

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	PL/25/1521	Brief description of the project / development	Request for a Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) for the proposed development of a maximum of 102,500m ² (Gross External Area) Class B8 (Storage or distribution) floorspace, and 7,500 m ² (Gross External Area) Class B2 (General industrial) floorspace and associated works on land off Island Road, Reading.
Applicant	Stantec on behalf of SEGRO plc		
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)			Not applicable
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) (a) (Industrial Estate Development Projects). The area of the development exceeds 5ha, being 29.65ha in area
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?			Not applicable.
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes, exceeded
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			The area of the development exceeds 5ha, being 29.65ha in area.
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)			In respect of the currently emerging proposals within this red line boundary, no. It is however noted for information that alternative proposals on parts of the same red line boundary (other proposals were on wider sites), were issued on 10/02/2021 (Ref 201238 – positive screening opinion) and 21/02/2017 (Ref 170101 – negative screening opinion). No Sos SO or SD issued.
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?			Not applicable in relation to the currently emerging proposals within this red line boundary.
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			Not applicable in relation to the currently emerging proposals within this red line boundary.

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

4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?

Not applicable.

In the table below, references to the applicant's submission are simply summarising comments made by the applicant in support of their opinion that the proposals are not EIA development and that a negative screening opinion should be issued by the local planning authority (LPA). The viewpoint of the LPA is specifically referenced below, predominantly in section C of the response.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons) Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable)) 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 .
5. NATURAL RESOURCES		
5.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes The applicant's submission confirms there will be earthworks (grading, excavation and alterations) but in summary concludes that such impacts will be managed through careful planning, construction practices, and ongoing maintenance and monitoring.	Yes The applicant's submission states the effect will not be significant, with the underlying landfill material remaining in place. Fill material is intended to be used rather than large scale excavation to achieve the required level development platform. Environmental management techniques will also be used. Local Planning Authority (LPA) viewpoint: Unproven at this stage that the effect will not be significant, so yes. Paragraph 3.1 of Appendix C of the submission confirms that the emerging development could be up to a maximum 25metres in height. No detailed topography information has been included within the submission. No information regarding the location of the built form within the red line boundary has been included either. In light of the significant site area (29.65ha) and the intention to create a level development platform, the construction of the project will potentially cause physical changes in the topography of the area.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
5.2 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?	Yes	The applicant's submission confirms the use of natural resources during both the construction (e.g. land/soil disturbance and use of finite materials) and operational (e.g. on-going energy and water use)	No The applicant's submission states the effect will not be significant, with the effects managed through best practices – e.g. travel plan and BREEAM excellent LPA viewpoint: Whilst the provision of 102,500m² (Gross External Area) Class B8 (Storage or distribution) floorspace means that the effects could be significant (e.g. potential for a data centre use of some form within Class B8), the effects are likely to be able to be managed and, moreover, will be required to in order to comply with adopted local plan policies (e.g. BREEAM).
5.3 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	The applicant's submission advises that there are no forestry, fisheries, tourism, or minerals resources that could be affected by the proposal. LPA viewpoint: Unlikely based on the information provided.	N/A
6. WASTE			
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	The applicant's submission confirms waste will be created during construction and operation. It is also acknowledged that the former landfill use increases the risk, but with the exception of piling, there is no intention by the applicant to excavate through the landfill cap.	No. The applicant's submission states the effect is unlikely to be significant, with it managed through various measures, including a site waste management plan. LPA viewpoint: The effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES		
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes The applicant's submission confirms the Proposed Development will release pollutants and potentially hazardous, toxic, or noxious substances into the air during both construction and operational phases. The former landfill use is a contributory factor, with the site having an active Environmental Permit, in addition with construction activities for the uses proposed and operational stage impacts, again as a result of the proposed uses.	No The applicant's submission states the effect is unlikely to be significant, with it managed through various measures, including a construction and environmental management plan (CEMP). LPA viewpoint: It is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes The applicant's submission concedes that the construction phase will be likely to generate noise and vibration due to the use of plant and machinery. Artificial lighting can contribute to light pollution, which may disturb local wildlife and nearby residents. At operation stage, internal and external lighting, as well as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems can all contribute to light spill. The operation of the concrete batching plant (which is the specified 7,500sqm Class B2 part of the proposals) will also generate noise.	Yes The applicant's submission specifies a series of mitigation measures will manage the impacts. In terms of noise, the CEMP is referenced, as is an Operational Noise Impact Assessment. With regard to lighting, again the CEMP is referenced, as is Operational lighting being designed in line with CIBSE Lighting Guide 1 'The Industrial Environment' and BS 5489-1:2003+A2:2008. Furthermore, the Appendix B Ecology note provides more detail on the lighting strategy. The applicant considers that overall, significant effects as a result of pollution sources are not considered likely given the appropriate implementation of mitigation measures. LPA viewpoint: The accuracy of the Appendix B Ecology note is called into question, given it references that parts of the application site is within both the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site and the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Area, but the remainder of the submission suggests this is largely no longer the case

