

# planning transport design environment infrastructure

Town & Country Planning (EIA) (England) Regulations 2017 Scoping Assessment of the Proposed Innovation Park LDO, Medway

November 2018 TS/13321





## Scoping assessment of the proposed Innovation Park LDO

Client: Medway Council

Project: Innovation Park LDO, Medway

Date: November 2018

Reference: TS/13321

Author: Tim Spicer BSc MSc PIEMA



DHA Planning Eclipse House Eclipse Park Sittingbourne Road Maidstone Kent ME14 3EN

Tel: 01622 776226

Email: <u>info@dhaenvironment.co.uk</u>
Web: <u>www.dhaenvironment.co.uk</u>
Twitter: <u>www.twitter.com/dhagroup</u>

## Contents

| 1   | INTRODUCTION                                      | 2  |
|-----|---|----|
| 1.1 | Purpose of this Document                          | 2  |
| 1.2 | Case Details                                      | 2  |
| 1.3 | Information sufficient to adopt a Scoping Opinion | 3  |
|     | Site Location                                     |    |
|     | Nature and Purpose of the Development             | 3  |
|     | Likely significant effects                        |    |
|     | Any other information                             |    |
|     | Summary   | 4  |
| 2   | SCOPING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT        | 5  |
| 2.1 | Background  | 5  |
| 2.2 | The purpose of scoping                            | 5  |
| 2.3 | Scoping methodology                               |    |
| 3   | SUMMARY   | 18 |



#### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This report has been prepared on behalf of Medway Council as an independent assessment as to the required scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment to be undertaken for the proposed Innovation Park Local Development in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.
- 1.1.1 The EIA Regulations require that applications for a specified range of projects, termed EIA developments, are accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) that reports the findings of an EIA of the development's potential significant environmental effects. The Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) online National Planning Practice Guidance defines the purpose of EIA:

"The aim of Environmental Impact Assessment is to protect the environment by ensuring that a local planning authority when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a project, which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account in the decision-making process."

- 1.1.2 This report presents information to assist the Council in its process of preparing a written opinion on the scope of the information that should be set out in the ES. It outlines DHA's initial assessment of the potentially significant environmental effects that the EIA would need to examine and the preliminary scope of the information that would need to be provided in the ES.
- 1.1.3 The preparation of this report has followed the EIA Regulations and the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) web-based Planning Practice Guidance: Environmental Impact Assessment which provides guidance on the application of EIA in England.

#### 1.2 Case Details

1.2.1 This report has been prepared using the information available in the Screening/Scoping Report produced by CampbellReith dated 5<sup>th</sup> October 2018 (doc. reference 12841) and the Innovation Park Medway Masterplan and appendices available at:

https://www.medway.gov.uk/downloads/download/380/innovation\_park\_medway\_masterplan

- 1.2.2 It should be noted that the scope of EIA should be reviewed in the event that material changes are proposed to the LDO as set out in the Innovation Park Medway Masterplan Statement including the parameters therein.
- 1.2.3 Due regard has also been given to following statutory consultation responses available at the time of producing this report:
  - Natural England



- KCC Biodiversity
- KCC Archaeology
- Environment Agency
- Medway Council Highways
- Medway Council Environmental Health
- Historic England
- Kent Downs AONB
- 1.2.4 All assumptions and recommendations set out in this report are based on professional experience.
- 1.2.5 The key details of the proposed development subject to this scoping report are set out in Table 1.

| Applicant                           | Medway Council   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Site Address                        | Land at Rochester Airport  |
| Brief Description of<br>Development | Local Development Order for a mixed-use business park comprising up to 101,000sqm of B1/B2 commercial uses |
| Site Area                           | 18.37ha  |

Table 1: Key Details

#### 1.3 Information sufficient to adopt a Scoping Opinion

#### Site Location

1.3.1 Regulation 15(2)(i) of the EIA Regulations as amended by Regulation 32 states that before issuing a scoping opinion the local authority must prepare "a plan sufficient to identify the land". Such a plan is provided as Figure 1.1 appended to the Screening/Scoping Request Report produced by CampbellReith on behalf of the Council.

#### Nature and Purpose of the Development

1.3.1 Regulation 15(2)(ii) as amended by Regulation 32 states that before issuing a scoping opinion the local authority must prepare a brief description of the nature and purpose of the development, including its location and technical capacity. This information is provided in section three of the CampbellReith report prepared on behalf of the Council.

