



Planning & Development
4th Floor, Brent House
High Road, Wembley
Middlesex HA9 6BZ

TEL 020 8937 3315
FAX 020 8937 5207
EMAIL Claire.Jones@brent.gov.uk

REGENERATION & MAJOR PROJECTS
Director: Andy Donald

WEB www.brent.gov.uk

Mark Jackson
Goals Soccer Centre plc
Orbital House
Peel Park
East Kilbride
G74 5PR

Date: 3rd June 2013

Dear Mr Jackson,

Re: Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 5 (1) 2011:
Request for EIA Screening Opinion for Kingsbury High School – Goals Soccer Centre

Thank you for your letter dated 16th May 2013 in which you requested that the planning authority adopt a screening opinion of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)(England and Wales) Regulations 2011 in respect of a forthcoming planning application for the redevelopment of Kingsbury High School playing fields to a soccer centre.

The description of the proposed development site is a 1.4 hectares site and is for the redevelopment of Kingsbury High School playing fields to provide community sports pitches comprising 8 no. small sided artificial grass pitches covering an area of approximately 5725m², a sports pavilion with a gross external floor space of approximately 320m², 85 car parking spaces and modifications to access.

The site is situated on land at Kingsbury High School, off Stag Lane. To the north of the proposed area are residential properties within the Roe Green Conservation Area. These properties have substantial rear gardens and are dominated in the main by mature trees on the southern boundary. On the eastern boundary are various community and new commercial buildings. To the southeast and also to south are two further residential areas, including a residential care home and sheltered housing in Stubbs Close. The western boundary is formed by the existing school buildings. The application site is largely flat with mature trees on the northern and to some extent on the eastern and southern boundaries. It is currently used as playing fields.

Having considered the proposals as detailed in your letter, Brent Council is of the opinion that the application does not fall within Schedule 1 Development of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 but within Schedule 2 Development, Part 10, Infrastructure Projects (b) – Urban development projects. The application site is 1.4 hectares and therefore falls within the criteria set out for Part 10 (b) as the area of the development exceeds the threshold of 0.5 hectares. However, Brent Council has also given consideration to the characteristics of the development, its location and potential impact as set out in Schedule 3 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 and the criteria set out in Annex A of Circular 02/99 Environmental Impact Assessments. Annex A indicates the types of case in which, an EIA is more likely to be required. It states:

“A18. In addition to the physical scale of such developments, particular consideration should be given to the potential increase in traffic, emissions and noise. EIA is unlikely to be required for the redevelopment of land unless the new development is on a significantly greater scale than the previous use, or the types of impact are of a markedly different nature or there is a high level of contamination (paragraph 41).”



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

“A19. *Development proposed for sites which have not previously been intensively developed are more likely to require EIA if:*

- *the site area of the scheme is more than 5 hectares; or*
- *it would provide a total of more than 10,000 m² of new commercial floorspace; or*
- *the development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non, urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1,000 dwellings).*

(Reference: DCLG, Circular 02/99 – Environmental Impact Assessments, Annex A, page 44)

Therefore the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the forthcoming application for the redevelopment of Kingsbury High School playing fields requires an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

Ecology and Nature Conservation

Paragraph 36 of Circular 02/99 lists land designations where an EIA would, by definition, be required because of the sensitive character of these sites. In these cases, the size thresholds in Schedule 2 Development do not apply.

These designations are:

- a) Sites of Special Scientific Interest, any consultation areas around them (where these have been notified to the local planning authority under article 10 (u)(ii) of the GPDO), land to which Nature Conservation Orders apply and international conservation sites; and
- b) National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, World Heritage Sites and scheduled monuments.

There are no areas which have an ecological designation (as listed above) on or around the site. I am of the view that the proposed development would not cause any significant adverse impacts.

Traffic related impacts-Movement and Safety

The Council does not consider that the development will result in significant impacts on highway capacity to warrant an EIA, as the proposal will not require any significant upgrades to the highway network or access. Some minor modifications to the site access would be necessary, but this would be of localised scale and limited to some widening of access road.

The council accepts that the development will lead to some traffic, noise and air pollution within the vicinity of the development but that the impact is not significant when taking into account the existing situation. These increases are not considered to be large, complex or unusual enough to require an EIA.

Contamination

It is considered that there is a very low risk of contamination associated with the forthcoming proposal for the redevelopment of this site and thus it is not considered to be large enough, complex or unusual enough to require an EIA.

