

**ANNEX D - THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT)  
REGULATIONS 2017 SCREENING MATRIX**

<b>1. CASE DETAILS</b>			
Case Reference	PA/2023/0715	Brief description of the project / development	Construction of a Wastewater Treatment Plant (WwTP), associated landscaping, and proposed vehicular access from Chilmington Green Road <sup>1</sup>
Site Address	Chilmington Green, Land to west of Chilmington Green Road.		
LPA	Ashford	Applicant	Hodson Developments Ltd
<b>2. EIA DETAILS</b>			
Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations?			No
If YES, which description of development (THEN GO TO Q4)			n/a
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?			Yes
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?			11(c) Other Projects - Waste water treatment plants - development area exceeds 1,000 square metres.
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?			No
If YES, which area?			n/a
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Exceeded
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			Site area is 1135sq/m plus the land area required for the outlet pipe.
<b>3. LPA/SOS SCREENING</b>			
Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued)			No
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?			n/a
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			n/a
<b>4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT</b>			

<sup>1</sup> The development would require the construction of an inlet pipe into the WwTP and an outlet pipe from the WwTP to the discharge point in the river Beult. These pipes are not proposed as part of the current planning application (ref: PA/2023/0715) because the pipes would be constructed under the permitted development rights afforded to Severn Trent Connect, the Ofwat regulated water company, who would operate the WwTP. In addition, the exact routes of the pipes and the discharge point are not yet known. The inlet pipe would be located within the red line boundary of the planning application site, however, the outlet pipe would be located outside the red line boundary on land that the applicant owns. The applicant has advised that the point of discharge will be determined via the EA Permit application process. This Screening Opinion includes an assessment of the impacts of the inlet pipe and outlet pipe and all references to 'the Development' include the inlet and outlet pipes.

Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?

No

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable)	
	Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)			Is a significant effect likely, having regard particularly to the magnitude and spatial extent (including population size affected), nature, intensity and complexity, probability, expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact and the possibility to effectively reduce the impact? If the finding of no significant effect is <b>reliant on specific features or measures</b> of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment <b>these should be identified in bold</b>
<b>5. NATURAL RESOURCES</b>				
5.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An earth bund (1.8m high) is proposed around three sides of the WwTP maintenance access road. The bund is intended to help screen the WwTP structures from view.</li> <li>No details have been provided about what decommissioning of the Development would involve.</li> </ul>		<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surrounding land is relatively flat and therefore the bund would be visible from long views. However, given the scale of the bund, at 1.8m, its extent within the site, alongside its distance from nearby residential properties, the bund is unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.</li> <li>Without any information from the applicant I can only envisage that decommissioning would involve the removal of all equipment and hard surfaces and/or removal of the earth bund. This would not alter the landscape</li> </ul>

				over and above the change involved as part of the Development. Conditions could secure an appropriate decommissioning / site remediation scheme. For these reasons, decommissioning is unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
5.2 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources above or below ground such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy which are non-renewable or in short supply?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the Development would involve the use of building materials (metal, concrete, tarmac, etc) and energy sources to power machinery.</li> <li>• The operation of the Development would involve the use of energy.</li> </ul>	No	The natural resources used during construction and operation of the Development would not be significant given the size and scale of the Development. The use of natural resources is therefore unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
5.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Development site is located within close proximity to an ancient woodland – Stubbcross Wood.</li> <li>• The Development site is currently agricultural land.</li> <li>• The treated waste water would be discharged into a tributary of the river Beult, which feeds into the river Beult SSSI.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Development would have a localised visual impact. The setting of the ancient woodland would be altered. However, this impact is unlikely to be significant given the size and scale of the Development and the visual impacts would be mitigated through the provision of an earth bund and landscaping scheme. For these reasons I conclude that the Development is unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.</li> <li>• The agricultural land classification survey submitted with the outline planning</li> </ul>

			<p>application for the Chilmington Green development identified the site as being moderate quality agricultural land - Subgrade 3b. This is not the best and most versatile land. Given the size of the site, alongside the grading of the land, the Development would not result in the loss of a scarce land resource of significant size. Therefore, a significant effect is unlikely and an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA is not required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The applicant has submitted information setting out the parameters and standards of treatment the WwTP is designed to achieve; the results of monitoring of the watercourse undertaken to establish the current water flow and water quality; and an assessment of the potential impact on the river Beult SSSI. Natural England and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the planning application and raised no objection. From the information submitted, alongside consideration of the scale of the Development, the location of the treated effluent discharge point currently envisaged by the applicant, and the advice from statutory consultees, I conclude that there is unlikely to be a significant effect on the SSSI and therefore an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA is not required</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