#### Likely significant effects

1.3.2 Regulation 15(2)(iii) as amended by Regulation 32 states that before issuing a scoping opinion the local authority must prepare an explanation of the likely



significant effects of the development on the environment. This information is provided in section three of the CampbellReith report prepared on behalf of the Council.

#### Any other information

1.3.3 Regulation 15(2)(iv) as amended by Regulation 32 states that before issuing a scoping opinion the local authority must prepare such other information or representations as the person making the request may wish to provide or make. This information is provided in section three of the CampbellReith report prepared on behalf on the Council.

#### Summary

1.3.4 The information in the Screening/Scoping Report produced by CampbellReith dated 5th October 2018 (doc. reference 12841) is sufficient to allow Medway Council to adopt a Scoping Opinion in accordance of the requirements of the EIA Regulations.



### 2 Scoping an Environmental Impact Assessment

#### 2.1 Background

2.1.1 The advice given in the DCLG EIA guidance (under the section "What Information should the Environmental Statement contain") is that:

"Whilst every Environmental Statement should provide a full factual description of the development, the emphasis of Schedule 4 is on the "main" or "significant" environmental effects to which a development is likely to give rise. The Environmental Statement should be proportionate and not be any longer than is necessary to assess properly those effects. Where, for example, only one environmental factor is likely to be significantly affected, the assessment should focus on that issue only. Impacts which have little or no significance for the particular development in question will need only very brief treatment to indicate that their possible relevance has been considered."

2.1.2 This approach is reinforced by case law. Judgements have stated that, even in relation to the minimum requirements for an ES, not every possible effect has to be considered. The focus should be on the main effects and on remedying the significant adverse effects. The Milne judgement (R v Rochdale MBC ex parte Milne) states that,

"the Environmental Statement does not have to describe every environmental effect, however minor, but only the main effects or likely significant effects".

2.1.3 The Tew judgement (R v Rochdale MBC ex parte Tew) noted that the underlying objective of EIA is that decisions be taken "in full knowledge" of a project's likely significant effects and stated:

"that is not to suggest that full knowledge requires an environmental statement to contain every conceivable scrap of environmental information about a particular project. The Directive and the Assessment Regulations require the likely significant effects to be assessed. It will be for the local planning authority to decide whether a particular effect is significant."

#### 2.2 The purpose of scoping

- 2.2.1 There is no statutory provision as to the form of an ES. However, it must contain the information specified in Regulation 18(3) and must meet the requirements of Regulation 18(4). It must also include any additional information specified in Schedule 4 of the Regulations which is relevant to the specific characteristics of the particular development or type of development and to the environmental features likely to be significantly affected.
- 2.2.2 The planning authority's scoping opinion (provided pursuant to Regulation 15(1) of the EIA Regulations as amended by Regulation 32) represents its formal opinion on the information that needs to be presented in the ES. A local planning authority must consult the consultation bodies before providing a scoping opinion.



- 2.2.3 A comprehensive and focused scoping opinion that identifies the likely significant effects and any EIA methodologies that the planning authority (and relevant consultees) wishes to see employed will enable the production of an ES that provides a concise and objective analysis that deals with the significant areas of impact and highlights the key issues relevant to the decision-making process.
- 2.2.4 The purpose of scoping is to 'scope in' only those aspects considered to have likely significant environmental effects. Where a particular environmental feature, or component of it, has not been included within the proposed scope of an EIA, this is not to suggest that there will be no associated effects; rather that these are not considered to be among the significant effects.
- 2.2.5 As required under the EIA Regulations, scoping is an identification process that will need to be kept under review throughout the EIA process, ensuring any new potentially significant environmental effects are identified and included. The Council are advised to amend the scope of the EIA as required and, in the event of a significant change to the proposals or the baseline conditions.

