

Luken Beck
59 Tower Street
Winchester
SO23 8TA

Date: 10th April 2026

Please ask for: Mr S Davis

Tel: 01903 737874

Your Ref:

Our Ref: BN/41/26/ESO

Dear Mr Jarvis,

Environmental Screening Opinion for the erection of up to 195 No dwellings with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure.

Land at Sunnyside Yapton Road Barnham

Screening Opinion

The Group Head of Planning has determined under delegated powers that the above proposal does not require the submission of an Environmental Statement, as any impacts as there are on the environment are not likely to be of a magnitude to be covered by the Regulations. The following environmental issues are considered relevant to this proposal and have been considered in reaching this decision:

The Council considers that the proposal is an "Urban Development Project" as found within section 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Regarding the Schedule 2 relevant criteria and thresholds, it is noted that the proposed number of dwellings (up to 195) exceeds the applicable threshold of 150 and the site area (8.16ha per the Statement or 8.09ha per the Location Plan annotation) also exceeds the threshold of 5ha.

According to paragraph: 032 (Reference ID: 4-032-20170728) of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), all developments in sensitive areas should be screened regardless of whether they meet the stated thresholds. The NPPG states that sensitive areas are:

- Sites of Special Scientific Interest and European Sites.
- National Parks, the Broads, and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and
- World Heritage Sites and scheduled monuments.

The NPPG states that "In certain cases, local designations which are not included in the definition of "sensitive areas", but which are nonetheless environmentally sensitive, may also be relevant in determining whether an assessment is required".

The Council agrees that the site does not lie within any statutory sites for nature conservation, and that there are no designated ecological sites within 2km that are likely to be adversely affected by the development. The site is 1.5km from the Singleton and Cocking Tunnels SAC 12km buffer and 1km from the Arun Valley SPA Impact Risk Zone 2 (both distances approximate). However, these are themselves buffer areas and crucially, the site is not within either. There is a Neighbourhood Plan designated Biodiversity Corridor running the length of the Public Right of Way within the eastern boundary however, this is not a statutory designation and only has very local importance.

Paragraph: 017 (Reference ID: 4-017-20170728) of the NPPG states that "If a proposed project is listed in the first column in Schedule 2 of the 2017 Regulations and exceeds the relevant thresholds or criteria set out in the second column, the proposal needs to be screened by the local planning authority to determine whether significant effects on the environment are likely and hence whether an Environmental Impact Assessment is required."

The proposal is Schedule 2 development. An EIA is not automatically required unless the Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development is likely to have significant effects on the environment.

It is necessary to consider the proposal against Schedule 3 of the Regulations which outlines the criteria to consider in determining whether development falling within Schedule 2 will require an EIA. These criteria include (1) the characteristics of the development (e.g., its size, design, cumulative impact along with other developments, use of natural resources); (2) the environmental sensitivity of the location; and (3) the characteristics of the potential impact (e.g., its magnitude and duration). Paragraph 018 (reference ID: 4-018-20170728) states:

"Only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require an Environmental Impact Assessment. While it is not possible to formulate criteria or thresholds which will provide a universal test of whether or not an assessment is required, it is possible to offer a broad indication of the type or scale of development which is likely to require an assessment. It is also possible to provide an indication of the sort of development for which an assessment is unlikely to be necessary. 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. The table also gives an indication of the types of impact that are most likely to be significant for particular types of development. However, it should not be presumed that developments above the indicative thresholds should always be subject to assessment, or those falling below these thresholds could never give rise to significant effects, especially where the development is in an environmentally sensitive location. Each development will need to be considered on its merits."

The indicative thresholds linked from paragraph: 057 (Reference ID: 4-057-2070720) state that "Environmental Impact Assessment is unlikely to be required for the re-development 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." In respect of sites which have not previously been intensively developed, the following criteria

are relevant:

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

The proposal exceeds criteria (i) but not (iii) and criteria (ii) is not relevant. This Screening Response now continues in response to the headings given within Schedule 3.

(1) Location of the Development

The site was formerly in arable and horticultural use, and now consists of grassland, with remnants of nursery buildings and dilapidated outbuildings. Defra's Magic Map (Provisional ALV dataset) suggests the site is grade 2 (best and most versatile). This is consistent with the results of agricultural land surveys for the land on the opposite side of the railway line to the North which were conducted prior to housing re-development.

The site is relatively flat and largely featureless, with the exception of established hedgerows and hedgerow trees along its western and eastern boundaries. The site is enclosed by built form on three sides: north (albeit on the opposite side of a mainline railway), south, and west. The east side of the site predominantly borders with a former horticultural nursery as well as some dwellings. None of the trees within the site or on its boundaries are protected. The site would be eligible for statutory Biodiversity Net Gain.