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
		(e.g. paragraph 1.3.3 of the main report and Appendix A) A small strip (0.49ha) of Fobney Island LWS and a small area (5.2ha) of the Kennet Valley BOA lie within the redline boundary to the north of Island Road. No other local sites are anticipated to be affected directly or indirectly by the proposed development. The 0.49ha of Fobney Island LWS within the redline will be retained in its entirety and will be incorporated into a habitat buffer between the LWS and the proposed development area. Furthermore, the 5.2ha of the Kennet Valley BOA present within the site boundary will be retained as part of the proposals. This area will be used to provide a significant area of land for attenuation purposes. 'Policy EN12: Biodiversity and The The proposals have the opportunity to deliver significant biodiversity benefits, which will be focused within 5.3ha of land located north of Island Road, the majority of which falls within the Kennet Valley BOA. The scheme offers the potential to maintain and substantially enhance the nature conservation value of this area in-line with current conservation priorities and to mitigate any identified adverse effects of the development on the flora and fauna of the site and its immediate environs. There is consequently ambiguity in this regard. In practice, it would appear to be likely that the Appendix B report is based on an earlier iteration of the emerging proposals and not those subject of this screening opinion request. GS Ecology (RBC's Ecology consultants) acknowledge that the measures set out by the applicant will reduce the potential impacts, but maintain their viewpoint (in the context of the 2021 screening opinion, which Appendix B seeks to respond to in part) that the emerging proposals are an EIA development. More specifically, significant effects (e.g. light) are likely on locally sensitive areas including the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area. Separate from the GS Ecology comments, it is noted that paragraph 2.4.4 of the report states that the concrete batching plant is proposed in the north-east corner of the Site, although no proposed layout plan has been included in the submission, meaning it is not 100% clear where this will be. It is noted that there are residential properties to both the north-east and south

