

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX**

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	Z0003.24	Brief description of the project / development	Up to 500 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and up to 7,000 sqm of floorspace in Use Classes E (retail, office, professional services, healthcare, nursery, café), F1 (education), F2 (local community uses) and Sui Generis (pub, hot food takeaway) across seven blocks.
Applicant	London Borough of Havering		
LPA	London Borough of Havering		
2. EIA DETAILS			
Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations?		No	
If YES, which description of development (THEN GO TO Q4)		---	
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?		Yes	
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?		(b) Urban development projects (ii) the development includes more than 150 dwellings	
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?		No	
If YES, which area?		---	
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?		Yes	
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?		More than 1 hectare of urban development and more than 150 dwellings	
3. LPA/SOS SCREENING			
Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued)		No	
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?		---	
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?		---	
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the applicant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?		N/A	

WHEN COMPLETING THIS DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO AN ENFORCEMENT APPEAL, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICER HAS HAD REGARD TO THE PROJECT AS ALLEGED IN THE RELEVANT ENFORCEMENT NOTICE WHEN REFERRING TO THE PROJECT / DEVELOPMENT.

A Screening Criteria Question		B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))	
		Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)	Is a significant effect likely, having regard particularly to the magnitude and spatial extent (including population size affected), nature, intensity and complexity, probability, expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact and the possibility to effectively reduce the impact? If the finding of no significant effect is reliant on specific features or measures of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment these should be identified in bold.	
5. NATURAL RESOURCES				
Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	No	The site currently slopes gently down towards the north with elevations ranging from 42m AOD in the north and 44m AOD in the south. The existing District Centre provides level access from the surrounding area and would be fundamental to the success of any new District Centre having a good level of inclusive access. Although the proposal would involve substantial demolition and construction it is anticipated the topography would not be substantially changed.	N/A	N/A
5.1 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources above or below ground such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy which are non-renewable or in short supply?	No	It is not envisaged that there would be a significant use of natural resources in either the construction or operation of the proposed development. Nonetheless, development would have to be carried out in accordance with adopted Building Regulations and would be controlled via a planning condition for a Construction Environmental Management Plan [CEMP].		

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	It is not considered that the proposal would result in the use of any natural resources that are considered to be in short supply.	
5.2 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No The development will not take place in an area which is designated for its geology. The surrounding area being predominately residential is not known to contain resources which could be affected by the proposal.	
6. WASTE		
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes All of the existing structures on the Site would be demolished except for Harold Hill Library which would be retained. The demolition and construction of the Development would be undertaken broadly in two phases. Phase one would be located in the northern/north-western part of the Site adjacent to Hilddene Avenue and would comprise the demolition of existing structures and the construction of three blocks. The construction of these blocks would include the re-provision of key retail units which are currently located in the southern portion of the Site, as well as residential units. Phase two would be located in the southern part of the Site and would comprise the demolition of existing structures and the construction of four blocks. These blocks would also comprise commercial and residential units.	No In respect of waste arising from de-commissioning and construction the proposal would be principally considered against London Plan Policy SI 7 (Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy). An application would require the proposal to promote circular economy outcomes and should aim to be net zero-waste. It would be expected to demonstrate that amongst other criteria that: - materials arising from demolition and remediation works will be re-used and/or recycled - how the proposal's design and construction will reduce material demands and enable building materials, components and products to be disassembled and re-used at the end of their useful life, and, - opportunities for managing as much waste as possible on site Waste arising from the construction stage will also be dealt with and disposed via a CEMP and site waste management plan which would be required via a planning condition. These would identify opportunities in conjunction with consideration of London Plan Policy for waste

