

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	172047/SCR	Brief description of the project / development	Construction of 884 new student bedrooms, a cafeteria/bar, bin and bike stores, sub-station and energy centre, together with a new access link and landscaping. Demolition of the existing student accommodation block at New Court, the SETS building, the warden's house, no. 4 Sherfield Drive, the reception and common room, (resubmission of application ref. 161182).
Applicant	UPP		
LPA	Reading Borough Council  Reading Borough Council Working better with you		
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(b) – Urban Development Projects
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?			N/A
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			Exceeds 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development
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?			N/A
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			N/A
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the applicant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			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)	
	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?	
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?	No	The proposal does not involve significant changes in ground level.	N/A	N/A
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	Sustainable construction techniques / materials are proposed to be employed on this project and the proposals include energy and water conservation measures as set out in the submitted BREEAM assessment, energy statement, and SuDS design. Can be secured by planning condition.	No	Subject to the securing of the environmental sustainability measures referenced in 2b
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?	No	There are no forestry or agricultural uses affected. Water resources are not likely to be adversely affected. The site is not specifically identified in the current Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	N/A	
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	Resulting from demolition of the existing buildings. Also throughout the development's lifetime, 'solid wastes' that would require landfill disposal would occur.	No	Recycling of materials/construction waste can reasonably be secured by planning condition under Policy CS2. The BREEAM assessment includes waste recycling targets. 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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				produced by the uses is controlled by other legislation.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	No	The uses proposed are residential in character and are suitable for location within a residential area. No industrial or other harmful process is proposed. The proposed CHP plant is gas-fired and unlikely to produce significant hazardous, toxic or noxious substances.	N/A	
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Noise (both during construction and end uses) has the potential to raise background noise levels when measured from the nearest receptors including neighbouring dwellings.	No	The impact is not likely to be significant in the long term. The possibility of mitigation measures for plant and equipment noise exists and are detailed in the submitted noise assessment. The possibility exists for of controls of over methods and hours of construction/demolition, as these can be reasonably secured by condition under policies CS34 and DM4. Noise and disturbance from future occupiers of the development would be a behavioural issue, falling under other legislation and not a direct consequence of the development.
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	Any risk identified is likely to be able to be dealt with appropriately through the Planning application process and mitigation secured as appropriate.	No	The proposed SuDS drainage scheme and BREEAM measures will reduce risks to below significant, or inherent to the proposal.
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	No	No evidence from visits to the site.	N/A	

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)	
standards are exceeded, which could be 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?	No	No more than usual risk than that associated with general construction projects.	N/A	
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	During construction. Not during operation.	No	Any likely significant risk would be mitigated by construction best practice and controlled by a Construction Method Statement, to be secured by condition as is the LPA's normal practice.
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		No	It is expected that any impact on groundwater identified would be suitably mitigated by the proposed SuDS drainage proposal.
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	Yes	Ponds to within the site to the south of proposed buildings could contain Great Crested Newts. Possibility that ecology could be affected. Appropriate ecological surveys have been submitted, which include mitigation	No	Significant impacts are unlikely. Any residual risk can be mitigated through the measures set out in the submitted surveys, including a Construction Environmental Management Plan. These can reasonably be secured by condition.

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)	
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 designation (international, national, regional or local))).		measures and also biodiversity enhancements The Council's Ecologist advises that, for the reasons set out by the applicant, from an ecological perspective, this application is neither a schedule 1 or a schedule 2 development and an EIA is not required.		
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	See above	No	See above
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).	No	The surrounding residential campus and Cintra Park are both of visual amenity value but not of the level that would warrant an EIA.	N/A	
7.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many	Yes	Visible from Northcourt Avenue which is well-used by pedestrians and vehicles. Taller	No	The retention of Pearson's Court serves to lessen the visual impact of larger buildings

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)	
people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)		buildings visible from Cintra Park. Long distance views from the south and west.		proposed to the north. The larger buildings, would be visible but would be within a landscaped campus setting and the visual impacts would not be significant in EIA terms.
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	Whitley Park Farmhouse is Grade II Listed. Pearson's Court is locally listed and a non-designated heritage asset. The Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment submitted with the application provides detailed information regarding the known archaeological potential of the area and the previous uses of the proposal site through historic mapping. The report suggests targeted trial trenching within the areas not previously developed, identifying a number of locations. This is an appropriate approach for the first stage of archaeological work, although there are additional areas that should be included within the trenching, such as Blocks H and L, or areas of extensive ground work for services or roads for example.	No	The scale of the proposals and the distance from the farmhouse is unlikely to be inherently harmful to the setting of the LB. The most historically significant elements of Pearson's Court are proposed to be retained, unchanged. The removal of the SETS building is not considered significant in EIA terms. The key significance relates to the historical associations and architectural detailing of the building. Introducing new buildings within the setting of Pearson's Court is unlikely to cause significant EIA impacts. Berkshire Archaeology are satisfied that suitable archaeological mitigation can be secured by condition.
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
9.1 Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public	No	There is no reason for the proposal to require changes to existing routes.	N/A	

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)	
for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?				
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		No	Given that the development is to be car free except in special circumstances, it is not considered that the increase in student numbers will create significant increase in daily vehicular movements to and from the site. Therefore, an Environmental Statement is not required as advised by RBC Transport Development Control. TDC require the application to be supported by a Transport Statement which assesses the full impact of the development. These are unlikely to be significant impacts.
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	Neighbouring dwellings in surrounding streets and retained student accommodation within the university owned land, (the wider St Patrick's campus) surrounding the site. The University Health Centre is opposite the site on Northcourt Avenue.	No	Noise, disturbance, daylight and privacy issues are to be dealt with appropriately through the planning application. There is no indication that the proposal would be likely to have a significant impact in respect of these matters. It is unlikely that any impact on the capacity of the health centre and other nearby community facilities would be of such a scale as to warrant an EIA.
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	There are no significant developments either within the existing Core Strategy, or Draft Local Plan that could be affected by the proposal.	N/A	
11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
11.1 Is the location susceptible to	No	No evidence to suggest these impacts.	N/A	

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)	
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?				
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?	No	There are no existing or approved developments which could have this effect. Any future development proposals could be controlled under planning legislation. There would be no direct requirement for further development as a result of the current proposal.	N/A	
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No	The effects would be local and would not cross local, national or international boundaries.		

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

Para 057 of the Environmental Impact Assessment section of the NPPG (Reference ID: 4-057-2070720) states that EIA is unlikely to be required for an urban development project involving the redevelopment of land unless the new development is on a significantly greater scale than the previous use, or the types of impact are of a markedly different nature or there is a high level of contamination.

Sites which have not previously been intensively developed:

- (i) area of the scheme is more than 5 hectares; or
- (ii) it would provide a total of more than 10,000 m² of new commercial floorspace; or
- (iii) the development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non-urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1,000 dwellings).

The proposed development is a significantly greater scale in terms of floorspace, but much of the increased scale would be contained within the existing residential campus and the types of impact identified in this report are not of a markedly different nature to the existing use. There is not a high level of contamination.

The site is near to a number of culturally and locally ecologically sensitive sites. However there is no evidence to suggest that the scale or nature of the proposal would result in harmful environmental effects on these.

It is considered that there are no likely significant impacts identified based on the scale and nature of the proposal as described in the submitted details.

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?	No

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	Steve Vigar, Principal Planning Officer
DATE	04 January 2018