

Mr A. James
bhpdesign
St Paul's Place,
40 St Paul's Square,
Birmingham
B3 1FQ

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

Web site: www.staffordshire.gov.uk/planning
Please ask for: David Bray

SENT BY EMAIL

Our Ref: [SCE.237/ES.17/01/511 MW](#)

28 March 2017

Dear Mr James,

APPLICATION NO. [ES.17/01/511 MW](#): CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION FACILITY TO INCORPORATE WORKSHOPS, WELFARE AND CUSTOMER HOSPITALITY AND CHANGING FACILITIES TOGETHER WITH SEPARATE COVERED GRANDSTAND AND ASSOCIATED WORKS AT KEVIN QUARRY, RAMSHORN, OAKAMoor, STOKE-ON-TRENT.

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2011: REGULATION 7 - SCREENING OPINION

I refer to your application which became valid on 16 March 2017 (ref. [ES.17/01/511 MW](#)) in connection with the above development.

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

The County Council has considered the application as submitted and is of the opinion that the proposed development could fall within the description provided within Schedule 2 paragraph 2(a) to the above regulations, but in the opinion of the County Council, having taken into account the criteria in Schedule 3 to the above regulations and the '[Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#)' (version 6/3/14), the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. Further details are provided in the accompanying 'Screening Opinion Checklist'.

Therefore, in accordance with the powers contained in the 'Scheme of Delegation to Officers', this letter confirms that the County Council is of the opinion that the proposed development is **not EIA development** and need not be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

Yours sincerely
David Bray
Principal Planning Officer

Accompanied by Screening Opinion Checklist



PA/PAD No. SCE.237/ES.17/01/511 MW		Site / Location: Kevin Quarry South, Ramshorn, Oakamoor, Stoke-on-Trent		
Description of development: Construction of demonstration facility to incorporate workshops, welfare and customer hospitality and changing facilities together with separate covered grandstand and associated works.				
PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required? (ref: EIA Regulations 2011, and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects)			Yes	No
1	Development Description	<p>Do you have enough information to define the size and type of development (a plan, description of type/nature/ purpose and possible effects)?**</p> <p>Yes/No (explain)</p> <p>Yes (Application ref. ES.17/01/511 MW)</p> <p>If Yes - proceed to step 2 If No - <i>either take the precautionary principle and assume the worst case or, request more information confirming 3 week deadline not commence until received;</i> **Note - Changes or extensions may also need an EIA! (Schedule 2, category 13)</p>	✓	
2	Is it a Schedule 1 development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes/No (explain) <p>No – <i>the development is not listed in Schedule 1</i></p> <p>If Yes - The development is category..... and a screening opinion is not required as an <u>EIA mandatory!</u> If No – <i>it may be listed in Schedule 2 (proceed to step 3)</i></p>		✓
3	Is it a Schedule 2 development? (Schedule 2, Col 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes/No (explain) <p>Yes - The development falls/could fall within categories 2 (a) (Extractive Industry) /10 (a) (Infrastructure project – Industrial estate development projects)/10 (b) Urban development projects / 13 (b) (Change to EIA development) (proceed to step 4)</p> <p>If No - it is not listed in Schedule 2 and a screening opinion is not required <u>and EIA not required</u></p>	✓	

<p>4(a) 4 Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No – (explain) <p>The threshold/criteria could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 2 (a) (Extractive Industry) - All development except the construction of buildings or other ancillary structures where the new floorspace does not exceed 1,000 square metres. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes - The proposed new floorspace of the ancillary building is 1,883 square metres. • Category 10 (a) (Infrastructure project – Industrial estate development projects) – The area of the development exceeds 5 hectares. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An EIA is more likely to be required for site area of the new development is more than 20 hectares and the key issues to consider: Potential increase in traffic, emissions and noise. No – The area of the proposed development does not exceed 5 hectares. • Category 10 (b) (Urban Development projects) - The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development; or (ii) the development includes more than 150 dwellings; or (iii) the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An Environmental Impact Assessment is unlikely to be required for 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) and the key issues to consider: physical scale of such developments, potential increase in traffic, emissions and noise. No – The area of the proposed development does not exceed 1 hectare /the development does not include dwellings and does not exceed 5 hectares in total. • Category 13 (b) – (Change to EIA development) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The development as changed or extended may have significant adverse effects on the environment; or (ii) in relation to development of a description mentioned in column 1 of Sch.2 the thresholds and criteria in the corresponding part of column 2 of Sch.2 applied to the change or extension are met or exceeded. No – The quarry is EIA development. The changes to the quarry development would not result in significant adverse effects on the environment nor would they meet the EIA thresholds or criteria for quarry development. An Environmental Statement accompanied permission to extend and revise the restoration scheme ref ES.16711/03 dated 13 July 2001 – this permission was varied by ES.07/16/511 MW dated 13 December 2013. <p style="text-align: center;">- 2 -</p> <p>(proceed to step 4b)</p>	✓	
---	---	---	--

	<p>4(b) Is the proposal within/near to a 'sensitive area'? (e.g. SSSI, NP, AONB, SAC, RAMSAR, Scheduled Monument)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No – (explain) <p>No – The development does not fall within/near to a sensitive area</p>		✓
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If you have answered 'Yes' to the threshold/criteria a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2</i> • <i>If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2</i> • <i>If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is not within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is not required.</i> 	✓	
5	Conclusion	Screening opinion required?	✓	

PART 2 – Is an EIA Required? (ref: [Schedule 3 - EIA Regulations 2011](#) and [Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#))

