



**Horsham  
District  
Council**

Groveland Planning  
1A High Street  
Cobham  
KT11 3DH

Your ref. Ref: VV/16-012/Phase2  
Our ref: HP/Scr/17/01

Contact: Helen Peacock  
helen.peacock@horsham.gov.uk  
01403 215513

28<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Dear Mr Verster,

**Request under regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended) for a Screening Opinion**

**Abingworth Nursery, Storrington Road, Thakeham, RH20 3EY**

Thank you for your letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016 regarding the above.

The proposal does fall within 10b of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations because the development site exceeds the 5ha threshold and includes more than 150 dwellings.

The next consideration is therefore whether the development is likely to have significant effects on the environment as per Schedule 3 of the EIA regulations paying attention to the development characteristics, location and nature of the impacts. The Council has also drawn on the information set out in the letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016 and planning application DC/16/2835. The results of this assessment are attached to this letter for information.

The potential impacts from the changes to the original consent proposed in the current planning application would arise from the increase in the number of dwellings and the removal of the age restriction. The main effects are likely to be from the additional traffic which could subsequently have a detrimental effect on the Air Quality Management Area in the neighbouring and larger settlement of Storrington. However, given the overall size of the permitted development of 146 dwellings the impact of an additional 12 dwellings is not significant enough to trigger the requirement for an EIA.

In conclusion, in light of the above it is deemed that an Environmental Impact Assessment is NOT required for the proposed development as it currently stands and with the information provided.

I confirm that this letter forms Horsham District Council's formal screening opinion and will be placed on the public register.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Peacock - Environmental Co-ordination Manager

## Horsham District Council EIA Screening Assessment

HDC Reference: HP/1701

Applicant Reference: DC

**Development Proposal:** DC/16/2835

Variation of Condition to previously approved application DC/16/0871 to amend the layout and design of 17 dwellings, to divide plot 35 into two plots to provide an additional dwelling and to amend plot 76 to increase the number of houses by 11 and provide a flat above the village shop

<b>EIA Regulations</b>	
Is the proposed development listed in schedule 1?	<b>No</b>
Is the proposed development listed in Schedule 2? (Note 'wide of scope, broad of purpose' legal judgement)	Item 10b: urban development projects. The proposed development includes more than 150 dwellings and is approximately 9.1ha meaning it is necessary to determine if development would have any significant environmental effects by virtue of the nature, size or location.
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)	<b>No</b>

### **Schedule 3 – Selection Criteria for Screening Schedule 2 Development**

<b>1. Characteristics of Development</b>	<b>Description (include permanent / temporary impacts, positive and / or negative impacts / likelihood of impact as applicable)</b>	<b>Significance</b>
a) Size of development (e.g. site area, scale)	The size of the site subject to the original planning consent is 9ha and was for 147. The proposal relates to part of the site and would increase the number of dwellings in this phase from 51 to 62, with an additional flat over the village shop. The dwellings in this area would also no longer be age restricted.	Low – for the current proposal
b) cumulation with other development	The change to the previous consent that is likely to have the most impact is the increase in the number of dwellings. Overall this is an increase of 12 and could have a cumulative effect given the 147 dwellings in the immediate vicinity that already have consent. The cumulative effects of these additional dwellings are considered below	Potential for cumulative effects with the size of the adjoining development
c) the use of natural resources (e.g. land, water, materials, energy – non renewable or in short supply?)	An increase in the number of dwellings would result in an increase in the use of water and energy but in the context of the total	Low

	development this increase would be minimal.	
d) the production of waste (demolition, construction, operation and decommissioning?)	The construction phase is likely to result in the production of waste but would be controlled by a Site Waste Management Plan. The operational phases of the development will require refuse to be collected from the residential properties onsite. The District Council's Acorn Scheme which operates in the area has resulted in high levels of recycling, and this would help reduce overall waste production in the operational phase of the development. Overall in both cases the addition of 12 dwellings would not result in a significant increase in the production of waste throughout the life cycle of the development.	Low
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)	There is the potential for noise and dust during the construction phase and there are residential properties in the immediate vicinity. However, the additional dwellings will not increase these effects significantly above the construction that already has consent and where measures to reduce these impacts are already conditioned in the planning permission.	Low
f) the risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances or technologies used	The risk of accidents is low given the proposed development	Low

