

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	384/5	Brief description of the project / development	Improvement of an existing golf facility
Appellant	Booth Ventures Ltd		
LPA	Rochdale Borough Council		
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?		12 (f)	
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?		Over 1 ha	
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 appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			

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				
5.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	Changes to topography through infilling with inert waste.	No	Proposed landscaping is considered low impact to create gradual incline from north to south of the site in order to facilitate an upgrade of the driving range.
5.2 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		n/a	
5.3 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		n/a	
6. WASTE				
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	Demolition of timber shed and driving range building.	No	The proposed landscaping would help facilitate the reduction of inert residual waste being sent to landfill. Any faction of the material from the demolished timber shed and old driving range

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))	
				building would be reused where possible. The reuse of material means fewer primary natural resources would be required. Proposed development would not produce waste beyond what is expected at a leisure facility.
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	Potential for dust emissions during tipping and from HGV movements.	No	Site is small in scale, HGV movements would be low over short period (51 weeks) and internal movements short, with a dust management plan implemented as dictated by a deposit for recovery EA permit.
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Potential noise from HGV movements, deposit of materials, and users of the site's vehicles once in operation.	No	Noise management scheme would be implemented. Site is located near to a strategic road network – M62 and A58 – which would be used as part of the HGV routing strategy. Site is part of an existing golf course - proposed upgrade would not produce unacceptable noise and vehicle movements beyond what is expected at a leisure facility.
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	Nominal risk of fuel or hydrocarbon leaks from plant and equipment.	No	Re-fuelling and maintenance would only be carried out in designated hard standing / sealed surface areas. Double bunded fuel tanks would be used.
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	No known existing pollution. Site is bounded to the north, west and south by outdoor leisure facilities, and residential area to the east.	n/a	

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. 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?	Yes Potential for surface water flooding. High risk of flooding in the southwest corner of the site.	No Site is in Flood Zone 1; a Flood Risk Assessment would be carried out. Driving range building being removed from northwest of site and topography being raised here. Surface water management procedures put in place and a Drainage Strategy implemented.
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 Nearest residential properties are immediately adjacent to the northeast boundary of the site.	No Tree line boundary along east of site will also provide some screening. However, a suite of studies (flood risk, landscape, transport etc.) would be carried out to ensure the avoidance/mitigation of any potential impacts on the nearest residential receptors.
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 Rochdale Canal located 635m east of the site (separated by residential area and railway line).	No No impact anticipated due to distance from the site.
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,	Yes Rochdale Canal SSSI and SAC which has been designated for its population of floating water plantain. Hopwood Woodlands LNR 1.4km south of the site (separated by golf courses, disused railway, woodland, and the M62).	No Impact unlikely due to distances from site. LVIA and Ecology studies would be carried out and any mitigation implemented.

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))	
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))).				
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, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?	Yes	Great Crested Newts have been identified 1.77km to the southwest of the site and the southern part of the site has been identified as having good potential for GCN.	No	Preliminary Ecology Surveys would be carried out and specific GCN surveys if required.
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).	Yes	Rochdale Canal SSSI and SAC which has been designated for its population of floating water plantain. Hopwood Woodlands LNR 1.4km south of the site (separated by golf courses, disused railway, woodland, and the M62).	No	Impact unlikely due to distances from site. LVIA and Ecology studies would be carried out and any mitigation implemented.
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	Residential properties to the east of site. Bridleway along Chadwick Lane parallel to northern boundary of the site.	No	Treeline along eastern boundary and around site offers good screening.

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))
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).	Yes Grade II Listed building (United Reform Church) 265m east and Scheduled Monument (March Barn Bridge) 1.1km northeast of the site.	No HGV routing strategy would ensure no movements close to heritage assets. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment would confirm no impact on assets or views from them.
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 Bridleway and Connect 22 cycle route along Chadwick Lane, parallel to northern boundary of the site.	No Entrance to the site during infilling would be from the northeast of the site to limit impact on Chadwick Lane. Current entrance is southwest of site, this would be moved to northeast so reduced vehicle movements on the bridleway are anticipated.
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?	Yes Possible congestion on Manchester Road or Heywood Road.	No Transport Survey would be carried out and suitable HGV routing and vehicle movements recommended accordingly to limit/avoid any adverse impacts or possibility of congestion.
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	Yes Castleton Sports centre north of site (separated by Chadwick Lane), west and south of site is the wider Castle Hawk Golf Course. East of site is a residential area.	No Proposal is for the improvement of the driving range at Castle Hawk Golf Club. A suite of studies (arboriculture, flood risk, landscape, transport etc.) would be carried out to ensure the avoidance/mitigation of any potential impacts on the surrounding land/receptors.

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))	
relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.				
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes	Solar panel development 1.5km northwest of the site.	No	A Transport Survey would be carried out and limits to HGV applied accordingly. The solar farm construction would be over a 6-week period and the Transport Statement submitted with the solar farm application (20/00687/FUL) states the vehicle movements are considered to be relatively low.
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	No evidence of such conditions at the site.	n/a	
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	Yes, construction of solar development.	No	See 14.2. The HGV routing of both developments is considered to be negligible in the context of the highway networks on -M62 and A58.
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No		n/a	

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

Having reviewed The Site in conjunction with Schedule 3, and the details included in the screening matrix above, it is considered that, whilst environmental effects could occur as a result of the development and should therefore be appropriately considered in any Planning Application, the effects are unlikely to be significant, and therefore the development does not constitute EIA development, and an ES is not required.

19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided, do you agree with it?	
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	
Is an ES required?	

20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)	OUTCOME	
Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
<u>Not</u> likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	No
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	

21. REASON FOR SCREENING

No significant impacts identified.

NAME	SHEENA PEAT (ENVIRONMENT CONSULTANT AT MPG LTD.)
DATE	