EIA usually required for (i) major developments of more than local importance; (ii) development in particularly environmentally sensitive or vulnerable locations; (iii) developments with unusually complex and potentially hazardous environmental effects. This checklist should be used to determine whether significant effects are likely to arise from the development. **REMEMBER** – the Regs also apply to changes to EIA development and reserved matters / subsequent approvals

<p>1 Indicative thresholds/criteria</p>	<p>Does the development fall within the indicative thresholds/criteria? (see Indicative screening thresholds)</p>	<p>Yes- refer to Indicative screening thresholds of the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The development could fall within Category 2(a) quarries - All development except the construction of buildings or other ancillary structures where the new floorspace does <u>not</u> exceed 1,000 square metres. The proposed floor space / 1,883 square metres</p> <p>According to the guidance EIA is more likely to be required for all new open cast mines and underground mines. Clay, sand and gravel workings, quarries covering more than 15 hectares or involve the extraction of more than 30,000 tonnes of mineral per year.</p> <p>Key issues to consider: - The likelihood of significant effects will tend to depend on the scale and duration of the works, and the likely consequent impact of noise, dust, discharges to water and visual intrusion.</p> <p>The application relates to a demonstration facility and covered grandstand measures 1,883 square metres in size. The demonstration facility and covered grandstand would be used in association with the established mineral working (ref. ES.07/16/511 MW). The planning application includes the access track (total site area of 2.1 hectares/ 21,286 square metres).</p> <p>Having regard to the indicative thresholds/criteria it is considered that the proposal falls within the Indicative screening threshold (ref. category 2(a) of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations).</p>
---	---	---

2	Characteristic of the development:	Size of the development:	The demonstration facility and covered grandstand (two buildings measuring 1,883 square metres in size). The proposal also includes the access to the facility, hardstanding and two car parks) which would be located in Kevin Quarry. The quarry is 78 hectares in size. The proposal covers 2.7 % of the total quarry area.
		Cumulation with other developments	The proposals would be used in association with the existing quarry (ref. ES.07/16/511 MW). An ancillary development is located in the quarry (coating plant ref. ES.09/23/511 MW)
		Use of natural resources	Natural resources would be used in the construction of the demonstration facility and covered grandstand. The proposals relate to a permission involving the winning and working of limestone. The mineral extracted would be used when demonstrating plant and equipment (the 'interim operations' set out in the planning permission ref. ES.07/16/511 MW). The demonstration facility and covered grandstand would temporarily sterilise mineral, however the demonstration facility and covered grandstand would be removed to allow any mineral to be extracted and the site restored.
		Production of waste	None
		Pollution and nuisances	Vehicle emissions and dust generated by vehicle movements, noise, blasting and fuelling vehicles are potential sources of pollution and nuisance. However it is reasonable to conclude that conditions similar to those on the existing quarry planning permission could be imposed to minimise the potentially adverse environmental effects.
		Risk of accidents	Low risk if the site is operated properly in accordance with relevant health and safety legislation. It is not anticipated that there would be any additional implications from the proposed use of the demonstration facility and covered grandstand.

3	Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of area likely to be affected):	Existing land use (include past, present and future (allocated land))	<p>Past:- agricultural use</p> <p>Present:- non-operation land within quarry (permission was granted in June 1974 for the "quarrying and quarrying of limestone at Kevin and Wredon quarries".</p> <p>Future: - following cessation of quarrying the land would be restored to grassland; woodland/scrub and a waterbody in accordance with the approved restoration and aftercare scheme (ref. ES.07/16/511 MW).</p>
		Relative abundance, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources	The demonstration facility and covered grandstand would be removed prior to the re-commencement of the mineral extraction in the 'working operations' phase. Following completion of mineral extraction the site would be restored in accordance with the approved restoration and aftercare scheme(ref. ES.07/16/511 MW).
		Absorption capacity of natural environment (particularly wetlands, nature reserves/parks; SSSIs and international designations; areas where environmental quality standards have been exceeded; densely populated areas; landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site does not contain and is not immediately adjacent to any areas nationally or internationally designated for nature conservation value.
4	Characteristics of the potential impact	Extent of the impact (area and size of affected population)	It is reasonable to expect that dust; noise and transport effects can be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and mitigated. It is also reasonable to conclude that any negative impacts can be controlled by good site management and planning conditions.
		The magnitude and complexity of the impact	As above
		The probability of the impact	As above

		The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact	The demonstration facility and covered grandstand would have temporary impacts; the facility and covered grandstand would be removed to allow the mineral extraction to continue. The site would be restored by 31 December 2029 or if earlier then within 12 months of the cessation date (Condition 7 of planning permission <u>ES.07/16/511 MW</u>). It is reasonable to expect any negative impacts could be controlled by good site management and planning conditions.	
5	Can the significant effects be addressed by proposed mitigation measures?	Are the mitigation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modest in scope? • Plainly and easily achievable? 	<p>Yes – the mitigation measures which include pre-construction checks for protected species (Precautionary Working Method Statement); the management of Indian balsam and undertaking work outside the bird breeding season; are modest in scope and it is reasonable to assume that they could be plainly and easily achieved.</p> <p>It is also reasonable to assume that conditions similar to those on the existing quarry planning permission could be imposed to minimise the potentially adverse environmental effects.</p>	
6	Conclusion	ES required?	YES	NO ✓
	Signed and dated	Case Officer	David Bray (27/3/17)	Team Manager Mike Grundy 27/3/17