

Ref. No. SCE.235/ES.18/07/526 M		Site / Location: Trentbridge Farm, Bond End, Yoxall	
Description of development: Construction of an amenity pond involving the winning and working of mineral			
PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required? (ref: EIA Regulations 2017 , and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects)			Yes / No
1	Development Description	<p>Do you have enough information to define the size and type of development (a plan, description of type/nature/ purpose and possible effects)?**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (proceed to step 2) (Application ref. ES.18/07/526 M) • No - either take the precautionary principle and assume the worst case or, request more information confirming 3 week deadline not commence until received; <p>**Note - Changes or extensions may also need an EIA! (Schedule 2, category 13)</p>	Yes
2	Is it a Schedule 1 development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No (explain) YES – The development is category.....n/a..... and a screening opinion is not required as an EIA mandatory! • NO – If the development is not listed in Schedule 1 it may be listed in Schedule 2 (proceed to step 3) 	No
3	Is it a Schedule 2 development? (Schedule 2, Col 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No (explain) • YES - The development falls/could fall within category 2 Extractive industry (a) Quarries, open cast mining and peat extraction (proceed to step 4) • NO – If the development is not listed in Schedule 2 a screening opinion is not required and EIA not required! 	Yes
4	4(a) Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No – (explain) The threshold/criteria is ‘All development except the construction of buildings or other ancillary structures where the new floorspace does not exceed 1,000 square metres’ (proceed to step 4b) 	Yes
	4(b) Is the proposal within/near to a ‘ sensitive area ’? (e.g. SSSI, NP, AONB, SAC, RAMSAR, Scheduled Monument)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No – (explain) YES – The development falls within/near to the following designated site(s) Within or metres from Within or metres from..... (OR) 	No

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you have answered 'Yes' to the threshold/criteria a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2 • If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2 • If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is not within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is not required. 	
5	Conclusion	Screening opinion required?
		Yes

PART 2 – Are the proposals EIA development?

EIA usually required for (i) major developments of more than local importance; (ii) development in particularly environmentally sensitive or vulnerable locations; (iii) developments with unusually complex and potentially hazardous environmental effects. This checklist has been prepared with reference to Schedule 3 and Regulation 4 (2) and used to determine whether significant effects are likely to arise from the development. The Regulations also apply to changes to EIA development and reserved matters / subsequent approvals (ref: [Schedule 3 - EIA Regulations 2017](#), [Regulation 4 \(2\)](#) and [Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#))

1	Applicable screening thresholds/criteria	Does the development fall within the applicable screening thresholds / criteria? (see applicable screening thresholds)	<p>YES – The applicable screening threshold and criteria set out in the Planning Practice Guidance for category 2(a) - All new open cast mines and underground mines. Clay, sand and gravel workings, quarries covering more than 15 hectares or involve the extraction of more than 30,000 tonnes of mineral per year.</p> <p>Key issues to consider:- The likelihood of significant effects will tend to depend on the scale and duration of the works, and the likely consequent impact of noise, dust, discharges to water and visual intrusion.</p> <p>The applicant has proposed to extract 30,000 tonnes of sand to create an amenity pond.</p> <p>Having regard to the indicative thresholds/criteria it is considered that the proposal to construct a pond falls within the Indicative screening threshold (ref. category 2(a) of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations 2017).</p>
2	Characteristic of the development:	Size and design of the whole development:	The site is approximately 1.2 hectares including the access road.

	<p>Cumulation with other developments and/or approved development:</p>	<p>Mineral extraction would have a temporary impact (30,000 tonnes over a 3-month period). Planning permission (part retrospective) was granted by East Staffordshire Borough Council for the retention of existing extension (retrospective), erection of additional extensions to east of building and the formation of a pond (ref. P/2015/00506 dated 17 April 2015). The applicant has confirmed that the amenity pond has not been constructed due to the presence of a gas pipeline crossing the land. This application seeks an alternative location for the pond to the north of the pipeline.</p>
	<p>Use of natural resources (e.g. land, soil, water and biodiversity):</p>	<p>The proposal would involve the transport of sand and gravel from the land. Topsoil would be removed and reinstated on the pond slope margins.</p>
	<p>Production of waste:</p>	<p>None anticipated.</p>
	<p>Pollution and nuisances:</p>	<p>The potential risk of noise, dust, contaminated water emissions from mineral extraction operations, also noise and dust emissions, and congestion / road safety risk from traffic exporting the mineral from the site would need to be carefully assessed. However, given the temporary nature, limited scale and location of the operations it is reasonable to assume that the proposed mineral extraction could be carried out within planning and other regulatory controls. It is also reasonable to assume that the risk of pollution and nuisances would not be significant in EIA terms.</p>
	<p>Risk of major accidents and/or disasters relevant to the development including climate change:</p>	<p>Given the nature of the mineral extraction; the low technology plant and equipment; it is reasonable to assume that the risk of major accidents would not be significant in EIA terms.</p>

