EIA Screening Report

Change of Use and Outfall Applications

Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire

Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited

May 2020

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Background to the Site 3
3. The Proposed Development 6
4. EIA Screening Analysis 9
5. Summary and Conclusion 22

Appendices

Appendix I 2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Site Location Plan
Appendix II 2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Site Location Plan
Appendix III 2019 Outfall Application (ref. SMD/2019/0725) – Site Location Plan
Appendix IV 2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Parameters Plan
Appendix V 2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Eaves Lane Access Plan
Appendix VI 2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Restoration Plan
Appendix VII 2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Bowland Ecology: Building Inspection and Roost Assessment
Appendix VIII 2019 Outfall Application (ref. SMD/2019/0725) – Bowland Ecology: Ecology Statement
Appendix IX Planit-ie: Landscape and Visual Note
Appendix X Orion Heritage: Archaeology and Heritage Note
Appendix XI 2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Stantec: Transport Note

Prepared By: Jamie Lynch
Reviewed By: Richard Kevan
Status: Final
Draft Date: April 2020

For and on behalf of Avison Young

1. Introduction

1.1 Avison Young has been appointed by Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Limited ('the Applicant') to obtain a Screening Opinion from the Local Planning Authority ("LPA") for two applications at Moneystone Quarry, Staffordshire (hereafter referred to as 'the site'). These include a full planning application for the Change of Use ("CoU") of existing buildings (ref. SMD/2019/0716) (hereafter referred to as the '2019 CoU application') and a full planning application for a surface water outfall (ref. SMD/2019/0725) (hereafter referred to as the '2019 outfall application').

1.2 The Moneystone Quarry site is subject to an outline planning application (ref. SMD/2016/0378) (hereafter referred to as the '2016 outline application [or permission]') submitted in 2016 and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement ("ES") (hereafter referred to as the 'June 2016 ES') prepared by HOW Planning (now part of Avison Young) on behalf of the Applicant.

1.3 The 2019 CoU and 2019 outfall planning applications sit outside of the approved outline application boundary and therefore fall to be screened under the EIA Regulations. The Site Location Plans for the 2016 outline permission, the 2019 CoU application and 2019 outfall application are included at **Appendix I, II and III** respectively.

1.4 This Screening Report summarises the findings of the research and analysis undertaken by Avison Young and the assessment team in relation to the baseline conditions and the potential environmental effects of the proposed development. This report aims to determine whether there is a likelihood of significant environmental effects to enable an informed decision on the requirement for Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") to be made by the LPA.

1.5 Provision for the request of a Screening Opinion from an LPA is made within Regulation 6 of the 2017 EIA Regulations[1], which states:

> *(1) "A person who is minded to carry out development may request the relevant planning authority to adopt a Screening Opinion.*
>
> *(2) A person making a request for a screening opinion in relation to a development where an application for planning permission has been or is proposed to be submitted must provide the following:*
>
> *(a) A plan sufficient to identify the land;*
>
> *(b) A description of the development, including in particular:*
>
> *(i) A description of the physical characteristics of the development and, where relevant, of demolition works;*
>
> *(ii) A description of the location of the development, with particular regard to the environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected;*

[1] The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (England) (SI571/ 2017), DCLG, London

(c) A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development;

(d) To the extent the information is available, a description of any likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment resulting from:

(i) The expected residues and emissions and the production of waste, where relevant;

(ii) The use of natural resources, in particular soil, land, water and biodiversity; and

(e) Such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make, including any features of the proposed development or any measures envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant adverse effects on the environment."

1.6 As required by the EIA Regulations, this request for a Screening Opinion is accompanied by a plan sufficient to identify the land, a description of the proposed development (including any relevant demolition works), a description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development and a description of any likely significant effects of the proposed development on the environment. Additional information is provided in accordance with guidance presented in the Planning Practice Guidance[2] (PPG).

1.7 In relation to the obligations on LPAs, the EIA Regulations state within Regulation 6 that a screening opinion should be adopted within three weeks of receiving a request.

1.8 Regulation 5 (5) of the EIA Regulations states:

"Where a relevant planning authority adopts a screening opinion under regulation 6(6), or the Secretary of State makes a screening direction under regulation 7(5), the authority or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, must-

a) State the main reasons for their conclusion with reference to the relevant criteria listed in Schedule 3;

b) If it is determined that proposed development is not EIA development, state any features of the proposed development and measure envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment; and

c) Send a copy of the opinion or direction to the person who proposes to carry out, or who has carried out, the development in question."

1.9 Accordingly, we request that Staffordshire Moorlands District Council ("SMDC") provides a Screening Opinion with details of the reason for their decision within three weeks of receipt of this report.

1.10 Detailed plans and technical reports prepared by relevant technical experts have been prepared to inform the preparation of this Screening Report.

1.11 This Screening Report has been subject to legal review by Leading Counsel Paul G Tucker QC, Kings Chambers. Advice from Counsel has informed the approach to the assessment to ensure the Report is legally robust.