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
		of the site, who could be significantly affected by this element of the proposal in terms of noise and vibration and light disturbance in particular, also factoring in the potential 25m height of the proposed development. Given no proposed site layout plan is included to indicate the location of the 102,500m2 Class B8 floorspace, the location of this at any point within the red line boundary at a height of up to 25m means light disturbance could be caused to nearby residents (in the context of the lighting required to serve building(s) of such heights).
7.3 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 The applicant's submission confirms that the Proposed Development has the potential to lead to contamination of land and water from the release of pollutant during both the construction and operational phases. Various risks are identified by the applicant, such as the mobilisation of existing contaminants during construction for example. The applicant also points out that As the Site is a former domestic waste landfill with an active Environmental Permit it will be necessary to ensure that the Proposed Development does not result in any form of environmental impairment. It is also a requirement that the conditions of the Environmental Permit, especially landfill gas extraction and monitoring, can continue to be complied with.	No Significant effects are not considered likely by the applicant, with planning conditions recording, remediating and verifying contamination. The applicant also references the CEMP. LPA viewpoint: It is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.
7.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental	Yes The applicant's submission identifies the on-site former landfill use and this being subject to an active Environmental Permit by the EA. Close to the site, the applicant identifies air quality from the nearby A33 and	No The applicant considers that no significant effects are anticipated in relation to environmentally degraded or polluted areas, provided that Environmental Permit conditions are upheld throughout the development. Various transport-based responses are also provided.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?		water quality from the nearby River Kennet as other potentially affected areas. At operation stage, the applicant identifies that the Proposed Development may generate up to 67 HGV trips during the morning peak, and 77 during the afternoon peak, with all expected to route southbound along the A33 towards the M4. The applicant concedes that these journeys could create localised air quality hotspots,	LPA viewpoint: Transport matters, as raised in the context of air quality by the applicant, are separately responded to in section 13 below. In terms of on-site landfill and nearby air and water quality, it is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage..
8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH			
8.1 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	The applicant's submission accepts that new development has the potential to be affected (and therefore has the potential to impact the environment) by the risk of major accidents or disasters. The applicant concludes that in reviewing the characteristics of the development, the location of development and environmental baseline, it is considered, in relation to the EIA, that there are no specific risks to environmental receptors or environmental aspects identified within this request for a Screening Opinion, in relation to major accidents and disasters relevant to the development concerned.	No The applicant considers that significant effects are not considered likely, with measures including a CEMP, FRA, Drainage Strategy and Detailed Emergency Response Plan (to address off-site risks associated with AWE Burghfield) all referenced. LPA viewpoint: It is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage. With specific regard to Emergency Planning matters, the consultation response from West Berkshire Emergency Planning confirmed the following: - Positively the applicant has recognised they are in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone for AWE Burghfield - Positively it has been recognised that the applicant would need emergency plans in relation to any development.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
			As a result more detail would need to be provided as part of any full application coming forward to provide robust assurance that any development would not have an adverse effect on the AWE Off-Site Emergency Plan (OSEP), the responders associated with that OSEP and therefore will not have an adverse effect on the health, safety and wellbeing of those being part of that development through construction and operation plus the wider community by not drawing resources away from the existing community. This may be resolved by condition by way of a robust construction emergency plan, a detailed site wide emergency plan and operational plans for any tenant(s) who occupy the development. Wider consultation would also be necessary with the other responders who form part of the AWE Off-Site Planning Group (27 agencies).
8.2 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	The applicant's submission acknowledges that air pollution and water contamination to Green Park Village residents could occur during construction. Air and noise pollution, as well operational failures at the site could impact nearby populations at the operational stage.	No The applicant considers that the CEMP and associated measures will mitigate impacts and significant effects are not considered likely. LPA viewpoint: It is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.
9. WATER RESOURCES			
9.1 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	Whilst the headline response by the applicant is 'no', by virtue of the commentary provided the applicant's standpoint is actually 'yes', with the Kennet, South Lake, a stream to the south and east all identified, as well as confirming that wiliest most of the site is in flood zone 1, a portion of the site is at higher risk of flooding.	No The applicant's response specifies that FRA will assess the impacts, with the Drainage Strategy and CEMP also referenced in mitigation. The applicant considers that significant effects on water resources are therefore not considered likely. LPA viewpoint: The likelihood of a significant effect occurring will depend on the FRA, SuDS strategy and related matters, which will be considered at application