#### 2.3 Scoping methodology

- 2.3.1 Decisions about the likely significant effects of the proposed development and therefore the scope of the assessment have been based upon professional judgement, with reference to the project description, and using information about:
  - the receptors (people and environmental resources) that could be affected by the proposed development; the activities involved in constructing and operating the proposed development;
  - changes that could result from these activities (e.g. changes in traffic flows or landcover as a result of the proposed development);
  - the expected magnitude and other characteristics of the environmental changes that could result from these activities and that could affect important receptors; and
  - the susceptibility of important receptors to exposure to these changes e.g. how biodiversity receptors might be affected by changes in land cover.
- 2.3.2 If the information that is available does not enable a robust conclusion to be reached that a potential effect is not likely to be significant, then in accordance with the precautionary principle the effect is should then undergo further assessment.
- 2.3.3 Table 2.1 uses a checklist of environmental features and their components to identify:
  - i. Those environmental features, or components of them, that clearly have the potential to be subjected to likely significant environmental effects arising from the proposed development and those environmental features, or components of them, that may be subjected to effects arising from the proposed development, but it is not clear whether these effects have the potential to be 'likely significant' at this stage.



- ii. Those environmental features, or components of them, that are either of no relevance to the proposed development, or will clearly not be subjected to 'likely significant 'effects from the proposed development. Reasons are stated for potential effects that are assessed as being unlikely to be significant and that do not therefore require further assessment (i.e. they are scoped-out).
- 2.3.4 This checklist is based on the features of the environment referred to in the EIA Regulations and:
  - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), A handbook for scoping projects (Environment Agency 2002);
  - Guidance on EIA Scoping (European Commission, 2001); and
  - Guidelines for environmental impact assessment (The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2004).
- 2.3.5 A large group of potential environmental effects have examined, as set out in Table 2.1 below. Where potential significant environmental effects were identified these are highlighted in orange.



| Environmental aspect | Component                               | Possible significant construction effect envisaged? | Possible significant operational effect<br>envisaged? | Comments   |
|----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| AIR QUALITY          | Local air quality (criteria pollutants) | Yes   | Yes   | An air quality report has been produced in support of the Local Development Order (LDO) and is available on the Council's website. Whilst this concludes that the proposed LDO will not have significant air quality effects on nearby receptors it is noted that no commentary is provided on the likely impact on the surrounding AQMA's. It is noted that the potential impact is likely to be greatest in areas where air quality objectives are already being exceeded such as AQMA's. Whilst the report may have looked at the point of greatest impact the overall effect is understood to be relative to existing objective levels.  It is noted that the assessment concludes no likely significant effects from construction dust but no comment on construction vehicle numbers and their potential effect is provided.  Without a clear conclusion on the effects of the development alone and in combination with other approved or planned developments on existing AQMA's and on the basis of the pre-cautionary principle it is not considered that air quality should be scoped out the EIA. The assessment in the ES should include both the construction and the operational phases of the development. |
|                      | Dust                                    | Yes   | No  | Given the scale of the site and the level of groundworks anticipated during construction to deliver the proposed development there is the potential for significant dust generating activity during construction in proximity to an urban area. Dust generated particulate matter (PM) of less 10 micrometers can be detrimental to human health. It is therefore advised that dust effects are scoped into the EIA.   |
|                      | Odour                                   | No  | No  | There will be no significant odour emitting sources associated with the development.   |
|                      | Transboundary air<br>quality            | No  | No  | The scale and location of the proposed development suggests the potential for significant effects on transboundary air quality is negligible.  |