[2] Department for Communities and Local Government (2014) Planning Practice Guidance http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk

2. Background to the Location

Planning History and Planning Background

2.1 The main site, which lies adjacent to the CoU site and the outfall site was granted outline planning permission on 26 October 2016. The approved description of development is as follows:

> *"Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of a high quality leisure development comprising holiday lodges; a new central hub building (providing swimming pool, restaurant, bowling alley, spa, gym, informal screen/cinema room, children's soft play area, cafe, shop and sports hall); cafe; visitor centre with farm shop; administration building; maintenance building; archery centre; watersports centre; equipped play areas; multi-sports area; ropewalks; car parking; and managed footpaths, cycleways and bridleways set in attractive landscaping and ecological enhancements (re-submission of Planning Application SMD/2014/0682)."*

2.2 The extent of the 2016 outline permission is identified on the location plan at **Appendix I**. The planning application set a series of development parameters by identifying land use and height parameters which were used to inform the assessment presented within the ES and provided in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: June 2016 ES Assessment Parameters

EIA Parameter	Purpose	Appendix Reference
Outline Planning Application Boundary	Defines the extent of the site and the proposed development.	**Appendix I**
Parameters Plan	Defines the type of development, maximum building heights and open space within identified zones.	**Appendix IV**
Means of Access Plan	Defines the means of access to the site, which have been applied for in detail.	**Appendix V**
Restoration Plan	The approved restoration plan for the quarry represents the baseline for the assessments in the EIA.	**Appendix VI**

2.3 The ES provided with the 2016 outline permission can be accessed using the reference 'SMD/2016/0378' at the following link:

- https://www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk/article/564/Comment-on-an-application

2.4 The June 2016 ES is also available for viewing at SMDC's offices: Moorlands House, Stockwell Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 6HQ. Further copies of the ES are available on CD at a cost of £35 from Avison Young. Hard copies of the ES can be prepared upon request, a quote for reasonable printing and distribution charges will be sourced upon any request.

2.5 The key elements of the 2016 outline permission comprised:

- Up to 250 lodges;
- Main hub building and visitor centre;
- Archery centre and lakeside café;
- Administration block and maintenance depot; and
- Additional uses – multi activity hub area.

2.6 A reserved matters application for Phase 1 of the development (ref. SMD/2019/0646) (hereafter referred to as the '2019 reserved matters application') was submitted to SMDC on 21 October 2019 and the description of development is as follows:

> *"Reserved matters application proposing details for the appearance, scale, layout and landscaping for phase 1 of the leisure development comprising 190 lodges; erection of a new central hub building (providing farm shop, gym, swimming pool, spa, restaurant, cafe, games room, visitor centre, hub management and plant areas): reuse and external alterations to the existing office building to provide housekeeping and maintenance accommodation (including meeting rooms, offices, storage, staff areas and workshop); children's play areas; multi use games area; quarry park; car parking; refuse and lighting arrangements; and managed footpaths, cycleways and bridleways set in attractive hard and soft landscaping."*

2.7 The reserved matters proposals accord with the development thresholds, parameters and quantum's set by the 2016 outline planning permission.

Site Description

2.8 The Moneystone Quarry site is broken down into three quarry areas and totals approximately 51.8 ha. Quarry 1 comprises land to the south of Eaves Lane and east of the main internal access road. This also includes buildings formerly used for site activities. Quarry 2 comprises land to the north of Eaves Lane and Quarry 3 comprises land to the south of Eaves Lane and west of the main internal access road.

Change of Use Site Description

2.9 The CoU site is irregular in shape and extends to approximately 0.92 ha. The planning application boundary is edged red and provided at **Appendix II**. The site is located to the southern extent of the 2016 outline application and extends an access road through the site providing connectivity to Eaves Lane.

2.10 In terms of the immediate surroundings, the site is bound by vegetation to the north, an internal quarry access road to the east, and ponds and vegetation to the west and a car park to the south. The CoU site itself comprises a vacant building which was formerly used by Sibelco as laboratory facilities until June 2018. The building comprises of laboratories and offices with associated warehousing and plantroom. There is a surfaced car park comprising 21 marked bays to the north of the building.

Outfall Site Description

2.11 The outfall site is irregular in shape and extends to approximately 0.09 ha. The planning application boundary is edged red and provided at **Appendix III**. The site is located to the western extent of the 2016 outline application and provides a connection between the western quarry (Quarry 3) and a tributary to the River Churnet. In terms of the outfall site itself, it comprises the quarry lakeside edge, an access track and woodland and grassland.

3. The Proposed Development

Change of Use Application

3.1 The 2019 CoU application is submitted in detail and the description of development is as follows:

> *"Change of use of the existing building from a laboratory to a sports hall with climbing wall, soft play area, two-lane mini bowl, cinema room; craft room and craft store, bike store and maintenance and bike hire office, café, viewing area, WCs, management office and plant rooms associated with Moneystone Park; external alterations and reconfiguration of existing car park to provide 24no. car parking spaces."*

3.2 The majority of the uses proposed have already been consented under the 2016 outline permission; however it is not practical for all of these uses to be provided at the same time within the size of the Hub Building which is proposed under the 2019 reserved matters application. As such, it has been concluded that the most optimal option is to accommodate these employment generating facilities within the existing laboratory building which is located outwith of the red line boundary of the 2016 outline planning permission and in proximity to the main 'Hub Area' of the leisure park. This enables an existing structure, with embedded carbon to be beneficially reused rather than to increase the size of the proposed hub building for which detailed consent is being sought. The CoU development will be brought forward as part of Phase 1 of the development and integrated within the wider leisure park for use by visitors.

3.3 Full details of the proposed development, including materials and elevational treatments are contained within the Design and Access Statement (NBDA Architects, November 2019) submitted in support of the 2019 CoU application.

3.4 The retention and conversion of the existing building will involve the removal of the internal walls currently subdividing the existing portal framed warehouse within the upper building to create a Sports Hall. The mini bowl and Children's Soft Play are positioned within the clear spanned lean-to to the north west of the main hall, where the ceiling height remains over 3.0m. Minimal alterations to the single storey masonry flat roofed elements around the perimeter are proposed.