6. WASTE				
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During operation the WwTP treatment process would produce sludge. This would be stored on site in a tank and then removed from site via tanker to a WwTP with a sludge treatment centre.</li> <li>• During decommissioning the materials the Development would be constructed from would need to be disposed of.</li> </ul>	No	The amount of sludge produced would not be significant. The storage tank would be 56 cubic metres in size and would be covered to minimise odour impacts. The tanker movements would initially involve monthly tanker visits, increasing to twice monthly and then weekly. The sludge is unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA, due to the quantity of sludge that would be produced and the frequency of the associated tanker movements.
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	The sewerage treatment process would cause odours.	No	An odour assessment submitted by the applicant identifies that odours would be confined to the WwTP compound and subsequently would not impact nearby residents. Given the size and scale of the Development, the impact of odours on local amenity can be adequately assessed via the review of the odour report submitted. Any odour impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	There would be mechanical equipment installed on the site as part of the Development that would emit noise.	No	A noise assessment submitted by the applicant identifies that noise emitted by the mechanical equipment would potentially have an impact on residents if not mitigated. The

			<p>report recommends the provision of acoustic enclosures and a noise barrier. Given the size and scale of the development, and the form of the mitigation proposed, the impact of noise on local amenity can be adequately assessed via the review of the noise report submitted. Any noise impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.</p>
<p>7.3 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The treated waste water would be discharged into a tributary of the river Beult, either to surface water or ground.</li> <li>• It is possible that spillages could occur.</li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant has submitted information setting out the parameters and standards of treatment the WwTP is designed to achieve; the results of monitoring of the watercourse undertaken to establish the current water flow and water quality and an assessment of the potential impact on the river Beult SSSI. Natural England and the Environment Agency have been consulted on the planning application and raised no objection. From the information submitted, alongside consideration of the scale of the Development, the location of the treated effluent discharge point currently envisaged by the applicant, and the advice from statutory consultees, I conclude that there is unlikely to be a significant effect on the watercourse and therefore an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA is not required.</li> <li>• Low level bunds would be installed on site around relevant equipment to contain any</li> </ul>

				<p>spillages with collection in sumps or storage tanks segregated from the general surface water drainage system. A chamber with control valve(s) downstream of the filter drain, would enable the filter drain to be shut off in a spillage event to prevent contamination entering into the surface water drainage system. Collected spillages would be removed from the site. The scale of the Development alongside the measures described above leads me to conclude that there is unlikely to be a significant effect in respect of spillages and therefore an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA is not required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I note that the Development will require an environmental permit from the Environment Agency (EA) and that the EA will control pollution through the permitting process. The EA have raised no objection to the planning application.</li> </ul>
7.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	The river Beult is currently in an unfavourable condition, in part due to water quality impacts and that Natural England has set targets for flow, ammonia, suspended solids, total phosphorus and siltation.	No	Refer to 7.3 above in respect of water quality.
<b>8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>				



8.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?	No	There would be no risk of a major accident.	n/a	
8.2 Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to 7.1 above in respect of air pollution.</li> <li>Refer to 7.3 above in respect of water contamination</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to 7.1 above in respect of air pollution.</li> <li>Refer to 7.3 above in respect of water contamination</li> </ul>
<b>9. WATER RESOURCES</b>				
9.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to 7.3 above in respect of water quality.</li> <li>The Development would be built on agricultural fields and treated effluent would be discharged into an existing watercourse therefore there is potential to increase flood risk due to the provision of impermeable surfaces and built structures and due to an increase volume of water entering the watercourse</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to 7.3 above in respect of water quality.</li> <li>A surface water drainage system is proposed on the site to manage surface water and reduce the risk of flooding. In addition, the discharge from the Development is proposed to be limited to 3l/s. The County Council's Flood and Water Management team and the Environment Agency have reviewed the applicant's proposal and raised no objection. In light of the mitigation scheme proposed and the County Council's and EA's advice, I conclude that flood risk can be appropriately dealt with via the submission of a flood risk assessment and the potential flood risk</li> </ul>