|                     | Global climate change and greenhouse gas emissions       | No  | No  | The proposed development is not of a scale or type considered to result in significant CO2 or other greenhouse gas emissions, which would compromise national or regional carbon budgets.   |
|---------------------|--|-----|-----|---|
| CLIMATE CHANGE      | Vulnerability of the<br>development to climate<br>change | No  | No  | The nature and type of development proposed does not suggest it will be particularly vulnerable to the predicted effects of climate except by virtue of flood risk and surface water flooding. However, the site lies in flood zone 1 and there are no fluvial flood water sources in proximity to the site.  With regard to increasing off site flood risk, all drainage solutions are required to make a 40% allowance for climate change in accordance with Environment Agency Guidance. |
|                     | Demography   | No  | Yes | The proposed development by virtue of its scale has the potential to result in significant effects on the demography of the surrounding area particular given the socio/economic context of the development in Medway.  |
|                     | Housing supply   | No  | No  | No residential dwellings are proposed as part of the LDO.   |
|                     | Employment   | No  | Yes | The proposed development has the potential to generate a significant number of jobs associated with the up to 101,00sqm of B1/B2 floorspace.  |
| ОМІС                | Economy  | No  | Yes | The scale and nature of the development indicate that the proposed development could result in significant effects on the economy of the area.  |
| ND ECON             | Education, health and local services                     | No  | No  | The proposed development is not considered likely to result in significant effects on education, health or local services.  |
| SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC | Public health and safety                                 | No  | No  | In the event that the proposed development was permitted there would be no public access to the site during construction.   |
| COMMUNITY,          | Local environmental amenity                              | Yes | No  | Construction works could affect the amenity of local residents during construction. These will relate principally to air quality, noise and visual impact and are proposed to be addressed within the relevant topic chapters.  |
|                     | Electromagnetism /<br>radiation                          | No  | No  | The proposed development is not considered to be a significant source of electromagnetic fields or radiation. Notwithstanding this, the development would have to comply with the Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations 2016 and the Ionising Radiations Regulations 2017 (IRR17) in any event.   |
|                     | Telecommunications                                       | No  | No  | The proposed development will not affect Telecommunications.  |
|                     | Microclimate   | No  | No  | The proposed development is not considered likely to result in significant effects on the microclimate.   |



|              | Tourism   | No  | No  | The location and nature of the proposed development suggest that the proposed development will not have significant effects on the local tourist economy.  |
|--------------|---|-----|-----|--|
| HUMAN HEALTH | Direct or indirect deleterious<br>effects on human health | Yes | Yes | The potentially significant health impacts of the proposed development are considered to relate to air quality effects, noise and contamination and ground conditions which are addressed under the relevant headings.  These affects should be addressed within the relevant technical chapters/appendices as relevant as set out in this table. A standalone Human Health assessment is not therefore required.  |
|              | Archaeology   | No  | No  | A desk-based archaeological and built heritage impact assessment has been produced as part of the LDO process. The report is available on the Council's website.  The archaeological resource of the site is largely unknown albeit it is generally considered unlikely that remains of national significant exist on the site. Standard mitigation measures including preservation by record exist for archaeological remains of less than national significance. Safeguarding measures in the event of nationally significant archaeology exist to prevent significant harm. On this basis and in accordance with the relevant consultee responses it is considered that the proposed development would not result in likely significant effects on archaeology and heritage assets. |
| Э            | Scheduled monuments                                       | No  | No  | In accordance with the conclusions of the report produced in support of the LDO and in light of the consultation responses from Historic England and KCC Heritage no likely significant effects on scheduled monuments are envisaged.  |
| HERITAGE     | Listed buildings and<br>historic parks and<br>gardens     | No  | No  | In accordance with the conclusions of the report produced in support of the LDO and in light of the consultation responses from Historic England and KCC Heritage no likely significant are envisaged.   |



|                   | Unexploded Ordnance                        | Yes | No  | The desk based geotechnical report produced on behalf of the Council and available on their website identifies that there is a very high risk of unexploded ordnance on the site which indicates the potential for a likely significant effect.  |
|-------------------|--|-----|-----|--|
| GROUND CONDITIONS | Ground contamination                       | Yes | Yes | A desk-based contamination and geotechnical study has been produced as part of the LDO process. The report is available on the Council's website.  The report identifies that the site is considered to present a moderate to high risk of contamination. The underlying chalk formation is a principal aquifer and lies in ground water protection zone two. The site in its present state and without intrusive ground investigation results is identified as representing a high risk to surface water and ground water and a moderated to high risk to future occupiers of buildings on the site.  The report concludes that the desk study is sufficient for planning purposes and can be subject to further investigation prior to construction.  However, given the high risk of contamination on the site and the sensitivity of the underlying aquifer it is not considered that the information provided allows Medway Council to conclude that there is no risk of likely significant effects in accordance with the precautionary principle. It is common practice for preliminary ground investigations to be undertaken in situations such as this where a high risk is identified in addition to outlining feasible mitigation measures.  It is therefore suggested ground contamination is scoped into the ES and include preliminary ground investigations to support any conclusions made. |
|                   | Ground water                               | Yes | No  | See ground contamination above.  |
|                   | Mineral resources                          | No  | No  | The site is not considered to be a viable mineral extraction location.   |
|                   | Agriculture /<br>horticulture              | No  | No  | No significant loss of agricultural land is proposed as part of the development.   |
|                   | Forestry                                   | No  | No  | There is no woodland loss proposed as part of the Development.   |
| 111               | Recreation / open<br>space / rights of way | No  | No  | There are no Public Rights of Way that cross the site.   |
| LAND USE          | Mineral extraction                         | No  | No  | No mineral extraction on site is proposed.   |
|                   | Industrial / commercial<br>/ retail        | No  | No  | The likely significant effects of the proposed B1/B2 land use are considered to be addressed through the topics identified in the scoping report.  |
|                   | Residential                                | No  | No  | No residential development is proposed as part of the LDO.   |
|                   | Health / social /<br>education             | No  | No  | No health, social or education development land uses are proposed.   |