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
			minimisation, segregation and the transfer to appropriate processing facilities. It is therefore not anticipated that the effect from waste arising from the de-commissioning and construction development would be environmentally significant. Operational waste will be produced by end users, however, this would not be expected to be unusual or hazardous.
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES			
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	The applicant has undertaken a search of the UK Pollutant Release and Transfer Register website and has not identified any significant industrial or waste management sources that are likely to affect the Development, in terms of air quality. However, as a result of de-commissioning/demolition it could result in the release of particles within the fabric of existing structure / buildings such as asbestos and dust (due to the age of construction and likelihood of materials containing harmful particles).	No However, appropriate controls under best practice can be put into place and securement prior to commencement of any work of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). This would minimise airborne pollution to ensure that no significant levels will be created to pose a public health risk. Subject to any recommended mitigation measures during the construction phase, the proposals would not generate pollution or nuisances which would be significant.
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	The demolition and construction works could have the potential to give rise to activities such as foundation piling and noise nuisance including noise from plant and machinery as well as noise from construction traffic. It is not anticipated that the demolition and construction works would release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation which would be significant.	No The cumulative effect of the activities associated with demolition and construction of the development (taking in account the phased nature) would be effectively managed by a CEMP. As such it is considered the effect would not be significant. When fully operational it is considered the effect of noise and vibration would not be significantly indifferent to the existing District Centre.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	It is considered the operation of the completed Development would not generate significant noise and vibration effects or indeed light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation.	
7.3 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?	Yes The site and the surrounding Harold Hill underwent rapid change from agricultural land to a suburban area starting the 1950s. Although the area has experienced alterations it has remained largely unchanged from initial development. There would however be a risk associated with made ground and possible contaminants within. A Phase I investigation has been undertaken which considers the risk to ground contamination. There are some uncertainties and further action is required to assess the risk to future site users from existing businesses within the centre and effecting made ground (i.e. business activity such as dry cleaning, tanning and nail salons).	No Although there are data gaps and uncertainties in the Phase I Investigation these are not considered to be to be significant. Further investigation to inform the contamination linkages would involve understanding the risk to made ground from current/previous land uses within the District Centre. An intrusive ground investigation would be undertaken which would establish the ground conditions across the site, to assess the shallow soil and perched water (if present) and to assess underlying ground gas regime. Taking the historic ground condition into account and that an intrusive ground investigation would fully explore the likelihood of contamination it is considered the effect to not be significant.
7.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?	No The Site is located within an established suburban area and there are no known contributing factors to suggest there is pollution or environmental damage.	
8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH		
8.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?	No It is not considered that there are relevant and likely major accidents or disasters.	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
8.2 Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution)	Yes Given the site is bound by residential areas there would be a risk to human health arising from demolition and construction activities. The Site is located within the Havering Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The AQMA has been declared for exceedances of annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) and exceedances of 24-hour mean particulate matter (PM10). Therefore the surrounding area is sensitive to activities associated with demolition, construction and the end operation.	No Ground risks would be identify and appraised through an intrusive investigation. Although the Phase I survey has determined a low risk a Phase II investigation would identify remediation measures to make the development safe. Taking into account the previous use of the land prior to the construction of the current district centre it is anticipated that a potential risk to human health can be mitigated. With regard to airborne pollutants a combination of mitigating measures purported by an air quality assessment, noise impact assessment and a CEMP could be employed to reduce the effect on health. The nature of the development will not cause a significant risk to human health during demolition, construction and final use. Best working practices are required to be carried out during construction to limit any risks to human health during the construction stage and will be secured as part of the CEMP. As such taking into account the mitigation measures which can be secured by planning condition it is considered the effect to human health would not be significant.
9. WATER RESOURCES		
9.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	Yes The nearest water course is Paines Brook, an Environment Agency Main River that flows broadly south approximately 375m to the east of the Site. It is noted the site sits entirely within flood zone 1 as identified on the EA flood zone mapping. This would suggest the site would have a low risk of fluvial flooding.	No A Flood Risk assessment concludes the proposal would satisfy relevant national and local policy in regards to flood risk. It is considered to be an appropriate use of land within a low risk area of flooding. The implementation of best practice environmental management controls would ensure appropriate surface water drainage of the

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	The Site is also at a low risk of coastal/tidal flooding or flooding from sewers, reservoirs, canals, ponds, groundwater or other artificial sources. The Environment Agency shows the Site to be at low risk from surface water flooding with a chance of flooding of between 0.1% and 1% each year.	construction site, thereby ensuring no occurrence of significant localised surface water flooding during construction. It is anticipated that the Development would ensure inherent design measures of the Development are incorporated to safeguard against surface water and groundwater flooding risks and effects at the Site and elsewhere, even accounting for climate change (such as SuDs if shown to be feasible). As such the completed and operational Development is not anticipated to generate significant effects or risks in relation to flooding and drainage.

