Ref. No.. SCE.316/SM.19/07/1141 W		**Site / Location:** Whiston Hall Golf Club, Black Lane, Whiston	
Description of development: Remodelling of existing golf course to improve on-site water management, accessibility and player safety through the importation of engineering materials to regrade and reprofile part of the existing golf course, with the construction of new attenuation and irrigation ponds, erection of an associated pump house and proposed landscaping and tree planting			
PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required? ***(ref:*** EIA Regulations 2017***, and*** Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects			**Yes / No**
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)?** • **Yes** (proceed to step 2) (Application ref. SM.19/07/1141 W) • **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?	• **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)	• **YES -** The development falls/could fall within the following categories: **Category 11 'Other projects (b) Installations for the disposal of waste';** **Category 12 'Tourism and leisure - (f) Golf courses and associated developments'; and,** **Category 13 'Changes and Extensions – (b) to a development listed in Schedule 2'.** (proceed to step 4)	**Yes**

4	4(a) Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2)	**Yes** The applicable thresholds and criteria for: • **Category 11 (b) is i) the disposal is by incineration or ii) the area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare or iii) the installation is to be sited within 100 metres of any controlled waters.** • **Category 12 (f) – the area of the development exceeds 1 hectare;** • **Category 13 (b) – (i) the development as changed or extended may have significant adverse effects on the environment or in relation to development of a description mentioned in column 1 of Sch.2 (i.e. 11 (b) 'Installations for the disposal of waste' and /or 12 (f) 'Golf Courses and associated developments'), the thresholds and criteria in the corresponding part of column 2 of Sch.2 (see above) applied to the change or extension are met or exceeded.** The proposal relates to remodelling works through the importation of 150,000 tonnes of inert waste over a 24-month period to provide an improved accessibility and course layout across the northern half of the site (the back 9 holes). Whilst the Golf Course is an 18-hole course and approximately 35.5 hectares in area, the works however relates to an area of 8.8 hectares, approximately one quarter of the overall Golf Course site. The proposal therefore exceeds the applicable thresholds. (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)	**YES** – The development falls within/near to the following designated site(s) **The site is within the SSSI consultation zone. Whiston Eaves SSSI is a distance of 1.1km to the south of the site. Churnet Valley SSSI is 390 metres to the northwest**	**Yes**
		• *If you have answered **'Yes'** to the threshold/criteria **a screening opinion is required** – proceed to Part 2* • *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* • *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**.*	
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 Regulation 4 (2) 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, Regulation 4 (2) and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects*)*			
1	Applicable screening thresholds/criteria	Does the development fall within the applicable screening thresholds / criteria? (see applicable screening thresholds)	**YES:** The indicative screening thresholds set out in the 'Planning Practice Guidance' for development falling within category 11(b) are where new capacity is created to hold more than 50,000 tonnes per year, or to hold waste on a site of 10 hectares or more. Sites taking smaller quantities of wastes are unlikely to require Environmental Impact Assessment. Whilst the site area is approximately 8.8 hectares, the proposal is to import 150,000 tonnes of inert waste (75,000 tonnes per annum over a 2-year period). The proposed development therefore does exceed the indicative thresholds / criteria of category 11 b in respect of throughput, however is below the threshold for site area. The key issues to consider for this category are: the scale of the development; and, the nature of the potential impact in terms of discharges, emissions or odour. Changes to a Schedule 2 development (Category 13 (b)), are also relevant. Specifically including the potential impacts from noise, dust, traffic, upon the ecology of the site and the surroundings, discharges to water, and the landscape and visual impact. In respect of Category 12 (f) the applicable threshold / criteria are new 18-hole golf courses. This does not apply in this case.

2	Characteristic of the development:	Size and design of the whole development:	The site is the existing 35.5-hectare Whiston Hall 18-hole golf course, located immediately to the south and east / northeast of Whiston village. The former Moneystone Quarry is to the south of the golf course. A former railway line embankment (Whiston Tramway embankment) separates the northern and southern parts of the golf course. The proposal relates to remodelling works of existing fairways and greens in the northern half of the golf course (the back 9 holes), an area of 8.8 hectare to improve on-site water management, provide an improved accessibility and course layout, new attenuation pond and proposed landscaping. The import of 100,000 cubic metres / 150,000 tonnes of inert waste over a 24-month period is proposed to regrade and reprofile part of the existing golf course. The existing Whiston Hall Golf Club and Hotel will remain open during the construction period and a minimum of 9 holes will remain playable whilst the temporary works are taking place. A new temporary access from a new junction off the A52, approx. 400m to the west of the junction with Blakely Lane is proposed for construction vehicles. Construction works would be undertaken over 5 phases, five days per week Monday to Friday between 07:30 to 17:30 hours (10-hour period). Based on the estimated 150,000 tonnes of material to be imported and an average truck load of 22.5 tonnes there would be a total of 6,667 deliveries to the site / 13,334 movements over the 24-month period. Based on a worst-case scenario of 67 weeks of construction (rather than 87 weeks over a 20-month period) on average there would be a total of 100 loads / 200 movements per week equivalent to 20 loads / 40 movements a day or 2 loads / 4 movements per hour. This equates to a vehicle movement every 15 minutes.

