

Horsham District Council Screening Assessment

HDC Reference: CH/Scr/15/08

Applicant Reference: DC/15/1242

Development Proposal: Minor Material Amendment to planning permission DC/10/13/14 – redevelopment of Abingworth Nursery for 146 dwellings

EIA Regulations	
Is the proposed development listed in schedule 1?	No
Is the proposed development listed in Schedule 2? (Note 'wide of scope, broad of purpose' legal judgement)	Yes. This site has a complex planning history. Two separate but linked applications have been submitted and permission has been granted. To the north west of Thakeham, permission has been granted for the demolition of existing and construction of a new mushroom growing facility (most recent application is DC/12/0841). To the south, permission has been granted for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of 146 dwellings and associated community facilities (DC/10/1314). These sites have both been subject to screening opinions in the past. For the purposes of EIA assessment, this application and DC/12/0841 are considered as one linked development. Further to DC/14/2161 (which was also subject to screening), this application seeks a minor amendment of the pitches, village hall, changing rooms and shop and consequently the rearrangement of the 21 residential properties surrounding the cricket pitch. Whilst the site falls below the new screening threshold of 150 homes, both this site and the land to the north are still above the site area threshold of 5ha, and it is therefore necessary to screen this application to determine if the proposed amendments to the site will generate significant environmental impacts as to require an EIA to be submitted with the application.
Is the proposed development in a sensitive area as defined in Regulation 2? (SSSI, National Park, property on World Heritage List, Scheduled monuments, AONB, SPA or SAC)	No

Schedule 3 – Selection Criteria for Screening Schedule 2 Development

1. Characteristics of Development	Description (include permanent / temporary impacts, positive and / or negative impacts / likelihood of impact as applicable)	Significance
a) Size of development (e.g. site area, scale)	Cumulatively, this development location totals a site area of over 30 ha. This element of the proposal is smaller and totals 146 homes which is just short of the new screening threshold for housing developments although it still qualifies for screening due to the overall site area. The proposed amendment to the scheme does not change the overall scale or quantum of development.	Overall the proposal lies within an existing area where permission for development has been granted, and the overall development and quantum of development has not changed.
b) cumulation with other development	As has already been stated, the proposals for development on this site are connected to DC/12/0841 for redevelopment of the mushroom farm. Any development on this site must be considered in cumulation with the impacts from this development. There are however no other developments within the immediate vicinity of the site. It should however be noted that there are a number of housing applications in Storrington that have or are seeking permission – the cumulative impacts of these schemes (taking into account this site) have already been considered as part of those applications.	
c) the use of natural resources (e.g. land, water, materials, energy – non renewable or in short supply?)	This application area covers an area of previously developed land, and would not therefore result in the loss of arable land compared with other greenfield proposals. As the scale and development location remains as that contained in the original application, there are no additional impacts to natural resources that would have significant environmental impacts.	Low
d) the production of waste (demolition, construction, operation and decommissioning?)	As set out in the original application, this proposal includes an element of demolition. This was not considered of sufficient significance to require an EIA, and as the proposed alteration to the scheme does not impact further on this issue, there is no change in the original conclusion.	No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.
e) pollution and nuisances (e.g. potential for noise, dust, vibration, light, odours, production of substances / emissions which may damage environment -construction, operation and decommissioning t)	As set out in the original application, this proposal includes an element of demolition which has the potential to generate pollution and nuisances such as noise. This was not considered of sufficient significance to require an EIA, and as the proposed alteration to the scheme does not impact further on this issue, there is no change in the original conclusion.	No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.

f) the risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances or technologies used	Taking into account legislative requirements etc, the risk of accidents associated with the demolition and subsequent development is considered to be low and has not changed since the previous application.	Low – as per DC/10/1314
--	---	-------------------------

2. Location of Development: the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by development must be considered having regard, in particular to	Description (include permanent / temporary impacts, positive and / or negative impacts / likelihood of impact as applicable)	Significance
a) the existing land use	The application site comprises an area of brownfield land, formerly used for the production of mushrooms. The proposed development is also connected to DC/12/0841 which is brownfield development. This proposal does not increase the overall land area of the development parcel, but instead alters the layout of a small part of the development.	Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.
b) the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area (common land use? Quality of land / designations / protected species – would development lead to irreversible loss of key qualities or resources in the area?)	This element of the development is on brownfield land, as is the proposed redevelopment of the mushroom production facility DC/12/0841. Development on this site is not therefore likely to have significant additional impacts on the quality or regenerative capacity of natural resources.	Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.
c) the absorption capacity of the natural environment, paying particular attention to		
i) wetlands (e.g. floodplains, impacts on drainage, aquifers)	The site is not identified as being at risk from flooding or being close to any significant wetland areas. The changed layout has the potential to alter on-site surface water drainage patterns. An updated SFRA has been submitted to support the revised application. The outcome of this study does not identify significant new impacts, although adverse impacts will need to be controlled using SUDS.	Medium / low: Whilst development will impact surface water drainage, data submitted does not indicate that these will have significant environmental impacts.
ii) coastal zones (any potential for the scheme to impact on coastal areas e.g. runoff etc)	N/A	Low
iii) mountain and forest areas (impacts on wooded areas, including any designated areas of ancient woodland / TPOs).	N/A	Low
iv) nature reserves and parks (e.g. any impacts on designated nature conservation sites / other areas of nature conservation importance?)	There are no nature reserves or parks in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site.	Low
v) areas classified or protected under Member States' legislation; areas designated by Member states pursuant	The nearest SPA's and SACs to this site are at Pulborough Brooks and the Mens woodland. Mitigation measures in place as a result of	Low