10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)

10.1 Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, or any non-designated / non-classified areas which are important or sensitive for reasons of their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project? (e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other water-bodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, undesignated nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local))).	No	There are no statutory or non-statutory sites on or adjacent to the boundary of the Site. There are two Statutory Designations (Local Nature Reserve, LNR) within 1.2 km of the site, with the closest being 880m west of the site. There are five Non-Statutory Sites (Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) within 1km of the site. They are considered to be adequately distanced from the Site so that they would not be directly or indirectly affected by demolition or construction activity.	N/A	N/A
10.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting,	Yes	The buildings on Site were identified as having low potential to support roosting bats. Owing to the urban context and existing lighting levels roosting potential is considered to be low. Vegetation is focussed towards the northern end	No	Ecology matters are explored within the submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal with mitigation measures aimed at protecting the current level of wildlife and roosting potential within the site.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?		of the site and therefore assessed with low potential to support foraging bats. The potential for roosting birds is considered high due to the presence of trees within the northern part of the site of a range of common and widespread bird species.	The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal sets out a dusk emergence survey would be undertaken to establish the presence or likely absence of roosting bats. Should bats be found a mitigation strategy under Natural England licence would be undertaken to mitigate the bat's roosting habitat prior to demolition. As such it considered the effect to not be significant in EIA terms.
11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL			
11.1 Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	The Site is not situated within any area designated in recognition of its landscape or townscape quality or value at either a statutory or non-statutory level. Given the relatively low building heights in the surrounding area there would be an effect the townscape setting as the proposal would see a stepped increase. However, it is not anticipated that the height differential to be significant in EIA terms.	N/A
11.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)	Yes	The presence of a construction site would give rise to visible hoardings, plant and machinery and other activities associated with the Works. These features and activities would be present to the immediate surrounding residential properties and to visitors to the centre while operating and to passers-by. The site is visible from multiple angles at ground floor and longer range views from the south	No Any townscape and visual effects associated with the demolition and construction phase(s) would be limited, localised and temporary. Hoardings can be decorated if present for prolonged lengths of time to improve visual amenity. While an increase of height and massing would be notable given the difference with the existing District Centre this would be considered against a backdrop of an existing suburban area and

¹ See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	(Dartfields and King's Lynn Drive) due to the rise in topography.	generated informed views in a Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) which would accompany a planning application. The effect on views and the townscape would be considered against other factors in the planning balance. The height and massing differential is considered to not however be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations.
12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY		
12.1 Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No The Site is not within a Conservation Area, the nearest Listed Building is 940m west of the Site boundary. In respect of archaeological value it is noted the site is not situated within an Archaeological Priority Area. It has been supported by an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment the archaeological potential within the site is low and is restricted to post-medieval archaeological remains of low significance. Although there might still be the possibility of findings within the site it would not exceed the threshold to be of significance or present particularly complex environmental implications.	
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS		
13.1 Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?	Yes The site is currently a fully operational district centre serving the needs of the local community. The existing shops and facilities attract customers with car parking and is well served by a local bus network which connects to Harold Wood (Elizabeth Line) leading to central London.	No It is considered that an increase in motor and non-motorised traffic would not be of particular significance or present particularly complex environmental implications.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	Taking into account the urban setting, the district centre results in a significant flow of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles which travel by different means of transportation. Indeed, while there is a proposed reduction in commercial floor space and uplift in residential homes within the site it is anticipated that theatre would be an increase in trip generation resulting in an increase of circa 200 two way trips (existing 1,988 and proposed 2,196).	
13.2 Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No The site and existing District Centre is located within an established post war residential extension to Harold Hill. Routes to and from the District Centre are well known and used but not to a level of significant congestion. The phased demolition and development of the District Centre would be controlled through appropriate planning condition to ensure the movements associated with the demolition and development assimilate into the existing road network without causing significant undue harm to existing levels of congestion. During operation although the Site has a PTAL rating of 1b to 2, which indicates a low level of accessibility to public transport there are connections adjacent to the northern boundary on Hilldene Avenue. The Number 174, 256, 297 and 499 bus routes run directly past the Site offering connections to Rainham, Romford, Noak Hill and Hornchurch and Harold Wood station which provides direct services to London Paddington Station along the Elizabeth Line. Given the public transport options and cycling options it is considered unlikely that there would	

