

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	19/01818/OUT	Brief description of the project / development	South Caldecotte, Industrial Development
Appellant	HB (South Caldecotte Limited)		
LPA	Milton Keynes 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)		N/A	
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?		Yes	
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?		10 (a) Industrial Estate Development Projects	
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?		Yes	
If YES, which area?		It is near to a Scheduled Monument, the remains of the Roman town of Magiovinium and Roman fort, which lies to the south-west of the site (list entry number: 1006943)	
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?		Yes	
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?		The area of development exceeds 0.5 hectares.	
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)		Yes, under Milton Keynes reference	
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?		Yes	
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?		No	
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?		No	

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.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) Briefly explain answer to Part 2a and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature and proximity to site (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is 'No', the answer to Part 3a / 3b is 'N/A')		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) 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.	
1. NATURAL RESOURCES				
1.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	There will be some alteration to the ground levels in order to construct the proposed buildings.	?	It is unclear at this stage whether such physical changes will cause a significant effect
1.2 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	Construction is likely to use a variety of materials and natural resources. However, none are in significantly short supply for normal construction.	N/A	
1.3 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?	Yes	The western part of the site is Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and Soils (BMV) Grade 3a which is designated as 'good quality agricultural land'.	?	The agricultural land would be lost. It is unclear whether the loss of the BMV would have significant effect.
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid	Yes	The clearance of the site and construction of the	No	Applicant will be required to provide site waste

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?		buildings will produce normal construction waste.		management strategy via application or submission, to minimise the effects.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	No	Normal demolition and constructions methods will be undertaken, and it is not expected that any hazardous substances will be released. There is a high pressure pipeline running under the site, but it is not considered that the construction of the development would result in pollution.	N/A	
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Some noise and vibration is possible form demolition and construction. Also from traffic including cumulatively with other developments in the area.	?	Unclear as to the overall effects of any noise/vibration impact at this stage.
3.3 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?	No	There is minimal risk of contamination, provided proper construction methods are followed.	N/A	
3.4 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	There are no surrounding areas known to be subject to pollution or environmental damage.	N/A	
4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
4.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with	No	There is an extremely limited risk of accidents as a result of the demolition and construction of the site.	No	

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?				
4.2 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)	No	Provided that best practice is followed and relevant works controlled by condition, there is minimal risk to human health of the surrounding population.	N/A	
5. WATER RESOURCES				
5.1 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	Caldecotte Lake is to the north of the site and the River Ouzel runs to the north/west of the site and an open watercourse/brook runs partly through the site.	No	The applicant proposes a new drainage scheme to cope with changing circumstances, and it is unlikely that the development will increase the risk of flooding.
6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
6.1 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	Yes	Part of the site is designated as a Priority Habitat- Lowland Meadow. The site lies partly within the designated A5 Road Corridor Wildlife Corridors. It is in close proximity to the River Ouzel Wet Corridor to the north and west and the Woburn – Bletchley Rail Corridor which runs in an east-west direction immediately to the north of the site. The site is in close proximity to Greensands Ridge Biodiversity Opportunity Area.	Yes	It is understood that the development of the site would result in the loss of the Priority Habitats in their entirety. The scale of the development proposed is such that it is unlikely that the ecological value could be mitigated or replaced on the site satisfactorily. Planning policy does allow for off-site mitigation of loss of biodiversity in certain circumstances. At this stage it is unclear whether this would be possible in the context of the current application

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
designation (international, national, regional or local))).				
6.2 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	As mentioned above the site is located partly within or in close proximity to designated Wildlife Corridors. Documentation submitted indicates the presence of bats, badgers and reptiles within the site.	Yes	The proposal is likely to result in a significant impact on flora and fauna on site (including potential impacts on protected species). This could potentially be mitigated, subject to a full assessment in due course.
7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL				
7.1 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	The site is directly adjacent to the Brickhills, to the east of the site which is locally designated as an Area of Attractive Landscape within the recently adopted Plan: MK. The Plan:MK Sustainability Appraisal identifies the site as having 'medium' landscape sensitivity.	Yes	The scheme could potentially have a significant impact on the landscape and scenic value of the area. This will need to be assessed as part of this application.
7.2 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	It is likely to be visible from the Brickhills, an elevated area to the east of the site and from surrounding vantage points and properties, particularly to the east of the site in Bow Brickhill. It will also be visible from the surrounding road and rail networks.	?	-The extent of the impact has not yet been fully assessed.