<p>to Directive 79/409/EEC (conservation of wild birds) and Directive 92/43/EEC (conservation of habitats and fauna) (In particular the Arun valley SPA and The Mens -Barbastelle bat flightlines are a key consideration here. Any other European protected species present that could be affected?)</p>	<p>the Council's HRA of the Core Strategy mean that this development will not have a significant adverse impact on either of these sites. An updated ecological assessment has been submitted in support of the area directly impacted by the changes set out in this development. The study concluded there is no evidence of protected species on the site and that the ecological value of the site is likely to have fallen since the previous assessments due to increased levels of maintenance of this area.</p>	
<p>vi) areas in which the environmental quality standards laid down in Community legislation have already been exceeded (any areas already subject to pollution or damage – include impact on any AQMAs).</p>	<p>This proposal will alter the access arrangements to the site, but does not change the overall quantum of development. It is noted that a transport assessment addendum has been provided which does not identify any additional impacts. Furthermore it is the scale of development which could have impacts on the AQMA to the south of Thakeham in Storrington. This has already been considered as part of the extant application and the proposed change will not have any additional impact.</p>	<p>Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.</p>
<p>vii) densely populated areas (size of population affected, changes to demography, lifestyles, employment etc)</p>	<p>The population of Thakeham parish at the 2011 census was 1816. The residents that would be most affected by this proposal are those living opposite the site. The development will have impacts on these residents particularly during the construction phase in relation to noise and dust, but these are relatively short term and temporary in nature. The scale and nature of development remains as proposed in the original application, and the impacts (including the positive impacts such as the provision of a village shop) have not changed in their significance since the original EIA Screening Opinion.</p>	<p>Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.</p>
<p>viii) landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance</p>	<p>The site is not subject to any landscape or heritage designations. The site is however partially greenfield and development of this land will result in changes to the landscape. The revised site layout places the football and cricket pitches on the northern edge of the site which is currently greenfield or existing leisure use. This will minimise any impacts of the changes and they are not considered to be so significant that they would require an EIA. A revised landscape assessment has concluded that there are no material changes to the initial proposals.</p>	<p>Low – medium given lack of constraints and layout to include open space on edge of development. No revised landscape assessment available so full impact difficult to assess at this stage.</p>

3. Characteristics of the potential impact: The potential significant effects of development must be considered in relation to criteria set out under 1 & 2, having particular regard to	Description	Significance
a) the extent of the impact (geographical area and size of the affected population)	The proposal does not increase the geographical extent of the existing proposals for this area. As set out above the population of the parish is 1816, although those directly affected will be lower. The impacts will not change significantly from that of the original proposal.	Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.
b) the transfrontier nature of the impact (any international impacts?)	N/A	None
c) the magnitude and complexity of the impact (e.g. overall size, scale, combination of impacts)	Overall, this development does will increase the scale of development in the Thakeham area than currently exists, but this application does not add to the quantum of development over and above the existing permission.	Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.
d) the probability of the impact (e.g. overall probability of impacts identified above)	The construction impacts such as noise and loss of some greenfield land are highly probable in the event that development takes place.	
e) the duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact (demolition, construction, operation and decommissioning)	Demolition and construction impacts would be temporary, but the operational stages of the development will be more permanent.	Low. No additional impacts over those in DC/10/1314 which was not an EIA development.

Conclusion

EIA Required?	No
Statement of reasons	<p>This proposal is for an amendment to the layout of the proposed development of 146 homes at Abingworth Nurseries in Thakeham. This proposal has been granted permission (DC/10/1314), and a screening opinion was issued which did not find such significant impacts arising from the scheme as to require an EIA. The site area and the potential cumulation of impacts with the redevelopment of land at for development for a new mushroom growing facility (most recent application is DC/12/0841) require this updated application to be subject to a further screening opinion.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the original scheme relate to the layout of the development rather than its scale or location and many impacts are therefore unchanged in significance from the 2010 decision. By altering the layout of the scheme, there is potential for drainage, biodiversity and landscape impacts arising from the scheme to alter. Additional FRA, landscape and ecological assessments have been provided and no significant impacts have been identified, although further information may still be required to assist the determination of the planning application.</p>

	Overall, it is considered that this scheme will not result in significant environmental impacts and an EIA is therefore not required to support this application.
Date	26/06/15