

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		4/12/2014							
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		12/12/2014							
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>									
David Fowler				2014/7101/P									
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>									
Liddell Industrial Estate 1-33 Liddell Road London NW6 2EW				Refer to Decision Notice									
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>							
<b>Proposal(s)</b>													
Request for EIA Screening Opinion in relation to emerging mixed-use redevelopment of the site, to include 4-form entry infant school, nursery, approximately 100 residential units in an 11 storey building and a 4/5 storey terrace and approximately 4000sqm of workspace in a 4/5 storey building.													
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		EIA Not Required											
<b>Application Type:</b>		Request for Screening Opinion											
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice											
<b>Informatives:</b>													
<b>Consultations</b>													
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified		00		No. of responses		00		No. of objections		00	
						No. electronic		00					
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		N/A											
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		No responses received.											

## Site Description

The site is currently occupied by the Liddell Road Industrial Estate, which comprises 33 low-rise light industrial units on either side of a service road (Liddell Road). The site is roughly 1.05 hectares and rectangular in shape.

The site is bordered to the north by a railway line, then a path along the railway line and then the rear of houses on Sumatra Road on the other side. To the east is commercial land used for light industrial and storage purposes. To the south is Maygrove Road which is residential in character with some office/light industrial uses also. To the east of the site is Maygrove Peace Park.

The area is predominantly residential in character, although there are a number of commercial uses (including the site itself) along the railway line.

## Relevant History

There is no relevant history to this request for an EIA Screening Opinion.

## Relevant policies

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990**

**Development Management Procedure Order 2010**

**Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011**

**NPPF 2012 (PPG paragraphs 017 and 018 of Environmental Impact Assessment)**

## Assessment

### Introduction

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion has been submitted for consideration in respect of the proposed emerging mixed-use redevelopment of the site, to include 4-form entry infant school, nursery, approximately 100 residential units in an 11 storey building and a 4/5 storey terrace and approximately 4000sqm of workspace in a 4/5 storey building.

The applicant has submitted a screening assessment.

### Assessment

The 2011 EIA Regs define EIA development as being either:

- (a) Schedule 1 development; or
- (b) Schedule 2 development likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location.

The development does not fall within any of the descriptions given in Schedule 1 and thus cannot be considered a Schedule 1 development.

The applicant considers that the proposal can be considered within Schedule 2 10(b) (column 1) which is “urban development projects”. Column 2 states the applicable thresholds and criteria for the purposes of classifying development as Schedule 2 development. As the site is approximately 1.05ha, it falls into section 10 (as it exceeds 0.5ha). The proposed development is therefore “Schedule 2 development”. Establishing whether an EIA is needed will be based upon any likely significant effects the development may have on the environment.

The applicant considers that the proposed development would not have significant adverse effects on the environment, and is seeking for the screening opinion to consider and confirm this to be the case.

Consequently the development is required to be considered against the selection criteria specified within Schedule 3, for screening Schedule 2 development. Schedule 3 comprises three main ‘selection criteria’ areas: the characteristics of development, the location of development (environmental sensitivity) and the characteristics of the potential impact from the proposed development.

The Planning Practice Guidance Note ‘Environmental Impact Assessment is also of relevance, with the following being of most relevance:

Paragraph 017 (When is an Environmental Impact Assessment required?)

Paragraph 018 (What is the procedure for deciding whether a Schedule 2 project is likely to have significant effects?)

Paragraph 017 states that if a proposed project is listed in the first column in Schedule 2 and exceeds the relevant thresholds or criteria set out in the second column (sometimes referred to as ‘exclusion thresholds and criteria’) the proposal needs to be screened by the local planning authority to determine whether significant effects are likely and hence whether an assessment is required. Projects listed in Schedule 2 which are located in, or partly in, a sensitive area also need to be screened, even if they are below the thresholds or do not meet the criteria.

Paragraph 018 states that when screening Schedule 2 projects, the local planning authority must take account of the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations. Not all of the criteria will be relevant in every case. Each case should be considered on its own merits in a balanced way and authorities should retain the evidence to justify their decision.

To aid local planning authorities to determine whether a project is likely to have significant environmental effects, a set of indicative thresholds and criteria have been produced.

Schedule 3 criteria falls into 3 categories:

1. Characteristics of development
2. Location of development
3. Characteristics of the potential impact

Hence in order to assess the proposal, each of the three main selection criteria in Schedule 3 are considered in turn:

First, the **characteristics of development** considerations are: (a) the size of the development; (b) the cumulation with other development; (c) the use of natural resources; (d) the production of waste; (e) pollution and nuisances; (f) the risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances or technologies used.