|                              | Waste disposal        | No  | No  | No waste management facilities are proposed as part of the LDO.   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----|---|
|                              | Landform / topography | No  | No  | At this stage no significant changes to the topography of<br>the site are proposed. Notwithstanding this any such<br>change would be inherently embedded in the landscape<br>assessment.  |
| LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL EFFECTS | Protected landscapes  | Yes | Yes | A landscape and visual assessment have been produced in support of the LDO and is available on the Council's website.  The report appears comprehensive and is undertaken in accordance with appropriate industry guidance (GLVIA 3rd Edition). The report concludes that the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse effects on landscape character or visual receptors as a result of the LDO. The report states that effects of moderate-major or above are significant; effects on the AONB are stated as ranging from minimal to slight. No others significant effects are envisaged.  Notwithstanding the above and considering the consultation response from the AONB Unit it is recommended that effects on the AONB are scoped into the ES on a precautionary basis. |
|                              | Sensitive views       | Yes | Yes | In light of the consultation response from the AONB Unit it is recommended that effects on sensitive views from within the AONB are scoped into the ES on a precautionary basis.  |
|                              | Landscape character   | Yes | Yes | In light of the consultation response from the AONB Unit it is recommended that effects on the landscape character of the AONB are scoped into the ES on a precautionary basis.   |



|                  | Habitats and protected species | No  | No  | An Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken and is available on the Council's website.  The site consists of species poor semi-natural habitats and built development and is recorded as supporting dormice, breeding birds including skylark and foraging and commuting bats. Subject to the mitigation measures set out within the assessment the proposed development is considered to result in site/local level effects only.  It is noted that the assessments of on-site trees for roosting bats has not yet concluded and so the degree of effect on roosting bats is unknown albeit unlikely to be significant. The Council are advised not to grant the LDO before these assessments have been concluded and KCC Ecology have been consulted.  It is noted that a developer is required to meet the legal tests of the relevant legislation (The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended, and The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended), which therefore minimises the potential for significant adverse effects on protected species, without necessitating EIA.   |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-----|-----|--|
| NATURAL HERITAGE | Designated sites               | Yes | Yes | With regard to off-site effects and in particular designated sites the Ecological Impact Assessment report states that all designated sites have been scoped out of the assessment "including impacts from nitrogen deposition because of the distance (over 200m) of the designated sites from roads that are likely to be used by vehicles."  A desktop review of the area identifies that the Wouldham to Detling Escarpment SSSI lies immediately adjacent to the A229 south of the site. A review of the Air Pollution information System indicates that existing levels of nitrogen deposition are in exceedance of the Critical load for the interest feature habitat type within 200m of the A229. A small part of the North Downs Woodland SAC also lies within 200m of the A229.  Whilst an assessment of air quality effects is presented in the air quality report available on the Council's website this appears to apply air quality objective levels for human health and ambient concentrations rather than nutrient nitrogen deposition rates to ecological receptors. There is no mention of critical loads. On the basis of the information provided it cannot currently be concluded that there will be no likely significant effects on designated sites pursuant to the LDO.  Air quality impacts on designated ecological sites should therefore be scoped into the EIA. |
|                  | Natural processes              | No  | No  | The proposed development is not considered likely to significantly affect natural processes which would impact on the ecological interest of the locality.   |