				effects are unlikely to be so significant to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)</b>				
<b>10.1</b> Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, or any non-designated / non-classified areas which are important or sensitive for reasons of their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project? (e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other water-bodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, undesignated nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local))).	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stubbcross Ancient Woodland – refer to 5.3 above.</li> <li>• The river Beult SSSI – refer to 7.3 above.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stubbcross Ancient Woodland – refer to 5.3 above.</li> <li>• The river Beult – refer to 7.3 above.</li> </ul>
<b>10.2</b> Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project	Yes	The Development site is currently farmland bounded by hedgerows and therefore has the potential for ecological value.	No	The applicant has submitted an ecological impact assessment which identifies potential impacts on wildlife and ecology and recommends mitigation measures. The County Council's Ecology team have reviewed the application and raised no objection. Due to the size and scale of the Development and the findings of the assessment, I conclude that any impacts on ecology and wildlife are

				unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>				
<b>11.1</b> Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project? <sup>2</sup> Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	There are no areas or features on or around the Development site that are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the site.	n/a	
<b>11.2</b> Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)	No	The proposed Development would be visible locally from Chilmington Green Road and the western end of Tally Ho Road; from a small number of properties on Tally Ho Road and Magpie Hall Lane; and from PROW to the north and south. As the Chilmington Green development is built out the proposed Development would be visible from public open space within the Chilmington Green development and future housing parcels. However, the proposed Development would not be highly visible to many people from long distances.	n/a	

<sup>2</sup> See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas

12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
<b>12.1</b> Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Development site is located in an area of archaeological potential.</li> <li>The route of a roman road, now a PROW, passes to the south of the Development site.</li> <li>There are features of archaeological interest within Chilmington Hamlet to the north.</li> <li>There are eight listed buildings within Chilmington Hamlet to the north.</li> <li>Snailswood Farmhouse, a listed building, is located in Shadoxhurst to the west.</li> </ul>	No	There is already a significant amount of information about the archaeology of the wider Chilmington Green development site to enable an assessment to be made about the effects of the proposed Development on archaeology. There are no listed buildings within or immediately adjacent to the Development site. The nearest listed building is at the Hamlet, circa 800m from the site. The effects on cultural heritage and archaeology can be appropriately assessed from the information already available. I conclude that any impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
<b>13.1</b> Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	There is a PROW to the south of the Development site which follows the route of an old roman road.	no	Given the size and scale of the Development and its distance from the PROW I conclude that any impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>13.2</b> Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The A28, circa 2km to the north of the Development site is susceptible to congestion at peak times.</li> <li>Chilmington Green Road adjacent to the Development site to the north is a busy</li> </ul>	no	There would be limited traffic movements associated with the Development. The Local Highway Authority have reviewed the application and raised no objection. Given the limited traffic movements I conclude that any

		road and is in a poor state of repair in places, although not congested.		impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>14. LAND USE</b>				
<b>14.1</b> Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? E.g. housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	There are existing residential properties located close to the Development site.	No	Given the scale and size of the Development, its proximity to neighbouring residents, and the mitigation measures proposed, I conclude that any impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA
<b>14.2</b> Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes	There are new residential properties proposed to the north of the Development site as part of the Chilmington Green development and to the south east as part of the Court Lodge site allocation.	No	Given the scale and size of the Development, its proximity to future residential development, and the mitigation measures proposed, I conclude that any impacts are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE</b>				
<b>15.1</b> Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic conditions, e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?	No	The location is not susceptible to any of the environmental conditions listed.	n/a	

<b>16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>				
<b>16.1</b> Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes	The Development site is located within Chilmington Green development site and the wider South Ashford Garden Community growth area.	no	The Development site is located within a housing growth area where the impacts of the wider proposed development at Chilmington Green have been assessed via the submission of ES as part of the Outline planning application for the Chilmington Green development. The proposed development at Court Lodge is being assessed via the submission of an ES. Any additional cumulative impacts that may result from the proposed WwTP Development are unlikely to result in effects so significant as to require an assessment of the effects via the submission of an EIA.
<b>17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS</b>				
<b>17.1</b> Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? <sup>3</sup>	No	The Development is not located close to the boundary with another national jurisdiction and would not have an impact on another jurisdiction.	n/a	

<sup>3</sup> The Regulations require consideration of the transboundary nature of the impact. Due to the England's geographical location the vast majority of TCPA cases are unlikely to result in transboundary impacts.

**18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3**

The scale and effects of the Development would not be so significant as to be EIA development. Therefore the submission of an EIA is not required in order for the impacts of the proposed Development to be appropriately assessed via the information and documents already submitted as part of the planning application.

**19. SCREENING DECISION**

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	n/a
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	No
Is an ES required?	No

<b>20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	
Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	

**21. REASON FOR SCREENING**

The development is Schedule 2 development - 11(c) Other Projects - waste-water treatment plants - development area exceeds 1,000 square metres.

<b>NAME</b>	Faye Tomlinson
<b>DATE</b>	20 November 2023 (updated 2 April 2024)