3.5 The Informal Screen Room is located within the wide span space in the lower building. The original WC facilities, which serve the whole facility, have been removed and new WCs reinstated in the same location. A Bike Hire area is proposed within the southerly most section of the lower building. Minimal alterations to the single storey masonry flat roofed elements around the perimeter are envisaged and ancillary and support spaces are included within these areas.

3.6 The entrance into the building is positioned on the north west elevation facing towards the new Hub building and this is 'oversized' to create a clear visual signifier.

3.7 There are 3 no. small extensions to the existing building footprint:

- A feature entrance and lobby set within the opening formed by the existing roller shutter door on the north west elevation.

- A small extension to the rear of the lean-to to create sufficient length for the mini bowl; and,
- Additional space to the side of the stair within the link corridor to enable the inclusion of a wheelchair platform lift to allow wheelchair users access between the two levels.

3.8 External alterations are proposed to the building which will greatly improve its appearance and will tie in visually with the other buildings proposed within the Phase 1 Reserved Matters application. The existing metal cladding and patent glazing will be replaced with black Marley Eternit Profile 6 cladding (regularly used on agricultural buildings), new gutter profiles will be added and the brickwork will be overclad with vertical board and batten 'Accoya' timber panelling, as proposed for the Hub and Housekeeping buildings as part of the Phase 1 Reserved Matters applications. Windows will be replaced with grey powder coated double glazed aluminium framed units.

Context with the 2016 Outline Permission

3.9 The following uses which are proposed within this application were included in Condition 6 of the 2016 outline application. The permitted quantum of each land use within Condition 6 is shown in brackets:

- 320sqm sports hall with climbing wall *(up to 320sqm);*
- 85sqm children's soft play area *(up to 145sqm);*
- 50sqm 2 lane mini bowl *(up to 140sqm);* and
- 80sqm informal screen room *(Up to 80sqm).*

3.10 For each of the above uses, the quantum of development is within the permitted quantum of development for the approved Moneystone Park leisure development site.

3.11 The climbing wall element within the sports hall was not specified within the outline planning application. Therefore, this is a new use which is proposed to be within the sports hall allocation. The climbing wall itself will be within the existing building.

3.12 The 32sqm craft room and 126sqm bike hire facility were not proposed within the outline planning application for Moneystone Park. The café is additional to the permitted uses, however the seating elements floor space is contained within the permitted sports hall and soft play land uses and designated as viewing areas.

Outfall Application

3.13 The 2019 outfall application is submitted in detail and the description of development is as follows:

"Construction of surface water outfall associated with Moneystone Park leisure development."

A channel / cutting shall be made through the existing landbridge between Quarry 3 Lake and watercourse, known as Stream A, at a level of 153.8m Above Ordnance Datum ("AOD") through the existing bedrock,

reducing to a level of 153m AOD upon connection with Stream A. A flat bed weir shall then be constructed in line with the existing outfall, to maintain lake levels at or close to 154m AOD.

4. EIA Screening Analysis

4.1 When assessing whether an EIA is required, we have followed the guidance published in PPG in a step-by-step process, taking into account the requirements of Schedule 3 of the 2017 EIA Regulations. The analysis is presented below.

Step 1 – Is the Proposal Schedule 1 Development?

4.2 According to the EIA regulations and guidance, the application does not constitute Schedule 1 development.

Step 2 – Is the Proposal Schedule 2 Development?

4.3 The proposed development is categorised under Schedule 2, Class 13 'Changes and extensions' Subsection (b) 'Any change to or extension of development of a description listed in paragraphs 1 to 12 of column of this table, where that development is already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed'. For such development, an EIA may be required if;

- *"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 this table, thresholds and criteria in the corresponding part of column 2 of this table applied to the change or extension are met or exceeded."*

4.4 The proposed development will extend the Moneystone Quarry development by incorporating the 2019 CoU application site within the proposals, as well as delivering infrastructure to accommodate the drainage strategy via the 2019 outfall application.

4.5 The buildings within the 2019 CoU application formed part of the existing site conditions in the June 2016 ES and therefore it is not envisaged the proposals to refurbish and improve the CoU site would result in significant environmental effects. The June 2016 ES anticipated an outfall connection from Quarry 3; however, this required further analysis once the detailed designs had progressed. Therefore, it is not considered the proposals represent a significant departure from the development assessed approved by the 2016 outline application, but for robustness these 'amendments' are addressed within this EIA Screening Report.

4.6 The effects of the development as changed Is considered in the following sections of the report to ascertain whether the proposed changes are likely to result in significant environmental effects and require assessment through the EIA process

Step 3 – Is the Proposal in a Sensitive Area?

4.7 This section focuses on the potential significance of the development effects which could have changed or not been identified previously within the 2016 outline permission. Therefore, there are a number of technical

areas which do not need to be revisited as they will have been appropriately assessed within the June 2016 ES. The following technical areas have been scoped-out of this assessment:

- **Socioeconomics** – The proposed developments fall within the broad quantum of development approved as part of the 2016 outline permission, with a slight increase in additional complementary uses as presented previously in Chapter 3. However, it is not considered these additional uses would result in a change to the significance of effects previously identified nor result in new significant effects.

- **Ground Conditions** – The June 2016 ES provided an assessment of on-site and off-site impacts associated with the existing ground conditions. Therefore, it is not anticipated that by including the additional land within the development red edge will lead to any effects that have not been identified previously. Any relevant conditions identified in the 2016 outline decision notice can be reflected in the 2019 CoU and 2019 outfall applications to ensure appropriate environmental management controls and mitigation measures are implemented. As such, the potential effects associated with ground conditions is not considered further within this report.

