

Sarah McCann  
Staffordshire County Council  
Strategic Planning Advice  
Strategic Property Unit  
1 Staffordshire Place  
Stafford  
ST16 2LP

**Postal Address:** *Planning, Policy & Development Control (Floor 2)*  
*Staffordshire County Council*  
*Block A, Wedgwood Building*  
*Tipping Street*  
*Stafford*  
*ST16 2DH*

Our Ref: SCE.173/ES.13/19

27 March 2014

**SENT BY EMAIL ONLY**

Dear Ms McCann

**ES.13/19: EXTENSION TO RYKNELD PRIMARY SCHOOL TO INCLUDE 10 NEW CLASSROOMS, STAFF FACILITIES, CAR PARKING, ALL WEATHER PLAYING PITCH, LANDSCAPING, HARD PLAY AREAS, THE ERECTION OF NEW TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS AND DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES AND THE RELOCATION OF EXISTING SPORTS PITCHES AT RYKNELD COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL, MAIN STREET, BRANSTON, BURTON-ON-TRENT**

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

I refer to your application dated 23 December 2013 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 information you supplied and is of the opinion that the proposed development falls within the description provided within Schedule 2 paragraph 10(b) of 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 indicative threshold criteria currently available in Circular 2/99 ‘EIA – A Guide to Procedures’, 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 attached ‘Screening Opinion Checklist’.



Under the powers contained in the 'Scheme of Delegation to Officers', this letter therefore 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,

**Alfia Cox**  
Senior Planning Officer

Attachment: Screening Opinion Checklist dated 24 March 2014.

<b>PA/PAD No.</b> SCE.173/ES.13/19		<b>Site / Location:</b> Rykneld County Primary School, Main Street, Branston, Burton-on-Trent			
<b>Description of development:</b> Extension to Rykneld Primary School to include 10 new classrooms, staff facilities, car parking, all weather playing pitch, landscaping, hard play areas, the erection of new temporary classrooms and demolition of existing buildings and structures and the relocation of existing sports pitches					
<b>PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required?</b> (ref: <a href="#">EIA Regulations 2011</a> , <a href="#">Circular 2/99</a> and <a href="#">DETR EIA – Guide to procedures 2000</a> ) See also DCLG note to LPAs on EIA click <a href="#">here</a> and for DCLG guidance from June 2006 about reserved matters and variations of condition and EIA click <a href="#">here</a>				<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>1</b>	Development Description	Do you have enough information to define the size and type of development (a plan, description of type/nature/ purpose and possible effects)?**  <b>Yes</b> (proceed to step 2)		✓	
<b>2</b>	Is it a Schedule 1 development?	<b>NO</b> – If the development is not listed in Schedule 1 it may be listed in Schedule 2 (proceed to step 3)			✓
<b>3</b>	Is it a Schedule 2 development? (Schedule 2, Col 1)	<b>YES</b> - The development falls/could fall within Schedule 2 category10 (b) – Urban Development projects		✓	
<b>4</b>	4(a) Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2)	<b>Yes</b> The threshold/criteria is 0.5 hectares and the proposal is 3.3 hectares (proceed to step 4b)		✓	
	4(b) Is the proposal within/near to a 'sensitive area'? (e.g. SSSI, NP, AONB, SAC, RAMSAR, Scheduled Monument)	<b>No</b> – The development does not fall within/near to any 'sensitive areas'			✓
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>Screening opinion required?</b>		<b>YES</b>	

**PART 2 – Is an EIA Required? (ref: [Schedule 3 - EIA Regulations 2011](#), [Circular 2/99](#) and [DETR EIA – Guide to procedures 2000](#))**

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

1	Indicative thresholds/criteria	Does the development fall within the indicative thresholds/criteria? (see Circular 02/99 and DETR EIA - links above)	<p><b>The latest guidance contained in Circular 02/1999 ‘Urban development projects’:</b></p> <p><b>A18.</b> states that EIA 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.</p> <p><b>A19.</b> states that development proposed for sites which have not previously been intensively developed are more likely to require EIA if: the site area of the scheme is more than 5 hectares; or it would provide a total of more than 10,000 m<sup>2</sup> of new commercial floorspace; or the development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non, urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1,000 dwellings).</p> <p>The proposal affects previously developed land and involves built development with a footprint of about 1,500 sq m.</p> <p>The site area is less than 5ha and involves less than 10,000 sq m.</p>
2	Characteristic of the development:	Size of the development:	The application site is 1ha although the footprint of the built aspects of the new development would be less than 0.2ha of floorspace. The remainder of the site would be playing fields.
		Cumulation with other developments	The land is occupied by the school. The site is bounded by open space to the north and the Main Street to the west; residential properties are to the east and south of the application site.

		Use of natural resources	Construction materials
		Production of waste	Demolition, construction and excavations
		Pollution and nuisances	Possible - during demolition and construction works. Potential traffic impact, which could be associated with the increased capacity of the school but no significant emissions or noise is anticipated with school use
		Risk of accidents	Low risk if the site is operated properly in accordance with relevant health and safety legislation.
3	Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of area likely to be affected):	Existing land use (include past, present and future (allocated land))	Present and future - Existing school
		Relative abundance, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources	It is reasonable to assume that the land would continue to be used as a school. It is not anticipated that there would be any additional implications from the proposed changes to the existing site.
		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).	In EIA terms the site is not within an environmental sensitive area. It is reasonable to assume that any impacts of the development would be addressed as part of the detailed planning application
4	Characteristics of the potential impact	Extent of the impact (area and size of affected population)	Minimal impact. It is not anticipated that there would be any additional implications from the proposed changes to the existing site. The site is located on previously developed land; and there would be potential impacts, e.g. visual, residential amenity and traffic. However, it is reasonable to assume that they would not be significant in EIA terms and can be addressed as part of the detailed consideration of the proposal.
		The magnitude and complexity of the impact	Due to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development the magnitude and complexity of the impact is considered to be low.

		The probability of the impact	Likely impacts during demolition and construction and use of the school but impacts are not considered to be significant	
		The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact	Demolition and construction works would have only temporary impact. The school use is permanent.	
5	Can the significant effects be addressed by proposed mitigation measures?	Are the mitigation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modest in scope</li> <li>• Plainly and easily achievable</li> </ul>	<b>Yes.</b> It is anticipated that the environmental effects and potential impacts can be controlled by mitigation measures imposed by planning conditions that are similar to the current permission, subject to appropriate variations where necessary.	
6	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>ES required?</b>	<b>No</b>	
	<b>Signed and dated</b>	<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Alfia Cox</b> 24 March 2014	<b>Team Leader/Team Manager</b> <b>Julie Castree-Denton</b> 25 March 2014