|                       |                          |     | 1   |   |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|---|
| NOISE AND VIBRATION   | Noise                    | No  | No  | A full comprehensive noise assessment of the likely significant effects of the proposed LDO on nearby sensitive receptors and key traffic routes has been undertaken.  This appears comprehensive and considers both construction and operational phases of the development. The report concludes that subject to standard construction noise reduction methods and plant noise level limits secured through appropriately worded conditions attached to the LDO that no likely significant noise effects are envisaged.  On the basis of the information provided DHA agree that significant noise and vibration effects are unlikely.   |
|                       | Vibration                | No  | No  | At this stage it is not anticipated that pilling would be required to facilitate the proposed development. In the absence of piling no significant vibration related effects are anticipated. Should this change the need for a vibration assessment to be undertaken and included in the ES will be reviewed.  |
| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT | Traffic flows            | Yes | Yes | A draft Transport Assessment has been produced by CampbellReith summarised in their Screening/Scoping Report and available in full on the Council's website.  The report states that the proposed LDO would generate 1,092 two-way vehicle trips in the am peak and 753 two-way vehicle trips in the PM peak hour. The report concludes that junction capacity improvements will be required to the local road network to facilitate the proposed development but details on the feasibility on these improvements is not given and so these cannot be considered at this stage with regard to mitigating likely significant effects. The trips generated in the am and pm peaks indicate a significant increase in traffic.  It is therefore considered that the effect of the traffic flows of the proposed LDO are scoped into the ES and include abnormal dangerous loads during construction and driver severance, delay, accidents and safety during construction and post completion of the development. |
| TRAI                  | Infrastructure           | Yes | Yes | The CampbellReith report concludes that junction capacity improvements will be required to the local road network to facilitate the proposed development.   |
|                       | Pedestrians and cyclists | Yes | Yes | The volume of traffic generated by the proposed development has the potential to result in pedestrian and cyclist severance and delay.  |
|                       | Air traffic              | No  | No  | There is no potential for effects on air traffic.   |
|                       | Water traffic            | No  | No  | There is no potential for effects on water traffic.   |



|                | 1                                    |    | 1  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|----|----|--|
| WASTE          | Construction waste                   | No | No | In accordance with the Duty of Care (Section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act) all those who produce or handle wastes from demolition, earthworks and construction activities are legally obligated to ensure its safekeeping, best practice management, transport and subsequent recovery or disposal.  The construction contractors, waste transfer company and the receiving waste disposal site will all be fully responsible for waste classification, retaining legal responsibilities for fulfilling waste management duty of care requirements and ensuring that waste is deposited lawfully. No likely significant effects during construction are therefore envisaged.           |
|                | Waste management                     | No | No | Following occupation of the development waste from the commercial uses on the site will be dealt with by way of licensed waste carriers. The obligation to dispose of any hazardous waste produced is the responsibility of the waste producer in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 and the Waste Management (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 amongst others. No likely significant effects are therefore envisaged.  |
| MENT           | Surface water quality                | No | No | A SUDS Design and Development Report has been produced in support of the LDO. This proposes to discharge surface water to ground through a series of infiltration basins. At this stage given the potentially high contamination status of the site it may not be feasible to install infiltration features by way of surface water disposal particularly given its location in SPZ2.  Notwithstanding this given the presence of surface and foul water sewers within or in proximity to the site it is likely that an alternative solution is available sufficient to conclude no likely significant effect however the recommendations set out under 'ground conditions' should be addressed. |
| WATER ENVIRONM | Flood risk                           | No | No | The site lies in flood zone 1.   |
| WATE           | Surface water<br>temperature         | No | No | No processes are proposed that could change surface water temperature.   |
|                | Coastal / oceanic<br>water quality   | No | No | The site is not near the coast.  |
|                | Coastal water<br>temperature         | No | No | The site is not near the coast.  |
|                | Coastal processes /<br>hydrodynamics | No | No | The site is not near the coast.  |



