

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	181659/SCR	Brief description of the project / development	Various works close to the River Thames, including: c. 4,000m of flood defences along the north bank of the River Thames, extending from Promenade Road in the west to Nire Road / Ruskin in the east; flood defences on the south bank along the Thames Path from Waterman Place in the west to Reading (George Street) Bridge in the east.
Applicant	Environment Agency		
LPA	Reading 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)			Click here to enter text.
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?			Yes
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?			Part 10 (Infrastructure projects) (h) flood relief works & site area over 1ha
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?			Click here to enter text.
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			Site area is over 1ha
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)			Not to date
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?			N/A
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			N/A
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			N/A

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)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (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')		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	Flood embankments raised c. 300 – c. 2800mm above the existing ground level	Yes	Potentially, depending on the exact nature of what could be proposed.
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		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 River Thames is a Major Landscape Feature, and an existing green link. Parts of land adjoining the River Thames are important areas of open space	Yes	Potentially, depending on the exact nature of what could be proposed.
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation	Yes	Possibly – depending on the exact location of the works and the characteristics of the land at	No	Likely to be able to be managed.

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
or decommissioning?		those locations		
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	No	Unlikely	N/A	
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Potentially noise disturbance during construction phase.	No	Likely to be managed through the submission of information at application stage. More specifically, noise and dust from the construction phase would be fairly widespread. The proposals would need a noise and dust management plan and the applicant should separately apply for consent under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 for the noise controls. The RBC Environmental Protection and Nuisance Team advises in overall terms that all impacts would be temporary from this perspective; therefore meaning that a full EIA is not considered necessary by Environmental Protection staff.
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?	Yes	Potentially	No	A contaminated land assessment would be carried out. The RBC Environmental Protection and Nuisance Team advises in overall terms that all impacts would be temporary from this perspective; therefore meaning that a full EIA is not considered necessary by Environmental Protection staff.
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	Yes	Yes; parts of the site are already in an air quality management area.	No	The nature of the proposals are such that air quality is unlikely to be a significant constraint.

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
affected by the project?				
4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
4.1 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	Potentially, given the publicly accessible and geographical coverage of the proposals.	No	No, given that site management would reduce the likelihood. Furthermore, a construction method statement would also be likely to be secured at application stage.
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)	Yes	Potentially, given the publicly accessible and geographical coverage of the proposals.	No	No, given that site management would reduce the likelihood.
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	Inherent to the nature of the proposals	Yes	It would be anticipated that the significant effect would be positive.
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	Yes	The River Thames is a Major Landscape Feature, and an existing green link. Parts of land adjoining the River Thames are important areas of open space. An extended phase 1 ecology survey has been submitted with the screening opinion	Yes	The Council's Ecology Consultant agrees with the EA's covering letter (which states: "With regard to Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations, it is considered likely that the scheme will give rise to significant environmental effects and therefore require a statutory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), supported by an

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)	
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 designation (international, national, regional or local))).		submission. This includes the following conclusions: - Ruderal vegetation – of local value - Grassland – of value within the immediate zone of influence only - Hedgerows – of local value - Mature trees – of up to district value for nature conservation - Ditches – of local value - River Thames – regional ecological value - Woodland – local value		Environmental Statement.”) that this is EIA development and that an ES will be required, with a chapter on ecology and a chapter on landscape.
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	The extended phase 1 survey states “It is considered that further surveys need to be undertaken and detailed design information received before any conclusion can be made on the ecological impacts of the proposed flood alleviation options. Recommendations are then made in relation to badgers, bats, birds, invertebrates, plants, reptiles, signal crayfish and wolverines.	Yes	The Council’s Ecology Consultant agrees with the EA’s covering letter (which states: “With regard to Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations, it is considered likely that the scheme will give rise to significant environmental effects and therefore require a statutory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), supported by an Environmental Statement.”) that this is EIA development and that an ES will be required, with a chapter on ecology and a chapter on landscape.
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	Yes	The River Thames is a Major Landscape Feature, and an existing green link. Parts of land adjoining the River Thames are important areas of open space (the above are locally designated). There are also numerous nationally listed buildings/structures in and around the	Yes	Depending on the full extent and nature of the proposals the effects could be significant and would need to be carefully considered/justified in relation to these elements as part of any future planning 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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).		site.		
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	Given the geographical coverage of the site (which in part includes a Thames Path and public right of way) and nature of the area, parts are highly visible to many people on a daily basis.	Yes	Depending on the full extent and nature of the proposals the effects could be significant and would need to be carefully considered/justified in relation to these elements as part of any future planning application.
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	Parts of the site are within or border a designated area of archaeological importance (local designation). As referenced at 7.1 above, there are numerous nationally listed buildings/structures within or adjacent to the site area.		Berkshire Archaeology advises: "Berkshire Archaeology has had some preliminary discussions regarding this proposal with the Environment Agency's archaeological consultants. As a result the applicant arranged for an archaeological watching brief during preliminary geotechnical investigations for this scheme and they have included the report on the results with their application (Cotswold Archaeology, December 2017). Despite the results of the watching brief, any future application in relation to this scheme should include a consideration of its impacts on the buried archaeological heritage, given the scheme's location within the archaeologically rich Middle Thames Valley. This should take the form of an archaeological desk-based assessment that should consider the known and

