

**Sal Khan CPFA, MSc
Head of Service (Section 151 Officer)**

Date: 26 June 2018

Mike Shelton
Tatenhill Aviation Ltd
Tatenhill Airfield
Newborough Road
Needwood
Staffordshire
DE13 9PD

Direct Line: 01283 508746
Direct Fax: 01283 508388
Reply to: Lisa Bird
Email: lisa.bird@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk
Our Ref: QU\2018\ENQ\0177

*(please quote this reference on all correspondence
with us)*

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: Consultation & Screening Opinion - Proposed positioning of a building.
Tatenhill Airfield, Newborough Road, Needwood, Staffordshire, DE13 9PD**

I refer to your letter and plans submitted to this department on the 3rd May 2018 in relation to the above site.

The Local Planning Authority has considered your consultation against the EIA regulations, and also against Schedule 2, Part 8, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

We are in a position to confirm that the works proposed, i.e. the erection of a new three storey administration building, does not require the submission of an Environmental Statement, and can be completed as permitted development under Part 8 of the above order.

You should be aware of the requirement to re-consult the Local Planning Authority should your plans in the future differ from the information submitted under this enquiry.

Yours faithfully

Lisa Bird

Lisa Bird
Planner
Development Control

Screening Opinion Checklist

Case Officer: Lisa Bird

Date: 20th June 2018

Ref. No. QUI\2018\ENQ\0177	Site / Location: Tatenhill Airfield, Newborough Road, Needwood	
Description of development: Erection of an administration building up to 3 storeys in height to replace existing units		
PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required? (ref: EIA Regulations 2017, and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects)		
1	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)?** <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (proceed to step 2) No - either take the precautionary principle and assume the worst case or, request more information confirming 3 week deadline not commence until received; **Note - Changes or extensions may also need an EIA! (Schedule 2, category 13)	Yes ✓
2	Is it a Schedule 1 development? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes/No (explain) YES – The development is category..... and a screening opinion is not required as an EIA mandatory! NO – If the development is not listed in Schedule 1 it may be listed in Schedule 2 (proceed to step 3) 	No ✓
3	Is it a Schedule 2 development? (Schedule 2, Col 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES - The development falls/could fall within category 10 Infrastructure Projects, sub-category (e)(ii) Construction of Airfields. (proceed to step 4) • NO – If the development is not listed in Schedule 2 a screening opinion is not required and EIA not required! 	Yes ✓
4(a)	Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes The threshold/criteria is 1 hectare and the site is approximately 145 hectares (it should be noted that the 145 hectares relates to the whole of the Airfield site rather than the area affected by the proposed development which is significantly less than 1 hectare. (proceed to step 4b) 	Yes ✓
4(b)	Is the proposal within/near to a 'sensitive area'? (e.g. SSSI, NP, AONB, SAC, RAMSAR, Scheduled Monument) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YES – The development falls within/near to the following designated site(s) Within or metres from Within or metres from..... (OR) 	No ✓
5	Conclusion Screening opinion required?	Yes ✓

PART 2 – Are the proposals EIA development?



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 has been prepared with reference to Schedule 3 and used to determine whether significant effects are likely to arise from the development. The Regulations also apply to changes to EIA development and reserved matters / subsequent approvals (ref: [Schedule 3 - EIA Regulations 2017](#) and [Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#))

Indicative thresholds/criteria	Does the development fall within the indicative thresholds/criteria? (see Indicative screening thresholds)	
<p>1</p> <p>Characteristic of the development:</p>	<p>a) Size and design of the whole development:</p>	<p>The site is 145 hectares, above the threshold of 5 hectares set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations.</p> <p>The site is currently used as an Airfield and is operated by a 'relevant airport operator'. The site currently has several single storey buildings, utilised for administration and maintenance and aircraft hangars (these hangars are taller). The majority of the site is flat and open, made up of the runways, aircraft parking aprons and open areas of grass.</p> <p>The proposal is for the erection of an administration building, situated towards the front of the site near to the existing Air Ambulance office and hangar. The building is proposed to be up to 3 storeys in height with a footprint of approximately 15.2m x 23.7m. The building is taller than existing buildings, but will be set away from the road replacing the existing unit. The area of the site at approximately 145 hectares means that EIA screening is required, however the area affected by the proposal is significantly less than 1 hectare.</p>
	<p>b) Cumulation with other developments and/or approved development:</p>	<p>There have been previous permitted developments for aircraft hangars, however, due to their relatively small scale it is not considered that there are any likely significant cumulative effects likely from other existing or approved developments. In addition, there are no similar proposals within the immediate local area to conclude that significant cumulative effects are likely.</p>
	<p>c) Use of natural resources (e.g. land, soil, water and biodiversity):</p>	<p>The demolition, construction and operational phases of the development would use land, soil, aggregate, water and energy that would be standard for a development of this size and is not considered to raise significant environmental effects.</p>

<p>d) Production of waste:</p>	<p>Demolition and construction wastes can be recycled where possible and operational waste will be managed through applicable legislation.</p> <p>It is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on air quality in the immediate area. Dust generation would be managed under relevant legislation.</p> <p>The emissions associated with vehicle movements would not increase significantly during the course of the construction.</p> <p>The proposed development is for an administration building which is not associated with hazardous substances or toxic emissions to air. There is not anticipated to be a requirement to store large volumes of hazardous materials. Any such materials would be stored and handled in accordance with relevant legislation. The site is not located within, or in proximity to, any Air Quality Management Areas.</p> <p>The area is at low risk of contamination due to a previous use as a poultry farm. The remediation of the land should be undertaken with advice and agreement from the Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Health Team.</p> <p>Whilst the proposal would be situated near to some residential properties it is not considered to be likely to result in a development which has an impact in terms of noise. Any noise during construction could be managed utilising the relevant legislation.</p>
<p>e) Pollution and nuisances:</p>	<p>It is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any significant increase in the risk of accidents given that the proposal is for an administration building and not associated with increased use of the wider site as an airfield. It is therefore not considered an EIA is required on this basis.</p>
<p>f) Risk of major accidents and/or disasters relevant to the development including climate change:</p>	