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
		stage. It is agreed that the effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant.
10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)		
10.1 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 designation (international, national, regional or local))).	Yes The applicant's submission states at Section 6 (page 25) that the nearest sites designated for their ecological value include: ▪ Fobney Island Wetland Nature Reserve, approximately 240 m north; ▪ Kennet Island Wildlife Conservation Area, approximately 760 m northeast; ▪ Loushill Copse Local Nature Reserve: approximately 2.75 km northwest The Proposed Development could affect these areas through various means, ranging from habitat disruption to the effects of runoff, air and noise pollution.	Yes The applicant states the following: <i>The Proposed Development has been informed by a comprehensive suite of ecological surveys undertaken since 2020, including assessments for breeding and wintering birds, bats, otters, water voles, reptiles, dormice, and great crested newts. These surveys have guided the design and mitigation strategy to ensure that the ecological value of the site and its surroundings is protected and enhanced.</i> <i>Key mitigation and best practice measures will be enforced through a CEMP. These measures include pollution prevention protocols to avoid siltation and chemical contamination of nearby aquatic habitats, dust control, and protection of retained trees and hedgerows through Root Protection Areas (RPAs). Construction activities will be scheduled to avoid sensitive periods such as breeding and migration seasons, thereby reducing the risk of disturbance to local wildlife.</i> <i>The Proposed Development is also designed to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), as a minimum.</i> <i>During operation, pollution from run-off from the Site will be managed through an appropriate drainage strategy.</i>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
		<i>As such, the proposed development is not considered to generate any significant adverse ecological effects.</i> LPA Viewpoint: The proximity of the site to areas of ecological value referenced by the applicant at page 25 differs from the information at Appendix B, where it references that parts of the application site is within both the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site and the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Area. GS Ecology (RBC's Ecology consultants) acknowledge that the measures set out by the applicant will reduce the potential impacts, but consider that the emerging proposals are an EIA development. A combination of the sensitive location (irrespective of the exact distances) and the size of the development size means significant effects are likely on locally sensitive areas including the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area.
10.2 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 applicant's submission concedes that the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on identified habitats (e.g. deciduous woodlands, hedgerows, as well as Fobney Island Wetland Nature Reserve and Kennet Island Wildlife Conservation Area) and species (e.g. Grey Partridge, Lapwing, Turtle Dove, and Yellow Wagtail) are significant.	Yes The applicant concludes that the proposed development incorporates robust mitigation and enhancement measures that will safeguard and improve the ecological value of the site. The retention and enhancement of key habitats, combined with sensitive construction practices and long-term ecological management, ensure that the development will not result in significant adverse ecological effects. On the contrary, it is expected to deliver a net positive impact on biodiversity, particularly within the Kennet Valley BOA. LPA viewpoint: GS Ecology (RBC's Ecology consultants) acknowledge that the measures set out by the applicant will reduce the potential impacts, but consider that the emerging proposals are an EIA development. Significant effects are likely on locally

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
			sensitive areas including the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area.
11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL			
11.1 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 applicant firstly notes that the area does not contain any national or internationally designated landscapes. The applicant then acknowledges that the green spaces, woodland walks and landscaped areas of Green Park village are important for maintaining the scenic and environmental quality of the region, albeit not formally designated. The applicant also acknowledges that the River Kennet and nearby lakes are valued for their natural beauty and recreational use and contribute to the overall landscape value of the area. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will assess the potential visual changes, evaluating and identifying any visual impacts and guiding the implementation of mitigation measures to ensure minimal disruption to the landscape.	Yes The applicant states that based on the Preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal Note (October 2025), the proposed development is anticipated to give rise to some principally localised landscape and visual effects. However, at this stage, the applicant considers it is not expected to result in significant overall or wider effects on protected landscapes. LPA viewpoint: It would appear that a small part of the site is located within the locally designated Kennet and Holy Brook Meadows Major Landscape Feature (or a larger part of the site based on Appendix B). As the applicant states, other areas of the surroundings have value too. Whilst the impact could be mitigated, as suggested by the applicant, based on the information presented for this screening application, a 25m high structure could be positioned at any point of the 29.65ha site, providing 102,500m² Class B8 and 7,500m² Class B2, all of which is considered to be significantly individually. When the height, site area and floorspace is combined as one, a significant effect is considered to be likely at this juncture.

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

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
11.2 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 The applicant acknowledges that proposed development will be visible to: residents of Green Park Village and the surrounding residential areas; employees and visitors to nearby commercial areas, including Green Park; drivers and passengers from the A33.	Yes The applicant's submission states that at this stage the proposed development is not expected to result in significant overall or wider effects on protected landscapes. It is noted that the site is already relatively enclosed, mitigation will be provided and <i>in many views, the Site may be seen in the context of existing industrial edges, which will help integrate it into the surrounding landscape.</i> LPA viewpoint: Based on the information submitted for this EIA screening application, there is no clear indication of the location of the significant floorspace (up to 102,500m² Class B8 and 7,500m² Class B2) on a significantly sized site area (29.65ha), aside from confirmation that the total height will be up to 25metres. In addition, it is also relevant that this submission also indicates that the proposed development will require the creation of a level development platform, which will be achieved through placement of suitable fill material (rather than large scale excavation given the Site's former landfill use). It is unclear based on the information submitted whether the 25m height is based on current ground levels, or those resultant after the level development frame. With the above in mind, it is highly likely that the project will be highly visible to many people, from all directions, but in particular from the north (residential areas of Southcote and Coley), the east (A33 and surrounds, which includes a significant residential population at Kennet Island) and the south (Green Park Village and surrounds). The closest views will be to those to the south (with residential properties within metres of the boundary), while the northern and eastern visibility are acknowledged to be long-range / setting viewpoints. However, in the context of the