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

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
8. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
8.1 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	The site is immediately adjacent to a designated heritage asset, the Scheduled Monument Roman town of Magiovinium and Roman fort, which lies to the south-west of the site, which is a national designation. The site itself additionally contains two archaeological notification areas delineating related areas of archaeological potential within the site. The additional studies submitted further confirm the presence of significant archaeological remains within the site.	Yes	The proposal, based on the proposed floor area and indicative layout plans is likely to have a significant impact on archaeological assets within the site.
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
9.1 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	There is a public right of way in the north of the site.	No	There is a potential impact, but this could be mitigated based on a proposed layout and so the proposal is not likely to have a significant effect.
9.2 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	The site is in close proximity to major road networks, which could be susceptible to congestion.	?	The full extent of any effect on transport routes has not yet been fully assessed and will be assessed as part of the application. However, there would be impacts, especially when considered alongside other proposals around the site (see 10.2 and 12.1 below) that would require mitigation.
10. LAND USE				
10.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the	Yes	The village of Bow Brickhill is in close proximity to the site, with a smaller number of residential properties immediately adjacent to the site.	?	The full extent of any effect on nearby uses has not yet been fully considered and will be

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
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.		There are also a large number of employment sites within proximity of the site.		assessed as part of the application.
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	?	The site to the north-east has been allocated as part of a Strategic Urban Extension for 3,000 houses as part of the recently adopted Plan: MK. At Eaton Leys to the south-west of the site there is extant outline planning permission for approximately 600 houses.	?	It is not clear at this stage whether and to what extent these future developments would be affected by the proposal. However, there would be cumulative effects that require mitigation (see section 12 below).
11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
11.1 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		N/A	
12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
12.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes	Please see above in 10.2 for reference to allocated and approved large-scale developments in the area.	Yes	Due to the scale of the proposed development and other large-scale developments in the area, there is potential for likely significant cumulative impacts during the construction/operation phase in terms of noise, vibration and traffic.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS		
13.1 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.

5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Characteristics of Development

The development will comprise a 57 hectare site and result in development of employment floorspace of over 241,000 sq m. The site is likely to contain large, flat roofed warehouse buildings of a, covering a significant proportion of the site area. In addition to the proposal, there is a site allocation for 3,000 new homes in the South-East Strategic Urban Extension to the north-east of the site and an extant outline planning permission for up to 600 homes at Eaton Leys.

The development is unlikely to result in significant use of natural resources although it will result in the loss of some agricultural land, but is likely to result in impact on biodiversity assets on the site. The scheme is likely to result in the production of waste, pollution and nuisances. The scheme is unlikely to result in major accidents or risks to human health subject to appropriate mitigation.

Location Of Development

The site is located on an almost entirely undeveloped site, which has been used for agricultural purposes. It contains a designated Priority Habitat- Lowland Meadow which covers a significant part of the south-west section of the site. The site is also adjacent to a designated heritage asset, the Scheduled Ancient Monument which is a national designation, comprising Roman town of Magiovinium and Roman fort, which lies to the south-west of the site. The site itself contains significant archaeological remains which area related to the Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Types and characteristics of potential impact

Based on the submitted documentation, the built footprint of the proposed buildings are likely to cover the majority of the application site, including the south-west section of the site which contains the important areas of heritage and ecology assets described immediately above. While the impacts could potentially be mitigated to some extent, the development is very likely to have a significant impact on these areas and there is a high likelihood that this would result in significant adverse impacts caused by the development.

In terms of cumulative impact, the development, in conjunction with other large-scale developments in the area during the construction/operation phase in terms of noise, vibration and traffic.

It is not considered likely that adverse impacts could be reversed and it is not clear at this stage if all of these impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated.

6. 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?	Yes	
7. 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	
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	

NAME	David Buckley, Senior Planning Officer
DATE	26 July 2019