	<p>g) Risk to human health (e.g. water contamination or air pollution):</p>	<p>It is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in any significant increase in risk to human health. Any impacts identified to water and air pollution would be managed through appropriate legislation.</p>
	<p>a) Existing and approved land use (<i>include past, present and future (allocated land/with permission)</i>)</p>	<p>The site is an airfield with existing administration and maintenance buildings and aircraft hangars. There are some residential properties nearby, an industrial estate and the National Football Centre, including a hotel and some community sport and leisure use. The development is not proposed to be in a previously undeveloped area and is not considered likely to have significant environmental effects on these surrounding uses.</p>
	<p>b) Relative abundance, availability, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground):</p>	<p>There are no areas on or around the site that contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the development. The site is brownfield and is within active use. It does not contain any watercourse and is located in Flood Zone 1. The site is not the subject of or close to and Source Protection Zone.</p>
<p>2 Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected):</p>	<p>c) Absorption capacity of natural environment (in Staffordshire these could include wetlands, riparian areas and forest areas; nature reserves/parks; SSSIs and international designations; areas where EU environmental quality standards have not been met; densely populated areas; landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance):</p>	<p>There are no statutory designations within or adjacent to the site i.e. there are no Scheduled Monuments, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), National Parks, Registered Battlefields, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, or Ramsar Sites.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the SAC through recreational pressure provided as the site is located approximately 14km from Cannock Chase SAC.</p> <p>The closest such designation is Slade Covert SSSI, designated for woodland habitat, approximately 500m to the south-west of the site.</p> <p>The nearest protected feature is the Grade II listed milestone located approximately 600m to the east of the site on Newborough Road.</p> <p>Newborough Conservation Area and Rangemore Conservation Areas, which include further listed buildings,</p>

		<p>are located approximately 2.2km to the west and east of the site respectively.</p> <p>The site is within a mineral safeguarding area and consultation will need to take place with Staffordshire County Council.</p> <p>It is considered that there would not be any significant environmental effects arising from the proposed development relating to absorption capacity.</p>	
<p>3</p> <p>Types and characteristics of the potential impact</p>	<p>The magnitude and spatial extent (e.g. geographical area and size of affected population likely to be affected):</p>	<p>The impact of the development is confined to the site and adjacent land. Residents, industrial estate and highway users could be affected during the demolition and construction phases. These impacts could be managed through relevant legislation.</p>	
	<p>The nature of the impact:</p>	<p>Noise, dust, drainage and contamination from hydrocarbons during the demolition and construction phase. These will be managed through appropriate legislation.</p>	
	<p>The transboundary nature of the impact:</p>	<p>The will be no transboundary impacts.</p>	
	<p>The intensity and complexity of the impact:</p>		<p>The impact will vary from intense during the demolition and construction phase to more limited, but continuous upon completion.</p>
			<p>The impact will not be unusually complex.</p> <p>Whilst there will be landscape impacts, due to the introduction of urban form, this is well screened by existing boundary treatments. Therefore it is not considered sufficiently intense or complex to require an EIA.</p>
		<p>The probability of the impact:</p>	<p>The probability of the impacts will be managed through appropriate legislation.</p>
<p>The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact:</p>		<p>Construction impacts would be short term in duration and the operational effects would be long term. The construction impacts would be intermittent and frequent, with the operational impacts being continuous. However, given that the Tatenhill Aviation already operate from the site and that this building is to replace an existing</p>	

		administration building there are considered to be no significant impacts.
	The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development:	There would be no significant cumulative impact with other existing or approved development.
	The possibility of effectively reducing the impact:	The impacts can be managed through relevant legislation.
	EIA Development	No
	Reasons for Conclusion on EIA development – the main reasons for the conclusion having regard to the above (Regulation 5(5)a):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not located within a sensitive area as defined by the EIA Regulations • There have been previous permitted developments at the site for proposed aircraft hangars, these hangars and the building proposed will not result in a significant increase in the frequency or type of air traffic or from the cumulative impact of these permitted developments. Given there will not be a significant increase in air traffic from this development, or cumulatively when considered alongside other developments there is unlikely to be any significant issues raised in relation to increase noise, emissions or traffic generation. • The site is a previously developed site and the development, whilst the building proposed is to be of a larger scale than some of the existing built form on the site, it will replace some of the units currently existing and is modest in relation to the overall scale of existing airfield. The scale and level of development, in the context of the airfield use, will not have a significant urbanising effect on the locality. • The site as a whole exceeds 1 hectare, however, the area for the proposed development is significantly less than 1 hectare • Preliminary investigations confirm that there are no significant or complex environmental effects resulting from the proposals. • The operators of the Airfield, Tatenhill Aviation Ltd, have confirmed that they are 'relevant airport operators' and therefore they meet the criteria required to undertake development under Schedule 2, Part 8 Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015 (as amended)). 	
Signed and dated		Team Leader/Team Manager
	20 th June 2018	 26-6-2018