|                                       | Water resource<br>(ground/surface)  | No  | No | Wastewater treatment requirements at the receiving Wastewater Treatment Works falls within the remit of the sewerage operator to assess and manage. Liaison with Southern Water through the normal pre planning process would establish any required upgrades, permits, funding (with the potential for developer funding).  As with wastewater requirements, the assessment of impact and provision of mitigation on potable water supply falls within the remit of the service provider.   |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|----|--|
| RISK OF MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS | Risk of major accidents<br>and or disasters and their<br>potential for significant<br>environmental effects | Yes | No | It is noted that the assessment of major accidents and disasters is a new requirement of Directive 2014/52/EU transposed in UK law on the 16th of May 2017 in the EIA Regulations. To date no formal guidance has been issued from either the Government or relevant parties as to the scope or nature of such assessment.  However, the nature of the development and its location indicate that it is not likely to result in accidents or disasters that would result in significant environmental effects or is vulnerable to accidents and disasters from neighbouring land uses. The exception to this is the risk of unexploded ordnance discussed under 'Contamination and ground conditions'. It is suggested that UXO can be incorporated into Contamination and ground condition assessment in the ES and does not necessitate a standalone chapter in the ES.  It is noted that the proposed development does not fall within the scope of EU legislation 2012/18/EU (control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances) or Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom (Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations) as identified in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations. |

- 2.3.6 The effects of the proposed development in combination with other schemes that are consented or for which planning permissions are currently being sought, will need to be assessed within the EIA where appropriate.
- 2.3.7 Cumulative effects should be considered on an issue-by-issue basis and the scope of the EIA expanded, if necessary, to include any cumulative issues that arise in the future. The cumulative effects of other developments should consider when sufficient information is available, i.e. when a project is within the planning domain and there is adequate information publicly available.
- 2.3.8 The assessment in Table 2.1 has been mindful to the potential cumulative effects of the proposals with other planned or approved development in the locality of the site and the potential for significant effects to result. It is advised that the following sites (in addition to major employment and housing allocations though the emerging local plan process) as a minimum are included in the ES and considered by virtue of the potential to result in significant cumulative effects with the proposed LDO:



- MC/18/0558 Construction of 11 industrial units for use in association with Use Class B1(c) (light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) with associated servicing, parking and landscaping demolition of existing building. Former D/X Freight Site, Maidstone Road, Rochester, ME1 3DQ.
- MC/17/2333 Hybrid planning application seeking outline permission for the erection of up to 1,400 no. dwellings including a primary school and nursery (D1 use), up to 1,200sqm of commercial floorspace (A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1 and D2 uses) together with a pedestrian footbridge, parking, open space and landscaping. Full permission for phase 1, 2 and 3 of the development consisting of the erection of 489 no. dwellings (of the 1,400 no. total), the provision of a hotel (use Class C1), 885sqm of commercial floorspace (A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1 and D2 uses) along with site access/spine road, parking, open space and landscaping. Rochester Riverside, Rochester, ME1 1NH.
- MC/18/2827 Town and Country Planning Act (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - request for a screening opinion for a residential/mixed use scheme. Land At North Dane Way, Lordswood, Chatham, Kent, ME5 8YE.



## 3 Summary

3.1.1 From this scoping exercise, it has been possible to reach a preliminary view on the environmental features that have the potential to be significantly affected by the proposed development and should be included within the EIA. All of the identified effects that are potentially significant are listed in Table 3.1 and should be appropriately assessed in the ES to support the LDO.

| Feature                         | Potentially significant effects  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Traffic and transport           | Effects associated with abnormal/dangerous loads during construction   |
|                                 | Effects on driver delay, accidents, and road safety during construction  |
|                                 | Effects on driver delay, accidents, and road safety associated with the future commercial uses of the site     |
|                                 | Effects on pedestrians and cyclists  |
|                                 | Alterations to local road infrastructure   |
| Air quality                     | Dust generated PM<10 μg m-3 associated with construction   |
|                                 | Traffic generated NO2 and PM<10 µg m-3 effects on human receptors including AQMAs during and post construction |
| Contamination                   | The risks of accidents and disasters associated with potential UXO on the site                                 |
|                                 | Effects associated with on-site contamination and risk to groundwater  |
|                                 | Potential effects to future development from ground gas  |
| Ecology                         | Traffic generate nutrient nitrogen and acid deposition on protected sites                                      |
| Socio-economic effects          | Effects on the demography of the local area  |
|                                 | Effects on local employment  |
|                                 | Effects on the local economy of Rochester and Medway   |
| Landscape and visual<br>effects | The effect of the development on the setting and landscape character of the AONB                               |
|                                 | The effect of the development from sensitive views and particular those from within the AONB                   |
| Table 3.1: Potentially si       | gnificant effects to be assessed in the ES   |