- **Air Quality** – The highways assessment prepared by Stantec as part of the June 2016 ES included the majority of uses which now form part of the 2019 CoU application. The additional uses are not anticipated to generate any additional trips such that this warrants an update to the air quality assessment. An Air Quality Management Area ("AQMA") has been designated approximately 8km west of the site at the Cellarhead Junction. An Air Quality Assessment has been undertaken which confirms the Moneystone development would not result in significant air quality effects at this junction. Any relevant conditions identified in the 2016 outline decision notice can be reflected in the 2019 CoU and outfall applications to ensure appropriate environmental management controls and mitigation measures are implemented. Therefore, this assessment does not need to be considered further as part of this Report.

- **Noise and Vibration** – The highways assessment prepared by Stantec as part of the June 2016 ES included the majority of uses which now form part of the 2019 CoU application. The additional uses are not anticipated to generate any material trips such that this warrants an update to the noise and vibration assessment. Any relevant conditions identified in the 2016 outline decision notice can be reflected in the 2019 CoU and outfall applications to ensure appropriate environmental management controls and mitigation measures are implemented. Therefore, this assessment does not need to be considered further as part of this Report.

Ecology and Nature Conservation

4.8 It is not considered that the proposed development, as amended via the full applications, would result in new significant impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified. The residual effects in the June 2016 ES comprised negligible to moderate beneficial effects. Due to the nature of works proposed at the CoU site and the outfall site, the following ecology reports have been prepared:

- Building Inspection and Roost Assessment (refer to **Appendix VII**) – 2019 CoU application; and

- Ecology Statement (refer to **Appendix VIII**) – 2019 outfall application.

4.9 Each planning application is dealt with in turn.

2019 CoU Application

4.10 As set out previously, the 2019 CoU application is outside of the application for the 2016 outline permission. However, this land is within the Applicant's control and therefore did form part of a number of surveys that were undertaken to inform the June 2016 ES. Bowland Ecology have therefore supplemented the existing evidence base with a detailed survey of the buildings on site to support bats and birds.

4.11 The buildings on site are considered to have a negligible / very low suitability for roosting bats and no evidence of roosting activity was found during the surveys. It is therefore proposed that any refurbishment works are implemented with Reasonable Avoidance Measures ("RAMs") to mitigate any effects on bats on a purely precautionary basis. No significant impacts are anticipated on bats such that the effects require assessment in an EIA.

4.12 Ventilation pipes, gaps at the roof verge and external ivy and shrubbery provide suitable nesting opportunities for breeding birds. Droppings found during the internal inspection also indicate that birds can access the buildings interior for roosting and / or nesting.

4.13 It is recommended that works to the buildings and adjacent scrub vegetation are undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (March to August inclusive). Where this is not possible, works will be subject to a bird survey, carried out by a suitably experienced ecologist. No works will be carried out within 5 metres of an identified nest until the young have fledged and are no longer returning to the nest site. Works will only be undertaken once the project ecologist has declared the nest to be no longer in use. Again, such measures are proposed on a precautionary basis and not because any impacts are expected.

4.14 It is not considered that the proposals will lead to any significant effects on bird species, subject to implementing commonplace mitigation measures which can be integrated with the Construction Ecological Management Plan ("CEcMP") secured via the 2016 outline permission.

2019 Outfall Application

4.15 The 2016 outline application did anticipate a connection being required from Quarry 3 to the watercourse and this formed a component of the outline drainage strategy. The ecology assessment which formed part of the June 2016 ES anticipated negligible effects on the SSSI during construction as the designated features of the SSSI will be appropriately mitigated by best practice measures which can be integrated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP") and CEcMP.

4.16 However, as the detailed design has now progressed the potential mitigation can be refined further. Bowland Ecology have prepared an Ecology Statement on this basis (**Appendix VIII)**. The principal receptor in this location is Whiston Eaves Site of Special Scientific Interest ("SSSI"); however, the habitats in this area of the designation do not comprise species rich grassland which formed the basis of the SSSI designation. Other receptors include any loss of vegetation which would impact habitats potentially used by nesting birds, bats and amphibians / reptiles, and the receiving watercourse.

4.17 During construction the proposals would result in the loss of some vegetation including tree and shrub clearance, in turn affecting potential habitat used by nesting birds, bats and amphibians / reptiles. The

construction machinery and risk of pollutions or spillages could affect the nearby watercourses. In the long term, the principle effect is the risk for increased flow into the watercourse. Mitigation measures associated with the SSSI, the associated habitats for protected species and the watercourse further refine the mitigation presented within the June 2016 ES and are all standard commonplace measures.

4.18 However, Bowland consider the works to be small scale and the impacts on terrestrial habitats will be minimal. Without mitigation there could be impacts, predominantly during construction; however, these would be robustly managed and mitigated by a CEMP and CEcMP, so as to avoid any significant impacts.

Summary

4.19 There are a number of conditions relating to ecology set out on the 2016 outline permission, including conditions 9, 12, 18 to 20 and 44. Where relevant, these should be reflected within any subsequent decision notice for the full planning applications.

4.20 Overall, it is not considered the development as changed, taking into account the proposed amendments as part of the full planning applications when compared with the approved outline development, would lead to any new significant effects on receptors previously identified or new receptors, nor change the significance of effects previously identified. It is therefore considered that a supplementary EIA is not required in relation to ecological receptors.

