features and provide 197ha Eco Valley. | Moderate adverse direct (new bridges and roads) Minor – Moderate beneficial direct (Eco Valley & SANG) | Significant |
| CA3 Arborfield River Terrace: Arborfield Hall Parkland | Medium | New buildings and infrastructure together. Part of Eco Valley/new Neighbourhood Park | Inherent Mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation and integrate development with the landscape. | Moderate adverse direct (built development) Moderate beneficial direct (new spaces) | Significant |
| CA4 Arborfield River Terrace: Loddon East | Medium | Arable farmland replaced with new residential neighbourhood Arable farmland replaced with areas of strategic green space, including parts of SANG link, natural green space & tree planting) | Inherent Mitigation. Proposed Development designed to minimise loss of vegetation, integrate development with the landscape and provide extensive areas of green space | Moderate adverse direct (built development) Moderate beneficial direct (new spaces) | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| CA5 Arborfield and Barkham Settled and Farmed Clay: Mole Road | Medium | Arable farmland replaced by self-build plots, allotments & Gypsy & Traveller Site. | | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| | | Some existing fields would remain undeveloped but with some views towards new homes to the north and south. | | Minor adverse indirect | Not significant |
| Landscape Features | | | | | |
| Land Use: Grassland | Medium | Some grassland would be replaced by spine road construction however majority of grassland would be retained and managed within the Eco Valley. Additional areas of meadow would also be created as part of the SANG and public open spaces. | Inherent mitigation – Proposed Development incorporates extensive areas of semi-natural greenspace within Eco Valley and housing areas. | Major beneficial direct | Significant |
| Land Use: Arable Farmland | Medium | Majority of arable land would be used for development of buildings and open spaces. | No mitigation. | Major adverse direct | Significant |
| Land Use: Built Form – Hall Place Farmhouse and adjacent cottages | High | Buildings to be retained. | Inherent mitigation. Buildings retained as part of Proposed Development | No change | Not significant |
| Land Use: Built Form – Twentieth Century Farm Buildings and Bungalows | Negligible | Buildings to be replaced by open space or new buildings. | Higher quality new buildings or new open space | Negligible beneficial direct | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| River valley landform and water features | Medium | Localised cut and fill to accommodate development. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed designed to minimise effects on valley landform and existing streams and ditches. Potential for new SuDS basins to be designed as new ponds | Negligible adverse direct | Not significant |
| | | Retention of overall valley character and enhanced management of ditches/streams | | Negligible beneficial direct | Not significant |
| | | Embankments to accommodate spine road across the Loddon Valley and the proposed bridges. | | Moderate adverse direct | Significant |
| Trees – Ancient Woodland, Trees covered by TPOs, Category A Trees | High | No change | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development avoids all protected trees. | No change | Not significant |
| All other trees | Medium | High beneficial. Significant numbers of new trees would be planted throughout the Green Infrastructure | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing trees wherever possible. | Major beneficial direct | Significant |
| Hedgerows | Medium | Medium beneficial. Whilst existing hedgerows would be lost, there would be new scrub planting and enhanced management of existing hedgerows. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing hedgerows wherever possible. | Moderate beneficial direct | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Access - PRoWs | Medium | High beneficial. Existing PRoWs retained and new active travel routes provided. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing PRoWs and provide extensive new routes and areas of public access, especially in the Eco Valley area. | Major beneficial direct | Significant |
| Visual Effects: North of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Cutbush Lane bridge over M4 (Footpath SHIN39) | Medium | Distant glimpsed view of new motorway bridge | No mitigation | Negligible neutral | Not significant |
| Users of short stretch of Lower Earley Way parallel to proposed bridge and roundabout | Low | New road bridge would be visible above existing trees in foreground in places. | Inherent mitigation – retention of existing vegetation along Lower Earley Way plus planting of additional trees. | Moderate neutral | Significant |
| Users of short stretch of southern end of Meldreth Way | Low | Increased highway infrastructure and reduced trees in backdrop. | Inherent mitigation – retention of existing vegetation along Lower Earley Way plus planting of additional trees. | Minor adverse | Not Significant |
| Users of M4 motorway | Low | Views of new bridge over the motorway | No mitigation | Moderate neutral | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: East of the Site | | | | | |
| Users and Residents of Betty Grove Lane (Byway open to all traffic ARBO5) | Medium | Glimpsed vies of the proposed gypsy & traveller Site in foreground and self-build plots in distance | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing vegetation wherever possible. Additional mitigation: Planting along boundary with Betty | Minor adverse (with strategic planting) | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | Grove Lane and within open space around self-build units. | | |
| Users of Julkes Lane, Carter's Hill, (ARBO 4A footpath) | Medium | <p>Glimpses of new allotment plots in foreground.</p> <p>Distant glimpsed views of proposed housing to the south of Carter's Hill.</p> | <p>Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing vegetation adjacent to Julkes Lane to provide screening.</p> <p>Additional mitigation: Planting along boundary with Betty Grove Lane and within open space around self-build units and housing to south of Carter's Hill.</p> | Minor adverse (with strategic planting) | Not significant |
| Users of Parkcorner Lane, Carter's Hill | Medium | Distant glimpses of self-build houses, Gypsy and traveller Site and allotments. | <p>Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing hedgerow vegetation.</p> <p>Additional mitigation: Planting along boundary with Betty Grove Lane and within open space around self-build units and housing to south of Carter's Hill.</p> | Negligible adverse | Not significant |