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				potential archaeological resource along the route and should include an assessment of the known and likely impacts of the proposal on buried archaeological remains. In the absence of any details of the proposal at this stage, in particular the scale of below ground impacts, I recommend that Berkshire Archaeology is re-consulted once the desk-based assessment has been completed and details of the proposal are known so that it can be considered if there is a need for further assessment through field survey (field evaluation) to inform a decision on any future planning application. This is in accordance with national and local planning policy." Depending on the full extent and nature of the proposals the effects (from an archaeological and listed building/structure perspective) could be significant and would need to be carefully considered/justified in relation to these elements as part of any future planning application.
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	River Thames. Thames Path is a public right of way; North Thames Path and Christchurch Playing Fields are cycle routes. Christchurch Bridge. Numerous roads serving various residential, recreational, leisure, commercial facilities – including the only two direct vehicular routes into Reading town centre from Caversham (Caversham Bridge and Reading	Yes	Impacts could be significant, although these are likely to be restricted to the construction phase.

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		Bridge)		
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	See 9.1 above.	Yes	See 9.1 above.
10. LAND USE				
10.1 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 relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	From the list provided, in particular: housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, tourism, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	A significant effect is likely; the information to be submitted at application stage will ascertain whether that is positive or negative.
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes	A number of sites adjacent to The River Thames are allocated within the Reading Central Area Action Plan (2009) – e.g. River Major Opportunity Area 'Riverside' (RC1g); Caversham Lock Island, Thames Side (RC4p); Kings Meadow Pool, Kings Meadow Pool (RC4o) – which has been implemented; Furthermore, the Sites and Detailed Policies 2012 (Altered 2015) includes nearby Napier Court, Napier Road (SA8i) as a site for housing development and Paddock Road as a core employment area (SA12m).	No	Likely that such proposals could be positively managed to ensure co-ordination (thereby ensuring effects are unlikely to be significant)

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)	
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	Given the location of the site includes/adjoins both Caversham Bridge and Reading Bridge (the only two direct vehicular routes into/out of Reading Town Centre to Caversham) the future proposals and all those in proximity to the	No	Likely that such proposals could be positively managed to ensure co-ordination (thereby ensuring effects are unlikely to be significant)
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

It is considered that the proposal does not fall within Schedule 1 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (hereafter referred to as the EIA Regulations 2017). The proposal falls within the description at paragraph 10(h) of Schedule 2 and exceeds the threshold of the site area being over 1ha in column 2. Therefore the Council considers the proposal to be 'Schedule 2 development' within the meaning of the EIA Regulations 2017.

Accordingly, the Council has considered if the proposed development is likely to have significant effects on the environment. In determining such effects, the Council has taken into account the criteria for screening Schedule 2 development set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations. These are the characteristics of the development, its location and the types and characteristics of the potential impact. Based upon the description of the development provided and the information provided in your submission received on 19/09/18, the development could be considered to be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size and location. More specifically, this is owing to the nature of the location and the potential effects on, in particular, the landscape and visual environment, biodiversity (species and habitats), transport and access, nearby land uses (e.g. part of the proposals are within important areas of open space), water resources, natural resources, various nearby listed buildings/structures (cultural heritage / archaeology) and the River Thames (a Major Landscape Feature).

Accordingly, in exercise of the powers conferred by Part 2 Regulation 6 (6) (b) of the EIA Regulations 2017 (the timeframe having been agreed to be extended until 15th November 2018 as per email correspondence on 18th, 25th and 26th October 2018), the Council hereby considers that the proposed development described in your request and the documents submitted with it is 'EIA development' within the meaning of the EIA Regulations 2017, and hence a positive screening opinion is hereby adopted.

Informatives

You are advised, by virtue of Part 2 Regulation 6 (10) (b) of the EIA Regulations 2017 that you have the option to make a request to the Secretary of State to issue a screening direction.

Please note that this screening opinion is provided without prejudice to the formal decision of the Council on this or any other application which may subsequently be submitted.

6. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?

N/A

Is it necessary to issue a SD?

Yes

Is an ES required?

Yes

7. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)

OUTCOME

Is likely to have significant effects on the environment

ES required

✓

Not likely to have significant effects on the environment

ES not required

More information is required to inform direction

Request further info

NAME	Jonathan Markwell – Principal Planning Officer
DATE	14 November 2018