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
		existing character, it would be likely to have a significant effect.
12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY		
12.1 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 applicant's submission identifies the grade II listed Kirton's Farmhouse 1.2km to the south-west of the site and states no archaeological interest remains.	No The applicant considers that due to the scarcity and distance of the nearest features of historic significance, the Proposed Development is not expected to cause any impacts on designated or non-designated historic assets, including their setting or views to, from, and within the Site. LPA viewpoint: It is considered that any effects (noting a nearby area of archaeological potential to the site) are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS		
13.1 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 The applicant's submission identifies a series of nearby routes, including a Public Right of Way, National Cycle Network Route 4, footpaths on Island Road, shared footways/cycleways/bus stops along the A33, as well as nearby Green Park Station.	No The applicant considers that a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Framework Travel Plan will mitigate any impacts, with the proposals also encouraging active travel. LPA viewpoint: It is considered that any effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage.
13.2 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 applicant's submission acknowledges that the A33 is a key arterial route in Reading that already experiences high traffic volumes. The applicant states that <i>the Proposed Development is expected to generate up to 400 two-way vehicle trips across the morning and afternoon peak hours, including approximately 169 HGVs. As outlined in the Transport Scoping Note, this could increase pressure</i>	Yes The applicant concedes that there are potential effects caused by traffic disturbance to local residences during the construction period as a result of routing construction traffic. Mitigation during the construction phase will be managed by a CEMP and the CTMP. The applicant concludes that <i>It is considered that effects to transport as a result of the Proposed Development would be Not Significant.</i>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	on the A33 / Island Road / Lindisfarne Way junction, particularly during peak times.	Effects during construction are short term and reversible and are therefore not considered to be significant. During operation, the Site will return to near baseline conditions. Therefore, significant effects are not anticipated. LPA viewpoint: The Highway Authority has advised that an EIA will be required in this respect. More specifically, the applicant's submission and cross referenced this with the pre-application submission documentation to ascertain the number of vehicle movements that would be generated by the development, which is calculated as being 3,453 vehicle trips. The applicant has obtained Automatic Traffic Counts (ATCs) but these have not been stipulated within the submissions to date. However, as part of previous applications it has been stated that '2017 traffic surveys on the A33 recorded an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) level of 32,453', but the applicant is now claiming that the flows are currently slightly less than previous surveys. This proposed increase in traffic would result in an increase of 10% or more on the A33. This is a route that is already at or exceeding capacity, thereby making it a highway link of high sensitivity. The Highway Authority would therefore advise that an EIA would be required.
14. LAND USE		
14.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the	Yes The applicant's submission states that the proposed uses aligns with the adopted and emerging local plan	Yes The applicant specifies construction and operation stage impacts will be mitigated, with the CEMP, CTMP