		Cumulation with other developments and/or approved development:	The proposals are likely to have a temporary impact upon the local road network and nearby residential properties of Whiston Village and residential properties on Blakeley Lane. The development would potentially be carried out in combination with any developments taking place on the adjacent former Moneystone Quarry to the south. The mineral permission for Moneystone Quarry SM.96/935 shall expire when the restoration and aftercare required by Condition 35 has been completed and complied with. Meanwhile an outline application by Laver Leisure for leisure development at Moneystone Quarry has been approved by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) (ref. SMD/2016/0378) on 26/10/2016 however the decision is pending the signing of a legal agreement . This development will comprise of holiday lodges, a new central hub building (providing swimming pool, restaurant, bowling alley, cinema, spa, gym, children's soft play area, café, shop, and sports hall); café; visitor centre with farm shop and associated multi sports areas and car parking (re-submission of planning application SMD/2014/0682).
		Use of natural resources (e.g. land, soil, water and biodiversity:	Importation of inert waste for infill and remodelling purposes. Proposals involve attenuation ponds and landscaping.
		Production of waste:	None anticipated. Imported material (inert waste) to be used in remodelling of the golf course. Non-conforming waste would need to be removed from site.

		Pollution and nuisances:	The key issues to consider are the proximity of dwellings, and the pollution and nuisance potential including noise and emissions to air, flood risk and impact of traffic movements. In respect of traffic, a temporary access for construction vehicles is proposed off the A52 in order to avoid travelling through the Whiston Village and using the existing Golf Course access. Whilst the traffic implications will need to be carefully assessed, it is however reasonable to assume that they would not be significant in EIA terms. In respect of noise and dust, the flood risk, given the nature of the waste to be imported, and the temporary nature of the operations, it is reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls (for example health and safety and Environment Agency pollution controls). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the risk in terms of pollution and nuisance would not be significant in EIA terms
		Risk of major accidents and/or disasters relevant to the development including climate change:	For the reasons described above it is also reasonable to assume that the risk of major accidents would not be significant in EIA terms.
		Risk to human health (e.g. water contamination or air pollution:	For the reasons described above it is also reasonable to assume that the risk to human health would not be significant in EIA terms. The application is accompanied by a Dust and Air Quality Management Plan, a Flood Risk Assessment, and a Noise Impact Assessment.
3	Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected):	Existing and approved land use (*include past, present and future (allocated land/with permission)*)	The site is an existing 18-hole golf course and once remodelled the site would continue to operate as a golf course.
		Relative abundance, availability, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground):	It is reasonable to assume that natural resources could be adequately protected utilising appropriate safeguards during operations. Relevant aftercare provisions could be required and subject to appropriate conditions that could be attached to any planning permission. The duration of the development would be dependent on the availability of inert waste to remodel the site in addition to suitable soils being retained on the site and the import of suitable topsoils if required.

		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):	The site is within a SSSI consultation zone. Whiston Eaves SSSI is a distance of 1.1km south of the site. Churnet Valley SSSI is 390 metres to the northwest There is also potential for protected species in the area and also potential for flood risk given the remodelled landform and proximity to and access adjacent to residential properties. A former railway line embankment separates the northern and southern parts of the golf course and the proposed works involve the remodelling of the 9 holes to the north. The former railway line embankment forms a definitive physical boundary separating two different hydrological catchments. As such, surface water run-off from the northern part of the site, within which the remodelling works would be contained, would be expected to travel to the on-site ponds and then to the north west. An Ecological Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, and Air Quality Assessment accompany the application to fully consider any impacts to the SSSI. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the likelihood that the natural environment would not be able to absorb the development is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.
4	Types and characteristics of the potential impact	The magnitude and spatial extent (e.g. geographical area and size of affected population likely to be affected):	The proposal relates to changes to an existing golf course which is bound to the north and west by Whiston village. It is reasonable to anticipate that dust, noise, air quality, water quality, visual and residential amenity, and transport effects can be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and mitigated. It is reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls (for example Environment Agency pollution controls). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the magnitude and spatial extent would not be significant in EIA terms.

		The nature of the impact:	Due to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, ecological impact, visual impact, flood risk, air and water quality and traffic would need to be carefully assessed and mitigation measures may be necessary. However, it is reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls (for example Environment Agency pollution controls). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the nature of the impacts would not be significant in EIA terms
		The transboundary nature of the impact:	Not applicable
		The intensity and complexity of the impact:	Due to the temporary nature, scale and location of the proposed development it is reasonable to assume that potential effects can be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and mitigated. It is also reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls (for example Environment Agency pollution controls). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the intensity and complexity of the impacts would not be significant in EIA terms.
		The probability of the impact:	As above.
		The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact:	The duration of operations would be 24 months. As above - It is reasonable to assume that the intensity and complexity of the impacts would not be significant in EIA terms.
		The cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development:	Consideration would need to be given to traffic impact and air quality and the approved development on the adjacent former Moneystone Quarry site. Any impact can reasonably be predicted and would not be significant in EIA terms
		The possibility of effectively reducing the impact:	It is reasonable to assume that appropriate mitigation measures could be imposed to minimise the impact of the development i.e. imposition of planning conditions by the Waste Planning Authority and pollution control regulated by the Environment Agency.
5	**EIA Development**		**No**

	The main reasons for the conclusion reached having regard to (Reg 5 (5)(b)). Due to the temporary nature, scale and location of the proposed development, it is reasonable to assume that the potential environmental effects can be predicted with a reasonable degree of accuracy and mitigated. It is also reasonable to assume that the site could operate within planning and other regulatory controls (for example Environment Agency pollution controls) which could be anticipated to be modest in scope. It is therefore reasonable to assume that in EIA terms no significant effects are likely to arise from the development.				
	Signed and dated	**Case Officer**	**Julie Castree-Denton 16 August 2019**	**Team Leader/Team Manager**	**Mike Grundy 16 August 2019**