Landscape and Visual

4.21 It is not considered that the proposed development, as amended via the full applications, would result in any significant new impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified. The residual effects in the June 2016 ES comprised moderate adverse to moderate beneficial effects. Due to the nature of works proposed at the CoU site and the outfall site, a detailed review of the June 2016 has been undertaken and a Technical Note prepared by Planit-ie is presented at **Appendix IX**.

4.22 Since the production of the June 2016 ES, the visual context of the site will have evolved as vegetation and habitats created associated with the site's restoration are implemented. There is little change to the landscape within the vicinity of the site, with the exception of the now erected solar panels to the east of Quarries 1 and 2 (which was assessed as part of the cumulative assessment). The June 2016 ES presented viewpoints which formed the basis of the visual assessment and which remain appropriate.

4.23 Potential effects during the construction phase are associated with ground and enabling works to deliver the new outfall from Quarry 3 to stream A for the 2019 outfall application. Long terms effects are associated with a minor change in character through the permanent channel which will be created. The construction effects associated with the 2019 CoU application relate to the refurbishment of the existing buildings including provision of car parking and landscaping. Whilst the building had been anticipated to be removed, nonetheless regard was had to its presence as part of the baseline in 2016. The 2016 ES assumed that the baseline was the approved restoration plan.

4.24 In the long term, the 2019 CoU application provides an opportunity to reuse, redesign and improve the architectural elements of the existing building to assimilate with the new high-quality scheme being delivered at Moneystone Quarry. Reuse of an existing structure to accommodate elements of the consented

scheme is a sustainable use of an existing resource (and its embedded carbon footprint), rather than the demolition of the building and the need for an expanded hub building. Whilst both developments are proposals on new areas of land outside of the 2016 outline application boundary, it is not considered significant effects on the identified receptors would change nor new significant effects be identified, and therefore mitigation measures identified as part of the June 2016 ES can be reflected for the CoU and Outfall applications, where relevant.

4.25 There are a number of conditions relating to landscape and visual set out on the 2016 outline permission, including conditions 12, 14, 17 and 44. Where relevant, these should be reflected within any subsequent decision notice for the full planning applications.

4.26 Overall, it is not considered the development as changed, taking into account the proposed amendments as part of the full planning applications when compared with the approved outline development, would lead to any new significant effects on receptors previously identified or new receptors, nor increase the significance of effects previously identified. it is therefore considered that a supplementary EIA is not required in relation to landscape and visual effects.

Archaeology and Heritage

4.27 It is not considered that the proposed development, as amended via the full applications, would result in new significant impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified. The residual effects in the June 2016 ES comprised negligible effects. Due to the nature of works proposed at the CoU site and the outfall site, a review of the June 2016 ES has been undertaken and a Technical Note prepared by Orion Heritage is presented at **Appendix X**.

4.28 The June 2016 ES created a study area that assessed the impacts of the development on archaeological assets. The assessment identified any potential assets on or within the immediate vicinity of the site which have the potential to be affected by the outline proposals. Due to the proximity of the 2019 CoU and 2019 outfall applications it is considered that any archaeological resources will have been appropriately defined and assessed within the June 2016 ES. As such, there are no further archaeological impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed developments.

4.29 The June 2016 ES confirmed there were no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Battlefields, Registered Parks and Gardens or Conservation Areas within the study area (which extended c. 1km beyond the site boundary). A total of 28 Listed Buildings were recorded within the study area, two of which formerly lay within the 2016 outline permission site boundary, though both were demolished during quarrying operations.

4.30 There are no heritage assets within or directly adjoining to the proposed development at the CoU or outfall sites. The nearest heritage asset is Little Eaves Farmhouse and associated Barn, both are Grade II Listed and c. 250m from the outfall site, and 340m from the CoU site. The proposals are not anticipated to result in significant affects on the significance of these heritage assets such that this warrants assessment in an EIA.

4.31 There is a condition relating to archaeology set out on the 2016 outline permission. Where relevant, condition 47 should be reflected within any subsequent decision notice for the full planning applications.

4.32 Overall, it is not considered the proposed developments would lead to significant effects on the significance of the heritage assets within the vicinity of the site or archaeological resources. It is therefore considered that a supplementary EIA is not required in relation to archaeology and heritage effects.

Drainage and Flood Risk

4.33 It is not considered that the proposed development, as amended via the full applications, would result in new significant impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified. The residual effects in the June 2016 ES comprised negligible to moderate beneficial effects. Due to the nature of works proposed at the CoU site and the outfall site, a review of the Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment prepared for the June 2016 ES has been undertaken.

4.34 As set out previously, the outline drainage strategy prepared to support the 2016 outline application envisaged a discharge location within Quarry 3 which rerouted the existing drainage to a formal managed discharge point into Stream A. The June 2016 ES anticipated the sustainable drainage strategy would result in a major beneficial effect to the SSSI. The design of this solution has now been progressed a result of further analysis of the groundwater conditions by Abbeydale. The current proposals for the outfall application are therefore in accordance with that of the 2016 outline application and the significance of effects remain as previously presented.

4.35 In respect of the CoU application, a comprehensive foul and surface water drainage scheme will be prepared to inform the detailed designs. This will build upon and integrate the measures that will be implemented as part of the wider development. It is not considered the inclusion of this application would lead to any significant flood risk impacts on future receptors due to the absence of fluvial flooding within the site. Furthermore, any drainage measures will tie into those proposed for the wider development and appropriately mitigated in line with best practice, thus reducing any off-site impacts.