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
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.	and <i>Therefore, the Proposed Development is fully compliant with local zoning and strategic planning objectives, and significant land use conflicts are unlikely.</i> The applicant then identifies the nearby uses surrounding the site, including residential (& primary school), commercial and industrial, and a business park.	and various air quality, lighting and noise measures all referenced. As such, the applicant considers a significant effect is unlikely. LPA viewpoint: A significant effect is likely; only the information to be submitted at application stage will ascertain whether that is positive or negative. The level and nature of information provided at this juncture does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a significant effect is unlikely.
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes The applicant states that <i>Immediately east of the Site lies land owned by RBC, which is earmarked for future B8 commercial warehousing. Another significant nearby site is the Thames Water Site (SR1c), located along Island Road near the A33. This site is identified in the Reading Borough Local Plan Partial update (2024) for between 25,000 and 38,000m2 of industrial, warehouse, R&D, or alternative commercial uses. Additionally, Unit A at the Island Road Logistics Centre, which was unoccupied during baseline traffic surveys, is expected to become operational.</i>	No The applicant states that <i>Strategically, the Island Road area is identified in the Local Plan as a key growth zone for industrial and warehouse development. The Plan highlights the areas potential to meet the majority of Reading's future need for such floor space. As a result, the Proposed Development will align with this broader vision and ensure that infrastructure, access, and environmental considerations are scalable and coordinated with future growth. Therefore, no significant effects are anticipated on future land use plans.</i> LPA viewpoint: It is considered that any effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage, with it particularly needing to be demonstrated that the proposals are part of a comprehensive approach to the area and does not compromise other allocated sites being able to come forward (in line with the site allocation) in the future.
15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE		
15.1 Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic	Yes The applicant's submission states that <i>The Site is not in a location susceptible to earthquakes, landslides, erosion or extreme climatic conditions. The Site is also</i>	No The applicant's submission considers that <i>Suitable mitigation measures relating to land stability will be implemented if required. Therefore, no significant</i>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
conditions, e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?		<i>not susceptible to a high risk of flooding, and measures identified by the drainage strategy will ensure resilience for the increased risk of flooding induced by climate change.</i> The applicant's submission however does acknowledge that <i>There is a risk of subsidence due to the Site's history as a landfill, which can lead to structural instability and long-term maintenance issues.</i>	<i>effects are anticipated in relation to land stability and climate.</i> LPA viewpoint: It is considered that any effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage,
16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS			
16.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes	The applicant's submission has identified the following: ▪ PL/24/1520, 300 Brook Drive; ▪ 220769, 250 Brook Drive; ▪ 19/01468/FUL, Land East of Cottage Lane; ▪ PL/17/0444, Land at Island Road West; and ▪ PL/14/1789, Land North of Island Road. LPA viewpoint: Officers would also point out paragraph 6.3.4 of the adopted Local Plan 2019 identifies that Planning permission already exists for over 70,000 sqm of offices on site SR1C (corner of Island Road and A33) as part of the Kennet Island planning permission. The local plan continues by confirming that whilst implementation of that scheme remains possible, this is not expected. Accordingly, the LPA's viewpoint is that this extant scheme also needs to be taken into account in addition to those already referenced by the applicant.	No The applicant's submission states that <i>As the Proposed Development is within the Island Road Major Opportunity Area allocation (Policy SR1). The cumulative effects arising during the construction and operation phases from these developments have been accounted for accommodated within the Local Plan and are not anticipated to be significant.</i> LPA viewpoint: It is considered that any effects are likely to be able to be managed to ensure they are not significant, albeit these will need to be demonstrated at application stage,

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS		
17.1 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.

18. 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(a) of Schedule 2 and exceeds the threshold of the areas of the development exceeding 5ha 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 23/10/2025, 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 (in particular being within the setting of the Fobney Island Local Wildlife Site (LWS), the Kennet Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area and the Kennet and Holy Brook Meadows Major Landscape Feature) and the potential effects on, in particular, the landscape and visual environment, natural resources, pollution and nuisances (light, noise and vibrations), biodiversity (species and habitats), transport and access (the A33) and land uses.

Accordingly, in exercise of the powers conferred by Regulation 6 (6) (b) of the EIA Regulations 2017 (the timeframe having been agreed to be extended until 04/12/2025, as per correspondence originally on 24/10/2025 and subsequently on 31/10/2025, 10/11/2025 and 11/11/2025, 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 if you disagree with this Opinion.

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

19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	Not applicable	
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	Not applicable – screening directions are issued by the SoS, not the LPA	
Is an ES required?	Yes	
20. 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	X
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	X

21. REASON FOR SCREENING

As per request from the prospective applicant.

NAME	Jonathan Markwell – Principal Planning Officer, Reading Borough Council
DATE	03/12/2025