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	be any significant cumulative effects with respect to transport and traffic related effects.	
14. LAND USE		
14.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? E.g. housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes Harold Hill library will be retained within the site – The library and visitors will be effected during the demolition and construction phase of the development. Dust, noise, vibration and odour will all have an effect on the library function and on accessing and egressing visitors. St Andrews Church and adjacent funeral parlour is located immediately to the south of the District Centre on the opposite side of Chippenham Road. The church and funeral parlour would be subject to dust, noise, vibration and odour associated with the demolition and construction phase of the proposal. Given the site is bound by established residential areas on all sides of the site there would be disruption incurred during the demolition and construction phases in respect of dust, noise, vibration and odour. In terms of operation the proposal would affect the above land uses in the following ways: Harold Hill Library, St Andrews Church, funeral parlour and residential areas would likely see a change to the level of daylight, sunlight and outlook from property windows and private garden spaces. An increase in overlooking and the sense of being overlooked. Increased pedestrians and vehicular activity using the existing network safely.	No There would be a considerable level of disruption and effect to the surrounding land uses during demolition and construction. However, the effect and impact to the surrounding residential and non-residential uses can be appropriately managed through a CEMP. This would allow consideration for any phasing of the scheme to coincide with existing uses inside and outside of the site. A significant effect would be mitigated and that public safety would be maintained at all times during demolition and construction. It is likely that would be a change to the level of daylight, sunlight and outlook. It has been modelled (with and without the cumulative effect from the Chippenham Road proposal) that a significant percentage would retain good VSC, NSL and ASPH levels. Although the level of impact to individual properties and buildings need to be fully considered the level of compliance with the BRE would result in not warranting an ES on the basis of the impact to surrounding properties. A relocation strategy can be secured by planning condition to minimise disruption to existing businesses who would look to relocate to the new District Centre. The CEMP would also allow considering of existing businesses and how the impact of demolition and construction is managed taking into account the level of business which might be affected.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	Existing retailers and commercial uses within the site would experience disruption, changes to footfall, different means of deliveries and servicing and temporary or permanent closure.	
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes Beyond the northern side of Hilddene Avenue planning permission has been approved for a new family welcome centre under LPA Ref: P0461.22. The approved scheme, currently under construction in effect comprises Phase I of the Farnham & Hilddene Estate Regeneration. Phase II of the Farnham & Hilddene Estate Regeneration is south of the site between Chippenham Road and King's Lynn Drive. It is anticipated this will comprise the demolition of the existing buildings on the site with the subsequent erection of circa 140 homes.	No The two sites bookend the site and cumulatively with the proposal form the three phases of the Farnham & Hilddene Estate Regeneration Masterplan. Extensive consultation has been undertaken with the public on each emerging Phase through the stages prior to submission of a planning application. While the phases form the overall masterplan they have been designed to be brought forward independently but still with close ties between each site. It is considered the effect of each phase and how they interplay with other Phases within the Masterplan would not result in a significant effect.
15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE		
15.1 Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic conditions, e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?	No The site is not in an area susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion or extreme, adverse climatic conditions.	
16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS		
16.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes As noted above the proposal forms part of a three phase masterplan for the redevelopment of Harold Hill. Although the three phases are being	No However, given the sites are intrinsically linked the disruption and effect of demolition and construction would be managed through detailed

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))	
		brought forward separately the demolition and construction stages will overlap. In respect of the operational phase it is likely there would an overlap with construction of the earlier phases being built out.		CEMPs to ensure the sites are brought forward in a timely and safe manner. In respect of the operational phase there would be the remnants the construction of earlier phases still being carried out, however, these would be relatively short lived as the re-development of the District Centre is the later phase. After completion of the construction the District Centre would be viewed and used in conjunction with the two residential led development and phases. Over time the three phases would assimilate with the existing surrounding area.
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No	Given the location of the site and scale of the proposals, no significant transboundary impact is expected.		