<b>2. Location of Development: the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by development must be considered having regard, in particular to</b>	<b>Description (include permanent / temporary impacts, positive and / or negative impacts / likelihood of impact as applicable)</b>	<b>Significance</b>
a) the existing land use	The larger development site subject to planning permission consisted of largely greenfield and the southern part of the site was a former Nursery.	
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?)	The site is already subject to planning permission so the loss of the greenfield land has already been accepted in the original consent.	
c) the absorption capacity of the natural environment, paying particular attention to		
i) wetlands (e.g. floodplains, impacts on drainage, aquifers)	The site is located in Flood Zone 1 which indicates a low probability (less than 0.1%) of flooding	Low
ii) coastal zones (any potential for the scheme to impact on coastal areas e.g. runoff etc)	N/A	
iii) mountain and forest areas (impacts on wooded areas, including any designated areas of ancient woodland / TPOs).	There are trees with an existing Tree Preservation Order within the part	Low

	of the site which is subject to this application. It is noted that the proposed layout for the proposed dwellings ensures that there is a buffer between the development and the copse containing these trees and that this does not impinge on the Root Protection Zone agreed as part of the original consent.	
iv) nature reserves and parks (e.g. any impacts on designated nature conservation sites / other areas of nature conservation importance?)	There are no designated nature reserves or parks adjoining the site and the site is not located within an environmentally sensitive area as defined by the EIA Regulations.	Low
v) areas classified or protected under Member States' legislation; areas designated by Member states pursuant 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?)	The proposal site does not constitute a 'sensitive area' as defined by the EIA Regulations. The closest SPA to the site is the Arun Valley and the nearest SAC is the Mens Woodland in Chichester District, however development in this location is not considered to adversely impact these sites.  The site is also not within in a Scheduled Ancient Monument Designation.	Low
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).	Residents from this development are likely to travel to Storrington or through Storrington to access facilities and services. Storrington has an existing Air Quality Management Area which has been designated due to transport related pollutants. The increased number of dwellings and the removal of the age restriction is likely to increase traffic movements from the development. However, an increase in 12 dwellings is unlikely to increase the amount of traffic significantly or result in a significant impact on the AQMA. Furthermore, a Low Emission Strategy was submitted as part of the original planning permission as was a Travel Plan which seeks to reduce the number of trips by car.	Low
vii) densely populated areas (size of population affected, changes to demography, lifestyles, employment etc)	The residents along the B2139 and those in Storrington could be affected by the development, through noise during the construction phase and traffic once the development is completed. Again the addition of 12 dwellings will not significantly affect these residents.	Low
viii) landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance	The landscape in the area of the development is not designated. There are Public Rights of Way both adjacent to and within the larger development site. These issues would have been considered as part of the original proposal and are not significantly affected by the addition of 12 dwellings.  There is a Conservation Area and Listed Buildings in the main part of the Thakeham 5km to the north of the larger development site. None of these would be significantly affected by the addition of 12 dwellings.	Low

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 additional dwellings proposed as part of the change of the condition are unlikely to significantly increase the effect of the original development of 146 dwellings.	Low
b) the transfrontier nature of the impact (any international impacts?)	None	
c) the magnitude and complexity of the impact (e.g. overall size, scale, combination of impacts)	The additional dwellings could increase the traffic from the site and add the air quality issues currently being experienced in Storrington where there is an existing Air Quality Management Area.	Low
d) the probability of the impact (e.g. overall probability of impacts identified above)	The probability of the impacts is highly likely during the construction phase. The probability of the impacts from traffic and on air quality is less certain but will not be significant given the low number of additional dwellings.	Low
e) the duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact (demolition, construction, operation and decommissioning)	The duration and frequency of the impacts through the construction phase will be regular but temporary. There will be irreversible impacts from the development but EIA terms these are not considered to be significant.	Low

### Conclusion

<b>EIA Required?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Statement of reasons</b>	<p>The potential impacts from the changes to the original consent proposed in the current planning application would arise from the increase in the number of dwellings and the removal of the age restriction. The main effects are likely to be traffic which could subsequently have a detrimental effect on the Air Quality Management Area in the neighbouring and larger settlement of Storrington. However, given the overall size of the permitted development of 146 dwellings the impact of an additional 12 dwellings is not significant enough to trigger the requirement for an EIA.</p> <p><b>Overall an EIA for the proposal is not required.</b></p>
<b>Date</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> January 2017