		Risk to human health (e.g. water contamination or air pollution):	See above. It is reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the risk to human health would not be significant in EIA terms.
3	Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected):	Existing and approved land use (<i>include past, present and future (allocated land/with permission)</i>)	The application site is 1.2 hectares of pasture associated with Trentbridge Farm. Following completion of mineral extraction, the land would be used as an amenity pond for the sole use of the applicant.
		Relative abundance, availability, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground):	No significant biodiversity / landscape designations would be affected.
		Absorption capacity of natural environment (in Staffordshire these could include wetlands, riparian areas and forest areas; nature reserves/parks; SSSIs and international designations; areas where EU environmental quality standards have not been met; densely populated areas; landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance):	The site is not located adjacent to any site of environmental importance such as nature reserves / parks or SSSIs. The land would be restored to an amenity pond.
4	Types and characteristics of the potential impact	The magnitude and spatial extent (e.g. geographical area and size of affected population likely to be affected):	It is considered that due to the temporary nature, limited scale and location of the proposed development, the magnitude of the impact would be localised and not significant in EIA terms.
		The nature of the impact:	The nature of the impact of the proposal e.g. the potential visual, dust, noise, water, archaeological and ecological impacts would need to be carefully assessed. It is however reasonable to assume that the proposed mineral extraction could be carried out within planning and other regulatory controls. It is also reasonable to assume that the nature of the impacts would not be significant in EIA terms.
		The transboundary nature of the impact:	Not applicable

	The intensity and complexity of the impact:	It is reasonable to assume that the proposal could be carried out in accordance with planning controls and other regulatory controls. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the intensity and complexity of the impacts would not be significant in EIA terms.
	The probability of the impact:	Due the temporary nature, limited scale and location of the proposal, it is reasonable to assume that the potential effects can reasonably be predicted and would not be significant in EIA terms.
	The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact:	ditto
	The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development:	<p>The cumulative impacts of the proposal with the proposed route of High Speed Rail 2 - Phase 2a /construction area (HS2) and location within the Area of Search defined in the Mineral Local Plan. (see Policy 1.1 (Inset Map 14 – Area of Search – West of A38 along Trent Valley) need to be considered.</p> <p>The proposal is located within 2.5 kilometres to the north of the proposed HS2 (Phase 2 a) route and 2 kilometres from one of proposed borrow pits associated with the construction of the route ('Kings Bromley North' shown on CT-05-2002 – Construction Phase) The borrow pit will operate in accordance with a Code of Construction Practice which will control the construction works (e.g. traffic measures including HGV routing). The applicant has proposed to commence operations in Summer 2019. This would avoid any cumulative impacts with HS2.</p>

			There are currently no other proposals within the Area of Search at this stage. Due to the temporary nature of the proposals (3 months) it is reasonable to assume that the cumulative impacts can reasonably be predicted and would not be significant in EIA terms.	
		The possibility of effectively reducing the impact:	It is reasonable to assume that appropriate mitigation measures could be imposed to minimise the impact of the development.	
	EIA Development		No	
	NOT EIA development – the features of the proposed development and measures envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment (Reg 5 (5)(b)).			
5	It is considered that the proposal to construct an amenity pond falls within the indicative screening threshold criteria (ref. category 2(a) of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations 2017), however due to the temporary nature, limited scale and location of the proposed development, it is reasonable to assume that the potential environmental effects can be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and mitigated. It is also reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls. It is therefore reasonable to assume that in EIA terms no significant effects are likely to arise from the proposed development.			
	Signed and dated	Case Officer	David Bray 20 May 2019	Team Leader/Team Manager
				Mike Grundy 20 May 2019

Mr Mark Walton
Director
WYG
54 Hagley Road,
Edgbaston, Birmingham,
B16 8PE

*Postal Address: Planning, Policy & Development Control
Staffordshire County Council
2 Staffordshire Place
Tipping Street
Stafford
ST16 2DH*

Please ask for: David Bray

Sent by email

Our Ref: [SCE.235/ES.18/07/526 M](#)

20 May 2019

Dear Mr Walton

Planning application: Construction of an amenity pond involving the winning and working of mineral at Trentbridge Farm, Bond End, Yoxall (ref. [ES.18/07/526 M](#))

[The Town and Country Planning \(Environmental Impact Assessment\) Regulations 2017: Regulation 8 - Screening Opinion](#)

I refer to the planning application and the regulations referred to above.

In accordance with the regulations the County Council is required to adopt a "Screening Opinion" to establish whether the submitted application should be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

The County Council has considered the information in the application as submitted and is of the opinion that the proposed development falls within the description provided within Schedule 2 paragraph 2(a) to the above regulations, but in the opinion of the County Council, having taken into account the criteria in Schedule 3 to the above regulations and the '[Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#)' (version 28/7/17), the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. Further details are provided in the accompanying 'Screening Opinion Checklist'.

Therefore, in accordance with the powers contained in the 'Scheme of Delegation to Officers', this letter confirms that the County Council is of the opinion that the proposed



development **is not EIA development** and need not be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

Yours sincerely

David Bray
Principal Planning Officer

Accompanied by a Screening Opinion Checklist