² The Regulations require consideration of the transboundary nature of the impact. Due to the England's geographical location the vast majority of TCPA cases are unlikely to result in transboundary impacts.

18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Schedule 3 is to consider the likely significant effects of the development on the environment in relation to the criteria set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 of that Schedule, namely the characteristics and location of development taking account of the following:

The magnitude and spatial extent of the impact (for example geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected)

The primary receptors are likely to be the non-residential uses within the site and the occupiers of nearby residential properties. Given the nature of the proposed development and how it would integrate with the phased development of the Masterplan area, it is considered that the development would not give rise of adversity given the nature of the proposed development and that the proposal is not significantly in different than the current use off the site. The proposed development would be considered appropriate in this location and sit well within the setting.

The nature of the impact

Construction works will be temporary and the impacts controlled and mitigated. Long term impacts of the development will be addressed at the application stage to safeguard ecology, environmental health and amenity.

The transboundary nature of the impact

No anticipated impacts

The intensity and complexity of the impact

The probability of impact on resources and the surrounding environment would be relatively low. The extent of the impact would be localised and on a relatively small population. The anticipated developmental effects can be managed effectively through the implementation of standard mitigation measures to be secured through planning conditions.

The probability of the impact

Any impacts arising from the loss of existing vegetation and site clearance works are unavoidable, however, these impacts reconsidered to be well below the significant threshold to warrant an EIA. There is considered to be a moderate degree of possibility of construction impact to the environment, particularly in respect of air quality, noise, vibration and highways operations. These areas will have to be addressed and mitigated through the submission of a number of assessments and strategies. Any unexpected issues, for instance contamination and archaeological finds will be safeguarded at application stage and via planning condition.

The expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact

The development would be both permanent and irreversible. The development would have the potential to have some non-significant environmental impacts upon the surrounding area for an extended period of time. The CTMP and CEMP should mitigate much of the impact. Long term impacts will be addressed at application stage via a full suite of reports and consultation with statutory and non-statutory consultees.

The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development

During construction there will be some noise, air and traffic impacts. These may cause adverse impacts however these impacts will only be temporary as vehicles use the existing infrastructure around the site. Management Plans will identify and address such issues and planning conditions will be imposed to mitigate such impacts.

The possibility of effectively reducing the impact

Temporary impacts would be reduced via the Construction Management Plans. Medium to long-term impacts would be addressed through mitigation measures and through discussions with the council and local stakeholders.

The proposed development has been screened in accordance with schedule 3 and considered in cumulation with existing development and the proposed development in the vicinity. The assessment concludes that the proposal, whether alone or in cumulation with the existing and proposed development, would be unlikely to give rise to effects on the environment that cannot be adequately assessed through the planning application process.

On the basis of the submitted information, the proposal is a Schedule 2 development (10b) of the EIA Regulations. In light of the above considerations and the relatively low impacts which the development would have on environmental resources in the locality and on a wider scale, it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development would not constitute Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Development and an Environmental Statement (ES) would not therefore be required.

Based on the consideration of criteria for proposals within Section 10 (b) and guidance contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance it is considered that an EIA WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.

19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	N/A
--	-----

Is it necessary to issue a SD?	N/A
--------------------------------	-----

Is an ES required?	No
--------------------	----

20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)	OUTCOME	
--	---------	--

Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
--	-------------	--

Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	X
--	-----------------	---

More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	
--	----------------------	--

21. REASON FOR SCREENING

The proposal is an infrastructure project comprising an urban development project of more than 150 dwellings thereby exceeding the threshold of Schedule Two under criterion 10(b).

NAME	Simon Thelwell
DATE	29 th July 2024