4.36 There are a number of conditions relating to drainage and flood risk set out on the 2016 outline permission, including conditions 27 to 30. Where relevant, these should be reflected within any subsequent decision notice for the full planning applications.

4.37 Overall, it is not considered the development as changed, taking into account the proposed amendments as part of the full planning applications when compared with the approved outline development, would lead to any new significant effects on receptors previously identified or new receptors, nor increase the significance of effects previously identified. it is therefore considered that a supplementary EIA is not required in relation to drainage and flood risk effects.

Transport and Access

4.38 It is not considered that the proposed development, as amended via the full applications, would result in new significant impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified. The residual effects in the June 2016 ES comprised minor beneficial to minor adverse effects. Due to the nature of works proposed at the CoU site, a review of the June 2016 has been undertaken and a Technical Note prepared by Stantec is presented at **Appendix XI**. It is not considered the 2019 outfall application would lead to any change in the significance of effects and therefore this application is not discussed further within this section.

4.39 Details of the permitted development in terms of maximum permitted floorspace are set out in Condition 6 of the 2016 outline permission. The following uses which are proposed within the 2019 CoU application were included in condition 6 of the 2016 outline permission. The permitted quantum of each land use within condition 6 is shown in brackets:

- 320sqm sports hall (with climbing wall) *(up to 320sqm);*
- 85sqm children's soft play area *(up to 145sqm);*
- 50sqm no.2 lane mini bowl *(up to 140sqm);* and
- 80sqm informal screen room *(up to 80sqm).*

4.40 For each of the above uses, the quantum of development is within the permitted quantum approved by the 2016 outline permission. The above uses which are proposed within the 2019 CoU application will not be provided within the approved Moneystone development via the 2016 outline permission.

4.41 The climbing wall element within the sports hall was not specified within the outline planning application. Therefore, this is a new use which is proposed to be within the sports hall allocation. The climbing wall itself will be within the existing building. It is considered that the similarity of these uses, their colocation and the frequency with such services are provided together, is such that their transport impacts are similar.

4.42 The 32sqm craft room and 126sqm bike hire facility were not proposed within the 2016 outline planning application. The vast majority of the use of the elements within the CoU building will be for visitors to the development and local residents, and therefore it is considered that the overwhelming majorities of journeys to the building there will be from within and between the different areas of the park.

4.43 In addition, the bike hire facility could be used by employees of the proposed development and visitors of the development, therefore providing a benefit and promoting cycling as a method of travel to work and for leisure trips.

4.44 The café is additional to the permitted uses, however the seating elements floorspace is contained within the permitted sports hall and soft play land uses and designated as viewing areas. These viewing areas are anticipated to be used by parents / carers and families of those undertaking activities, and thus no new trips are considered to be attributable to the café.

4.45 The proposals include the reconfiguration of the existing car park to form 24 short-stay visitor spaces. The 2016 outline permission restricts the maximum number of short-stay spaces within the overall development to 170 spaces. The 2019 reserved matters application seeks approval for 110 short-stay spaces within the first phase of development. With the addition of 24 short-stage spaces, there is still a surplus of 36 short-stay spaces which can be delivered at the overall development in accordance with the 2016 outline permission.

4.46 There are a number of conditions relating to transport and access set out on the 2016 outline permission, including conditions 16 and 21 to 26. Where relevant, these should be reflected within any subsequent decision notice for the full planning applications.

4.47 Overall, it is not considered the development as changed, taking into account the proposed amendments as part of the full planning applications when compared with the approved outline development, would lead to any new significant effects on receptors previously identified or new receptors, nor increase the significance of effects previously identified. it is therefore considered that a supplementary EIA is not required in relation to transport and access effects.

Residential Areas

4.48 Immediately surrounding the site there are a number of local farmsteads which are sparsely distributed throughout the local landscape. Residential properties can be sensitive to the effects of construction activities and efforts to minimise the impact of noise and dust will be made to reduce the potential for disturbance. These will be controlled through planning conditions. The retention of the lab buildings would also minimise any potential demolition effects. The potential impacts upon existing residential areas are discussed further under 'Step 4'.

Human Health

4.49 The nature of the proposed development is not considered to result in potential for significant direct health impacts to any nearby sensitive receptors. Any potential impacts on highways, and subsequently on noise and air quality, as a result of the proposed development that could give rise to indirect impacts on human health are expected to be mitigated in line with standard measures to result in no significant residual effects. As such, it is not considered a supplementary EIA is required on the basis of health.

Step 4 – Is the proposal likely to have 'Significant Effects' on the Environment?

4.50 Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations states that when determining whether EIA is required, the characteristics of the development, the sensitivity of the area to be affected and the characteristics of the potential environmental effects must be considered. There are three key tests which are to be undertaken:

- Consideration of the characteristics of the development;
- Consideration of the location of the development; and,
- Consideration of the characteristics of the potential impact.

4.51 Accordingly, we have considered these tests and applied the sub-criteria for each in turn:

Characteristics of the Development

(i) Size of the Development

4.52 As set out previously, the proposed development is screened under Schedule 2, Class 13 'Changes and extensions' Subsection (b) 'Any change to or extension of development of a description listed in paragraphs 1 to 12 of column of this table, where that development is already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed'. For such development, an EIA may be required if;

- *"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 this table, thresholds and criteria in the corresponding part of column 2 of this table applied to the change or extension are met or exceeded."*

4.53 The proposed developments which are the subject of this EIA Screening are within the Applicant's ownership boundary and therefore formed part of the study area in the June 2016 ES. In respect of the 2019 CoU application, the majority of uses proposed formed part of the 2016 outline permission and have therefore been located within the CoU site. With regards to the outfall application, this requirement was envisaged as part of the 2016 outline application, the precise requirements however were subject to further analysis and detailed designs at the appropriate time following outline consent. Therefore, it is considered whilst the proposed developments do include land outwith of the approved 2016 outline application boundary, development of the land in question would not result in significant environmental effects and the proposals largely formed part of the overall quantum assessed via the June 2016 ES.