| Users of Mole Road to the south-east of the Site | Low | Glimpsed views of proposed housing and Gypsy and Traveller Site along eastern side of the site. | Inherent mitigation. Proposed Development designed to retain existing hedgerow vegetation. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | | Additional mitigation: Tree planting within open spaces along site's south-eastern boundary. | | |
| Users of PRoW at ARBO9, north of Arborfield Waste Water Treatment Works | Medium | No change | N/A | No change | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: Views to the South of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Mole Road to the south of the Site | Low | No change | N/A | No change | Not significant |
| Users of ARBO3 Byway open to all traffic off Church Lane, Wokingham | Medium | Glimpsed views towards new housing to the north of green lane. | Inherent mitigation. Existing hedgerow retained and housing set back beyond proposed green space. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| Visitors to St. Bartholmew's Church yard, Arborfield | Medium | Glimpsed views of playing fields and clear views of the extension to the grave yard in the foreground. Views of housing and the local centre from the northern part of the church yard. | Inherent mitigation Retention of existing hedgerow around boundary and supplementing with adjacent hedgerow planting. | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of A327 Arborfield Relief Road/Observer Way | Low | Views of new access off the existing roundabout and new housing glimpsed beyond. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow around boundary | Minor adverse | Not significant |
| Users of A327 Reading Road, Arborfield immediately adjacent to | Low | Views of new access off the existing roundabout and new housing glimpsed beyond. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow around boundary | Moderate adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| the Site's southern boundary | | | | | |
| Users of A327 Arborfield Road, Shinfield | Low | Views of new trees and paths within Lourde's Meadow SANG area. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow. | Negligible beneficial | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: Views to West of the Site | | | | | |
| Users of Shinfield Eastern Relief Road | Low | Views of new trees and paths within Eco Valley. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow | Negligible beneficial | Not significant |
| Visual Effects: Views Within the Site | | | | | |
| Users of ARBO5A footpath (joining Betty Grove Lane with Julke's Lane Carter's Hill, to the south of Gravelpit Wood) | Medium | Views of self-build units and new allotment Site. Distant views towards proposed housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow and provision of new trees. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| Users of ARBO5 Byway open to all traffic (joining Betty Grove Lane with Julke's Lane Carter's Hill, to the north of Gravelpit Wood) | Medium | Glimpsed view towards proposed electricity sub-station to north and self-build units to the south. Distant views towards proposed housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | Inherent mitigation. Retention of existing hedgerow and woodland. Additional mitigation. Strategic planting adjacent to the path and around housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | Moderate adverse | Not significant |
| Users of ARBO4A Byway open to all traffic (joining Carter's Hill with Mole Road) | Medium | Glimpsed views through foreground hedgerows towards housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | Additional planting adjacent to hedgerow in foreground or in open space to north of housing to the south of Carter's Hill. | Negligible adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Users of ARBO3 Byway open to all traffic (joining Julke's Lane, Carter's Hill with Church Lane, Arborfield, via CEDAR farm buildings) | Medium | Clear views of new built infrastructure beyond green corridor in foreground. | Additional tree planting within the green corridor. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| ARBO2 footpath connecting the CEDAR farm buildings with Hall Farm | Medium | <p>Transient full view of a proposed green corridor/secondary street. There would be clear foreground changes from arable fields to a linear corridor.</p> <p>Mitigation planting would primarily comprise street trees, given the new route a leafy character.</p> | Additional tree planting within the green corridor. | Moderate adverse | Significant |
| ARBO1 Footpath linking the River Loddon at Hall Farm with Arborfield | Medium | Transient view along an existing park avenue. There would be clear foreground changes from arable fields to new housing to the south and the secondary school and playing fields to the north. The layout provides limited space for tree planting. | No mitigation. | Major adverse | Significant |
| SHIN4 footpath, linking Oldhouse Farm with the River Loddon at Hall Farm | High | No views of built development construction from here. The only changes | No mitigation necessary. | Negligible beneficial | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| SHIN5 footpath, linking connecting A327 Arborfield Road with the footbridge over the River Loddon at Hall Farm. | Medium | would be new pathways, fencing and trees within the SANG. | No mitigation necessary. | Negligible beneficial | Not significant |
| SHIN6 footpath, connecting A327 Arborfield Road with Cutbush Lane East | Medium | | No mitigation necessary. | Negligible beneficial | Not significant |
| Noise & Vibration | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| NSRs | Medium | Noise from construction | Adherence to a CEMP and good construction practice with regards to noise and vibration. | Negligible to Minor Adverse | Not Significant. |
| NSRs | Medium | Noise from construction traffic | Following the construction traffic data assessment, it is determined that mitigation would not be necessary to protect NSRs from road traffic noise. | Negligible Adverse | Not Significant. |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| NSRs | Medium | Noise from operation of plant/outdoor sports facilities | Appropriate design, selection of plant and physical mitigation, if required. | Negligible to Minor Adverse | Not significant |