In terms of a) the size of the development, it is considered that the increase in built form, when considered within the context of the existing, is relatively minor in nature. Whilst the massing and accumulation of the built form is not inconsequential, the urbanising effect of the development is not considered to warrant further investigation.

Regarding b) cumulative impacts, it is acknowledged that the site is in close proximity to other recent significant major applications:

- 187-199 West End Lane (2011/6129/P); 198 residential units plus (Class C3), retail, financial and professional services and food and drink floorspace (Class A1, A2, A3 and A4), flexible employment/healthcare floorspace (Class B1/D1)
- 65 & 67 Maygrove Road (2012/5934/P); 91 residential units

The site lies close to West Hampstead 'area for intensification' identified in the London Plan and a 'growth area' in Camden's Local Development Framework (LDF).

Whilst significant major applications, given the scale of the proposal and the scale of the proposals listed above, it is not considered that there would be a cumulative impact which warrants further investigation, nor would there be a cumulative impact taking into account the designations for West Hampstead listed above.

Turning to consider c) the use of natural resources, although using a variety of materials to allow implementation, such materials would be required to comply with modern building standards and the relevant sustainability/energy efficient construction techniques to result in no significant effects being envisaged in this regard.

Moving on to consider d) the production of waste, again the modern techniques which will be required to be used in the construction stage would minimise wastes. Moreover, it would be unlikely to lead to significant impacts. Furthermore, mitigation measures will be likely to be put in place within the air quality assessment and construction management plans for example.

In terms of e) pollution and nuisances and f) accidents, the likely construction management plan, acoustic assessment, health and safety regulations and the energy strategy for any scheme would all be of relevance. When considered together, such statements, incorporating various measures, mean that pollution and nuisances would be limited as far as possible, and the risk of accidents would also be limited.

Secondly, turning to **the location of development** (environmental sensitivity) considerations, these are:

(a) the existing land use; (b) the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area; (c) the absorption capacity of the natural environment, paying particular attention to the following areas— (i) wetlands; (ii) coastal zones; (iii) mountain and forest areas; (iv) nature reserves and parks; (v) areas designated by Member States i.e. conservation of wild birds, natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora; (vi) areas in which the environmental quality standards laid down in EU legislation have already been exceeded; (vii) densely populated areas; (viii) landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance. Each is considered in turn below:

In consideration a) the existing land use, the site is a brownfield site currently used for light industrial purposes. The proposed uses on the site are not considered to warrant further investigation.

In terms of b), it is considered that the abundance, quality and capacity of natural resources in the area required to serve the proposed development would not be materially affected by the proposals.

With regard to (c), there is a mound with planting on the southern side of the site which is designated as Open Space. This would be retained under the proposals. Maygrove Peace Park to the west of the site is also Open Space. The railway embankment to the north is designated as a Habitat Corridor. These adjoining areas would not be significantly affected by the proposals. An Ecological Appraisal and a Tree Survey have been submitted as part of the application which will address any issues with regards to the above areas.

Thirdly, in terms of the **characteristics of the potential impact**, caused by the significant effects of development, considerations are: (a) the extent of the impact (geographical area and size of the affected population); (b) the transfrontier nature of the impact; (c) the magnitude and complexity of the impact; (d) the probability of the impact; (e) the duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact. The potential significant effects of development must also be considered in relation to criteria set out under the aforementioned characteristics of development considerations and location of development (environmental sensitivity) considerations.

In respect of these matters, in the context of the site description, nature of the development and comments already made in this assessment, the proposals would not result in such impacts ('significant effects') to warrant progression of the EIA to the scoping stage. The proposed scheme seeks to implement redevelopment of the site in a conventional manner; it is not considered to bring about any unusually complex or hazardous environmental effects.

With the above in mind it is therefore considered that the proposal development would not have significant adverse effects on the environment

### **Conclusion:**

Given the above, and due to the proposed size, scale and nature of the proposal and the characteristics of the surrounding area, it is considered that the scheme would not constitute a 'major development' of more than local importance, be within a 'environmentally sensitive location' or 'create any unusual or hazardous effects' pursuant to the selection criteria of Schedule 3 of the EIA 2011 regulations.

As such, though the development is, by definition, Schedule 2 development, it is not considered to be EIA development as defined by Regulation 2(1) of the Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (SI 2001 no. 1824).