4.54 Overall, it is not considered that the proposed development as changed would result in any new significant environmental effects nor change the significance of effects previously identified. As such, it is not considered necessary to provide a supplementary EIA to assess the potential effects identified.

(ii) Cumulation with Other Development

4.55 PPG states that in judging whether the effects of a development are likely to be significant, Local Planning Authorities should have regard to the possible cumulative effects with any existing or approved development.

4.56 The principal cumulative effects are associated with the combination of the proposals with the consented 2016 outline permission at Moneystone. The June 2016 ES presented the likely environmental effects associated with the Moneystone development and these were appropriately mitigated. The cumulative effects associated with the proposed 2019 outfall application relate to construction phase impacts which can be appropriately controlled and managed by a CEMP and CEcMP, in line with the measures presented above. The 2019 outfall application formed part of the proposals presented in the June 2016 ES , and as such no further long-term cumulative impacts are anticipated which would warrant assessment in a supplementary EIA.

4.57 As set out above, there would be construction phase impact associated with the refurbishment of the CoU application, but it is not considered these proposals in combination with the outfall application and the approved Moneystone development would lead to significant cumulative construction phase impacts such that a supplemental EIA would be required to assess them. In the long term, the retention of the buildings is not anticipated to result in significant cumulative effects on identified receptors as presented earlier in this report.

4.58 Following discussions with SMDC, four cumulative sites have been identified within the vicinity of the site. These include two minor planning applications (ref. SMD/2016/0246 and SMD/2016/0567) for the CoU of the existing industrial units from manufacturing to storage and distribution. As these developments were existing

uses, it is not considered the CoU would result in significant cumulative effects such that a supplemental EIA would be required to assess them.

4.59 Two residential developments (ref. SMD/2019/0723 and SMD/2018/0180) are also located within the town of Cheadle approximately 3km southwest of the proposed development. Following a review of these additional sites, it is not anticipated there would be additional significant cumulative effects associated with the proposed development in combination with these developments. Whilst there would be additional vehicles on the local highways network, it is not considered this would result in significant cumulative effects such that this requires a supplemental EIA to be prepared.

4.60 Overall, it is not considered there would be any new significant cumulative effects associated with the proposed CoU and outfall developments in combination with the approved cumulative developments identified. As such, it is not considered that a supplementary is required in relation to cumulative effects.

(iii) Use of Natural Resources, in particular Land, Soil, Water and Biodiversity

4.61 The proposed development is in full accordance with the waste hierarchy to minimise natural resource consumption, and maximise the opportunity to re-use, recycle or recovery. The proposed works to deliver the outfall are partially within the SSSI; however, the habitats in this area of the designation do not comprise species rich grassland which formed the basis of the SSSI designation. The Ecology Statement has not anticipated significant effects on the SSSI and the potential effects were appropriately considered in the June 2016 ES as a discharge point was envisaged from this location. Overall, there would be no significant impact on the use of natural resources such that a supplementary EIA would be required.

(iv) Production of Waste

4.62 A Site Waste Management Plan will be prepared by the contractor to minimise the amount of waste being produced and ensure this is dealt with in accordance with the waste hierarchy and reused and recycled where possible.

4.63 All material will be dealt with in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The contractors will apply best working practices appropriate on the site with the intention of avoiding significant or unnecessary environmental effects, managing the production of waste and maximising recycling and reuse of materials. Waste will be segregated into a number of waste streams including general; recycled timber; and plasterboard. Waste transfer notes will be issued for all waste materials removed from the site.

4.64 The proposed CoU application makes an efficient re-use of an existing building within the Moneystone Quarry site, thus minimising the amount of waste materials that cannot be recycled or reused.

4.65 It is not considered a supplementary EIA would be required on the basis of waste arisings.

(v) Pollution and Nuisances

Traffic

4.66 It is not considered that the development as changed via the full applications would result in new impacts on receptors or a change in the significance previously identified as minor adverse to minor beneficial. The potential effects during construction will be controlled via a CEMP and Construction Traffic Management

Plan ("CTMP") to minimise the dust and nuisance effects of the development on the highways network and sensitive receptors, as agreed as part of the 2016 outline permission.

Air Quality and Dust

4.67 Construction phase activities such as dust generation and plant vehicle emissions will be short term effects and will be suitably reduced through the implementation of best practice mitigation measures approved by the Institute of Air Quality Management ("IAQM") and secured through planning conditions or obligations in a CEMP, as agreed as part of the 2016 outline permission.

4.68 The type of development proposed would not give rise to significant air quality effects and a series of sustainable transport options will be implemented. It is not considered that a supplementary EIA would be required on the basis of air quality.

Noise

4.69 The proposed development has the potential to generate noise during the site clearing and construction process. Noise associated with construction is inevitable but would be minimised as far as reasonably practicable through the application of best practice mitigation measures to minimise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors such as farmsteads.

4.70 The development proposed would not give rise to any significant adverse noise impacts, such that a supplementary EIA would be required to evaluate them.

(vi) The risk of major accidents and/or disasters relevant to the development concerned, including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge.

