Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

Request for a "Screening Opinion" in respect of the following development:

Proposed Development:

Erection of a single poly-tunnel type hangers at Tatenhill Airfield

Introduction:

The Council has been consulted on the above development, which is proposed to be carried out as being permitted under Part 18 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, by the relevant airport operator, Tatenhill Aviation Ltd. Details of the proposed development have been provided by means of plans and elevations sent with a letter dated the 6th March 2013. Having regard to Article 3(10) of the GPDO, in the case of development which is Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development within the meaning of the EIA Regulations, development is not permitted unless one of three conditions is satisfied, one of which is the adoption by the local planning authority of a screening opinion under Regulation 5 of the EIA Regulations that the development is not EIA development.

Schedule 1: No **Schedule 2:** Yes

The development proposed does not in itself fall within any of the descriptions listed in paragraphs 1 to 12 of Column 1 of Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations, but it is a proposal to change an existing development, namely Tatenhill Airfield, which falls within the description at paragraph 10(e) and has an area exceeding 1 hectare. The Council takes the view that, as a proposal to change an existing airfield with an area exceeding 1 hectare, the proposed development is to be regarded and treated as Schedule 2 development.

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

In respect of Schedule 2 development, an assessment will only be required if the development, or the existing impact of the use of the land as modified by the development is likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 require regard to be had to Schedule 3 of the Regulations when considering whether an Assessment should be required, including the following:

1. Characteristics of the development – size of the development, cumulative effects with other development, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisances, risk of accidents with regard to substances or

technologies utilised.

2. Location of the development: the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected must be considered, in particular

- the existing land use,
- the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources,
- the absorption capacity of the natural environment, with particular emphasis to the following areas:
    - (i) wetlands
    - (ii) coastal zones
    - (iii) mountain and forest areas
    - (iv) nature reserves and parks
    - (v) areas designated by Member states
    - (vi) where environmental quality standards have been laid down in Community legislation and have been exceeded
    - (vii) densely populated areas
    - (viii) landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological importance.

3. Characteristics of the potential impact, with regard to :

- The extent of the impact
- Transfrontier nature of the impact
- Magnitude and complexity of the impact
- Probability of the impact
- Duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact

In assessing whether an Environmental Assessment will be required under schedule 2 category 13 (a) the impact of the proposed development must be considered in the context of the existing development/use of the land, and the cumulative impact of any repeated small extensions.

Assessment:

The proposed works upon which the Council have been consulted are for the erection of a single poly-tunnel type, to allow dry storage of aircraft. The owners of the Airfield, namely Tatenhill Aviation Ltd, have advised the hanger is necessary for the dry storage of light aircraft already based at the site, the scale of the hanger is such that it can only house small light aircraft, and as it will be used by existing customers of the airfield they will not significantly increase the level of air traffic from the site.

The physical scale of the proposed development is modest in the setting of the existing airfield, and the hanger is of scale, design and finish appropriate to the location; the poly-tunnel hanger measures 12.8m x 10m, with a dome roof measuring 4.9m maximum, therefore the scale and level of development, in the context of the airfield use, will not have a significant urbanising effect in the locality. The Local Planning Authority considers from the submitted information, and the fact this is a single hanger, that there will not be a significant increase in the frequency or type of air traffic relating to these hangers, or from the cumulative impact of these, and previously permitted developments. The development will not involve large scale construction works, and as such there is no more than a local visual impact. The site

is not located in an environmentally sensitive location (in terms of the Regulations) nor is the development proposed complex or potentially hazardous. There is no proposal to extend the runway, while the area of land to be taken up by the hanger is significantly less than 1ha.

Given the above it is considered by the Council that the environmental effects of the development, including the cumulative impact of the proposal in the context of the existing land use, and previous permissions and works, are not such that the development is likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location or in any other manner, and therefore a formal Environmental Statement will not be required.

Recommendation:

A formal screening opinion be adopted that the development consulted on is not EIA development.

Planning Delivery Team Leader/Planning Manager comments:

N/A

The following decision is made by the undersigned in accordance with powers delegated to the undersigned under the provision of S101 of the Local Government Act 1972.

The development as proposed is not EIA development and no Environmental Statement is required.

Interim Principal Planner (Planning Applications)

Signature: 

Date: 26th June 2013