| NSRs | Medium | Noise from operational traffic | No requirement for mitigation identified. | Negligible Adverse | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|---|----------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Socio-economics | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Effects on residents of the Study Area who could work on the construction of the Proposed Development | Low | The Proposed Development could have an impact of low magnitude on the low sensitivity construction workers of the Study Area. This could result in a temporary beneficial effect of slight significance. | None | Stays the same | Not significant |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Effects on residents of the Study Area who could benefit from employment opportunities at the Proposed Development once operational | Medium | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial impact of low magnitude on the medium sensitivity residents of the Study Area, who could benefit from employment opportunities at the Proposed Development once operational | None | Stays the same | Not significant |
| Existing and future residents of the Housing Market Area looking for a dwelling in the area | Medium | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial effect of high magnitude on the Existing and future residents of the Housing Market Area looking for a dwelling in the area | None | Stays the same | Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---|---|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | This could result in a permanent beneficial effect of large significance, which is significant in EIA terms | | | |
| Effects on children in the local area using or seeking access to early years provision | Low | The Proposed Development is estimated to have an adverse impact of low magnitude on the low receptor sensitivity existing and future residents of Wokingham seeking access to childcare services, this results in a permanent adverse effect of slight significance, which is not significant in EIA terms. | It is recommended that the capacity of early years providers in the area should be kept under review at the Reserved Matters Application Stage to identify preferable opportunities to meet demand from the Proposed Development, for instance via the on-site provision of nursery space within the proposed local centre. | Stays the same | Not significant |
| Effects on children in the local area using or seeking access to primary education | Medium | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial impact of low magnitude on the medium sensitivity children seeking access to primary schools. This could result in a permanent beneficial effect of slight significance. | None | Stays the same | Not significant |
| Effects on children in the local area using or seeking access to secondary education | Low | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial impact of medium magnitude on the low sensitivity of children seeking access to secondary schools. This could result in | None | Stays the same | Not significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|--|--|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | | a permanent beneficial effect of slight significance. | | | |
| Effects on residents in the local area using or seeking access to open space | Medium | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial impact of medium magnitude on the medium sensitivity residents seeking access to open space. This could result in a permanent beneficial effect of moderate significance. | None | Stays the same | Significant |
| Local residents access to community infrastructure | Low | The Proposed Development is estimated to have a beneficial impact of low magnitude on the low sensitivity residents seeking access to community infrastructure. This could result in a permanent beneficial effect of slight significance. | None | Stays the same | Not significant |
| Transport & Access | | | | | |
| Construction Phase | | | | | |
| Formation of Access Junction onto Arborfield Road Corridor | Medium | Driver Delay | Construction Environmental Management Plan | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Formation of Access Junction onto Lower Early Way Corridor | Medium | Driver Delay | Construction Environmental Management Plan | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Adjacent Road Network | Various | Non Motorised User Amenity | Construction Environmental Management Plan | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Operation Phase | | | | | |
| Hatch Farm Way | Low | Community Severance | New signal crossing | Minor Beneficial | Not Significant |
| Shinfield Eastern Relief Road | Low | Community Severance | New signal and uncontrolled crossings | Minor Beneficial | Not Significant |
| Arborfield Road | Medium | Community Severance | New signal and uncontrolled crossings | Minor Beneficial | Not Significant |
| Observer Way | Low | Community Severance | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Meldreth Way | Medium | Community Severance | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Mole Road / Mill Land Roundabout | High | Driver Delay | Junction Improvement Scheme | Negligible | Not Significant |
| King Street Lane/ Hatch Farm Way Signal Junction | High | Driver Delay | Junction Improvement Scheme | Negligible | Not Significant |
| Hatch Farm Way | Low | Non Motorised User Delay | New signal crossing | Negligible | Not Significant |
| Shinfield Road | High | Non Motorised User Delay | New uncontrolled crossings | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |

| Receptor | Receptor Sensitivity | Description of potential impact | Proposed mitigation | Residual effect | Significant / not significant |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Shinfield Eastern Relief Road | Low | Non Motorised User Delay | New signal and uncontrolled crossings | Negligible | Not Significant |
| Arborfield Road | Low | Non Motorised User Delay | New signal and uncontrolled crossings | Negligible | Not Significant |
| Observer Way | Low | Non Motorised User Delay | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Mill Lane (north of M4) | Medium | Non Motorised User Amenity | Closure to Through Traffic | Moderate Beneficial | Significant |
| B3270 | Low | Fear & Intimidation | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Arborfield Road | Low | Fear & Intimidation | New shared use footway / cycleway and new signal and uncontrolled crossings | Minor Beneficial | Not Significant |
| Observer Way | Low | Fear & Intimidation | None | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |
| Surrounding Road Network | Varies | Road Safety | Active Travel Network Improvements | Minor Adverse | Not Significant |