Archaeology and Architectural Context

The proposed development borders Roe Green Conservation Area. It is not considered that the proposal will have any significant impact on the Conservation Area as development will be set away from the edge of the conservation area and will not be visible from the public realm within the context of the conservation area.

Air Quality and Noise

The site does not fall within Brent's Air Quality Management Area. The development will not release significant pollutants or hazardous, toxic or noxious substances into the air and the proposed use is not predicted to have a significant effect upon air quality or traffic generation in the area which would require an EIA.

Other impacts

The council has assessed other possible impacts and effects of the development, and considers that there are none that are significant enough to warrant an EIA.



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

I have enclosed a copy of a screening checklist document which has helped formulate this decision for reference.

Date of Decision: 3rd June 2013

On behalf of the Council of the London Borough of Brent



Ken Hullock
Head of Planning & Transport Strategy



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

SCREENING CHECKLIST

(taken from Guidance on EIA: Screening, European Commission, June 2001)

Brief Project Description:

The proposal is for the redevelopment of Kingsbury High School playing fields to provide community sports pitches comprising 8 no. small sided artificial grass pitches covering an area of approximately 5725m², a sports pavilion with a gross external floor space of approximately 320m², 85 car parking spaces and modifications to access.

Summary of features of project and of its location indicating the need for EIA

| Questions to be Considered For further guidance on factors to be considered see the more detailed questions listed in the Scoping Guidance | Yes / No / ? Briefly describe | Is this likely to result in a significant effect? Yes/No/? – Why? |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the Project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the locality (topography, land use, changes in waterbodies, etc)? | No - The proposed development is to provide sports facilities in an area of existing leisure provision. | No – The development is not of a markedly different nature to the existing use. |
| 2. Will construction or operation of the Project use natural resources such as land, water, materials or energy, especially any resources which are non-renewable or in short supply? | No - There will be no valuable or scarce resources consumed in the construction of the development. | No – the construction of this proposed development in this location is not predicted to have a complex or unusual effect and therefore would not have a significant effect on natural resources. |
| 3. Will the Project involve use, storage, transport, handling or production of substances or materials which could be harmful to human health or the environment or raise concerns about actual or perceived risks to human health? | No - the proposed development will not involve the use, storage, transport or production of substances or materials which could be harmful to people or the environment. | No – as the proposed use for the redevelopment of the site will not have a significant effect on human health or the environment. |
| 4. Will the Project produce solids during construction or operation or decommissioning? | Yes – There is no significant demolition proposed. There will be waste produced from construction, but much if not all of this will be re-used on site for the formation of landscaped earth bunds. | No – as waste produced from construction will be re-used on site. |
| 5. Will the Project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air? | No – There are no elements of the proposed development that will result in the generation or release of noxious, hazardous or toxic substances to air. | No – There will not be any environmental nuisance in respect to significant release of pollutants or contaminants. |
| 6. Will the Project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat energy or electromagnetic radiation? | Noise and some vibration may be generated by construction, but this can be managed by conditions. A noise assessment found the proposed development of the Goals Soccer Centre will not result in any significant noise impact at the closest noise receptors. The absolute noise levels, both externally and internally with a partially open window, do not exceed the recommended reasonable levels as prescribed by both | No – The effects are not predicted to be significant or unusual. Noise, and light will be generated but these effects are not predicted to be significant in this context. |