4.71 It is not considered that the proposed end-use is associated with a risk of accident and / or disasters significant for the purposes of requiring an EIA. Risks of accidents during the construction process will be controlled by health and safety measures in full compliance with national standards and legislation.

(vii) The risks to human health

4.72 It is not considered that the proposed development could lead to significant human health effects during the construction and operational phases of development. Appropriate health and safety measures will be implemented during the construction phase and any health and safety standards have been an integral consideration as the detailed designs have been prepared. It is therefore not considered an EIA would be required based on the risks to human health.

Location of the Development

(i) The Existing Land Use

4.73 Discussion on the sensitivity of the existing site features have been presented earlier in this report.

(ii) The relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources (including soil, land, water and biodiversity) in the area and its underground

4.74 Discussion on the sensitivity of natural resources has been presented earlier in this report.

(iii) Absorption Capacity of the Natural Environment

4.75 The EIA Regulations state that particular attention should be paid to wetlands; coastal zones; mountain and forest areas; nature reserves or parks; areas designated under European Union (EU) Directives on the conservation of wild birds, natural habitats, flora and fauna; areas in which environmental standards have been exceeded; densely populated areas; or landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance. The site possesses none of these characteristics, with the exception of the SSSI and the assessment confirms no significant effects are anticipated.

Characteristics of Potential Impact

(i) Magnitude and Spatial Extent of the Impact (for example geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected)

4.76 Construction phase effects such as noise and vehicle movements will be limited to the site and the immediate surrounding area. The impacts associated with construction can also be easily controlled by enforceable good practice.

4.77 Physical impacts will be limited to the site itself and are short term. Potential off-site operational impacts relate to vehicular movements. Overall, potential impacts are not assessed as significant such that an EIA is required to evaluate them.

(ii) The Nature of the Impact

4.78 The nature of potential impacts has been discussed earlier in this report.

(iii) Transboundary Nature of the Impact

4.79 Transboundary impacts are not applicable for a development of this nature and scale in this location.

(iv) Intensity and Complexity of the Impact

4.80 Given the location and surrounding area, the impacts during the construction phase would be of a relatively small scale and would relate to standard construction impacts such as noise and vehicular movements that they could be addressed through standard best practice operating procedures.

4.81 Overall, it is not considered that the magnitude and complexity of potential impacts is sufficient so as to require an EIA to evaluate and offset them.

(v) Probability of the Impact

4.82 Construction phase impacts such as noise are considered likely to occur on a localised level only and are easily addressed through appropriate site best practice measures. Contaminated materials on site will be appropriately treated and remediated in accordance with best practice guidance and an appropriate remediation strategy implemented.

(vi) Expected Onset, Duration, Frequency and Reversibility of Impact

4.83 Any impacts linked to construction works would be short term or temporary in nature. In the longer term, technical assessments have been undertaken which confirm there will be no long term significant adverse effects associated with the proposed development.

(vii) Cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development.

4.84 The cumulation of the proposed developments impact with existing and/or approved development has been discussed previously in the report.

(viii) Possibility of effectively reducing the impact

4.85 Measures to effectively reduce any potential impacts have been discussed throughout the report in each relevant section.

5. Summary and Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is located on land known as Moneystone Quarry which is subject to an extant planning permission for a high quality leisure development. Following the preparation of the 2019 reserved matters application, the detailed designs have progressed and therefore two full planning applications have been submitted to complement and support the delivery of the Moneystone development. These include a CoU application to accommodate leisure uses, the majority of which were secured via the 2016 outline permission. Whilst the 2019 outfall application was submitted following further analysis of the detailed drainage solution for the development.

5.2 As the proposals sit outwith of the approved red edge boundary, this EIA Screening Request has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2, Class 13 'Changes and extensions' Subsection (b) 'Any change to or extension of development of a description listed in paragraphs 1 to 12 of column of this table, where that development is already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed'.

5.3 Following a review of the revised proposals and a series of updated technical assessments, the report has identified the following key points:

- The proposed development will not lead to any new significant effects which were not previously identified, nor will it change the significance of effects previously identified.
- The technical assessments confirm that the likely effects of the development are well understood and easily mitigated by commonplace measures.
- The proposed development largely reflects the parameters of those previously assessed. There are some minor additions to the proposals as a result of detailed design and engineering analysis.

5.4 We request that SMDC's Opinion contains the main reasons for conclusions with reference to the relevant criteria in Schedule 3 and state any features of the proposed development and measures envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significance effects, in accordance with Section 5(5) of the EIA Regulations.

5.5 If the Local Authority requires any additional information in order to make a decision, please do not hesitate to contact Avison Young.

Appendix I

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Site Location Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix II

2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Site Location Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix III

2019 Outfall Application (ref. SMD/2019/0725) – Site Location Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix IV

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Parameters Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix V

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Eaves Lane Access Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix VI

2016 Outline Permission (ref. SMD/2016/0378) – Restoration Plan

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix VII

2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Bowland Ecology: Building Inspection and Roost Assessment

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix VIII

2019 Outfall Application (ref. SMD/2019/0725) – Bowland Ecology: Ecology Statement

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix IX

Planit-ie: Landscape and Visual Note

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix X

Orion Heritage: Archaeology and Heritage Note

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Appendix XI

2019 Change of Use Application (ref. SMD/2019/0716) – Stantec: Transport Note

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young

Contact Details

Enquiries
Jamie Lynch
0161 834 7187
Jonathan.Wilks@avisonyoung.com

Visit us online
www.avisonyoung.co.uk

Avison Young
Norfolk House, 7 Norfolk Street, Manchester M2 1DW
© 2019 Avison Young