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | WHO and BS 8233. All lighting will be confined to within the site as the lighting drop off is such that lighting returned to the normally ambient lux levels within a few metres of the edges of the pitches. | |
| 7. 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? | No- There is a very low risk of contamination of land or water, as with any construction programme. Any contaminated soil, of which none is anticipated, can be managed by conditions. | No – The level of contamination would not be significant enough to warrant an EIA. |
| 8. Will there be any risk of accidents during construction or operation of the Project which could affect human health or the environment? | No – the construction and operation of the site do not involve the use of high risk substances or the use of high risk technologies. | No – It is considered that there would be no significant risk of accidents as a result of the end use of the development. |
| 9. Will the Project result in social changes, for example, in demography, traditional lifestyles, employment? | Yes – the development will improve leisure opportunities for the school and wider community. | No – improvements to leisure opportunities does not constitute a significant effect. |
| 10. Are there any other factors which should be considered such as consequential development which could lead to environmental effects or the potential for cumulative impacts with other existing or planned activities in the locality? | No – The proposed development is not expected to introduce a cumulative impact. | No – The proposed development is not expected to introduce a cumulative impact. |
| 11. Are there any areas on or around the location which are protected under international or national or local legislation for their ecological, landscape, cultural or other value, which could be affected by the project? | Yes – Roe Green Park to the south of the site is a Grade II Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. | No – the proposed development will not impact on Roe Green Park. |
| 12. Are there any other areas on or around the location which are important or sensitive for reasons of their ecology e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other waterbodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, which could be affected by the project? | No | N/a |
| 13. Are there any areas on or around the location which are used by protected, important or sensitive species of fauna or flora e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, overwintering, migration, which could be affected by the project? | No | N/a |
| 14. Are there any inland, coastal, marine or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project? | No | N/a |
| 15. Are there any areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project? | No | N/a |
| 16. Are there any routes or facilities 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 – various community buildings are located on the eastern boundary of the site. These are accessible via Stag Lane. | No – there is unlikely to be any significant harm as a result of the proposed development because the soccer centre has a separate access to the community buildings. |
| 17. Are there any transport routes on or around | Yes – there are no known | No – The peak operation of |



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project? | congestion issues on Stag Lane. | the soccer centre is between 7-9pm and outside the peak hour of the surrounding traffic network. It is therefore not anticipated that the proposed development will have any significant impact on the highway network. The development is only of local significance. |
| 18. Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? | No – views of the development will be limited to the surrounding residential dwellings and those passing the site on Stag Lane, due to the surrounding buildings and tree belt. | No – there are unlikely to be significant effects as the proposed development will not be too dissimilar to the existing site. |
| 19. Are there any areas or features of historic or cultural importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project? | Yes – The proposed development borders Roe Green Conservation Area. | No – The development will be set away from the edge of the conservation area and will not be visible from the public realm within the context of the conservation area. There will not be any significant impacts of lighting onto the conservation area and given the distances involved there is no identified harm to the conservation area. |
| 20. Is the project located in a previously undeveloped area where there will be loss of greenfield land? | No | N/a |
| 21. Are there existing land uses on or around the location e.g. homes, gardens, other private property, industry, commerce, recreation, public open space, community facilities, agriculture, forestry, tourism, mining or quarrying which could be affected by the project? | Yes | No – the proposal is not considered to be unusual in this context and involves redevelopment of the existing site. |
| 22. Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project? | No | No – as the proposed development would complement the current uses in this urban area. |
| 23. Are there any areas on or around the location which are densely populated or built-up, which could be affected by the project? | Yes – The surrounding area will be affected. | No – Once operational, the surrounding area will experience the benefits of upgraded leisure facilities. |
| 24. Are there any areas on or around the location which are occupied by sensitive land uses e.g. hospitals, schools, places of worship, community facilities, which could be affected by the project? | Yes – the site is located adjacent community facilities. | No – the proposed uses for the redevelopment of this site complements community facilities. |
| 25. Are there any areas on or around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources e.g. groundwater, surface waters, forestry, agriculture, fisheries, tourism, minerals, which could be affected by the project? | No | N/a |
| 26. 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? | No | No |



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE



Brent – building a better borough

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| 27. Is the project location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme or adverse climatic conditions e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems? | No | No |
|---|----|----|

The **Screening Checklist** provides a list of questions to help identify where there is the potential for interactions between a project and its environment.

These questions have been considered for each “Yes” answer in the **Screening Checklist** and the conclusion and the reasons for it noted in the checklist. The questions are designed so that a “Yes” answer will generally point towards the need for EIA and a “No” answer to EIA not being required.

Questions to be Considered

1. Will there be a large change in environmental conditions?
2. Will new features be out-of-scale with the existing environment?
3. Will the effect be unusual in the area or particularly complex?
4. Will the effect extend over a large area?
5. Will there be any potential for transfrontier impact?
6. Will many people be affected?
7. Will many receptors of other types (fauna and flora, businesses, facilities) be affected?
8. Will valuable or scarce features or resources be affected?
9. Is there a risk that environmental standards will be breached?
10. Is there a risk that protected sites, areas, features will be affected?
11. Is there a high probability of the effect occurring?
12. Will the effect continue for a long time?
13. Will the effect be permanent rather than temporary?
14. Will the impact be continuous rather than intermittent?
15. If it is intermittent will it be frequent rather than rare?
16. Will the impact be irreversible?
17. Will it be difficult to avoid, or reduce or repair or compensate for the effect?



INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