The site is in Flood Zone 1 and climate change predictions don't indicate this will change in the future. Groundwater levels are likely to be high and there are pockets of known surface water risk within low areas of the site. The site is within the Lidsey Wastewater Treatment Catchment Area, this being an area where there is potential for surface water to enter the foul sewers resulting in localised flooding.

There are a number of heritage assets along Yapton Road for which their settings could be affected by development on this site. These consist of:

- Rose Cottage (Grade II Listed).
- The Windmill (Grade II Listed); and
- Sunnyside Barn, The Flint Barn, Vine Cottage and Old Mill Cottage (all Buildings of Character / non-designated Heritage Assets).

There is a Public Right of Way (ref BAR/325/1) running North/South along the eastern boundary.

Notwithstanding the above, this is not an environmentally sensitive site. Any environmental impacts that may arise are likely to be localised in nature and capable of resolution through localised mitigation.

(2) Characteristics of the Development

This development would comprise of up to 195 dwellings, associated parking, road/footway provision, foot/cycle paths, public open space, play provision, landscaping, drainage features,

and ancillary works. There are no details on scale at this stage, but this will likely reflect the character of existing or approved developments nearby. It is proposed to take vehicular access via an existing access opposite 46 Yapton Road. This will be widened and improved to serve the housing development. There will be a further pedestrian/cycle access onto Yapton Road via the footpath on the eastern side.

The site has only a very small frontage to Yapton Road and the bulk of the development will be set well back from the road thus limiting public views of the site to the eastern footpath, the railway line (from passengers on passing trains) and from the existing residential areas to the west (albeit these have existing landscape screening). The illustrative site layout drawing indicates the retention of existing tree screening with new tree planting to the boundaries and significantly to the southern boundary of the eastern site area.

There are existing residential developments around the site, and the characteristics of the development are not likely to be significant in the context of the EIA regulations.

(3) Characteristics of the Potential Impacts

The characteristics of the likely impacts in general are unlikely to be particularly significant, or long lasting, affect a significant area of the district or be complex in nature.

Subject to full assessment through the planning application, it is not likely that the development will result in any significant harm to ecological interests and it should be possible to mitigate any ecological impacts through planning conditions and/or a legal agreement, and the approval of an appropriate layout at a later date including significant buffer planting.

The entirety of the site is not at risk of flooding from surface water, rivers or sea and the development represents a potential opportunity to improve the existing surface water drainage system through infiltration and/or topographical changes and so reduce discharge rates to any local watercourses (also potentially reduce surface water runoff onto the railway line).

The development of the site will not directly affect any heritage assets, and it is unlikely, given the distances and screening, that substantial harm would be concluded to the setting of those along Yapton Road. The proposal is likely to result in harm to local character, but this will not be significant in the context of the EIA regulations, and the impacts will be localised in nature.

The landscape impacts will not be significant in the context of the EIA regulations. The surrounding landscape is relatively flat, and the site adjoins with other recent residential developments as well as long established dwellings. New landscaping and/or woodland planting to the boundaries of the site which adjoin with more open areas are likely to be sufficient to ensure that there is no significant or long-lasting impact on the wider landscape.

The proposal would result in the loss of a locally significant area of Grade 2 best and most versatile agricultural land. However, the impacts will be localised in nature, and it is recognised that this is a historic use and that the harm associated with the loss would be weighed against the benefits of the proposal, which are likely to be substantial in magnitude.

Although there will be an increase in vehicular traffic using the access junction onto Yapton Road (and thus in the vicinity of the site), this impact will not likely be significant. Traffic movements to/from the site will be staggered throughout the day and the site benefits from

being in a sustainable location with good access to local services and public transport, including Barnham Railway Station and a number of bus routes. To the west of the site access there is pavement and street lighting. Whilst the eastern end does not have street lighting, it does at least have pavement which continues all the way to Yapton.

It is not expected that there will be any significant impacts on local air quality or ambient noise levels arising from the operational stage of the development. Air quality impacts can also be offset by mitigation measures including electric vehicle use and other green initiatives. The previous agricultural and horticultural uses are not likely to have resulted in any site contamination such that would require significant remediation works.

Finally, although the construction phase of the site will result in impacts (such as noise, dust, traffic congestion) on the local population, these effects will be temporary and, provided suitable mitigation measures are put in place, not significant.

Cumulative Effects

Paragraph 024 (Reference ID: 4-024-20140306) of the NPPG states with regard to cumulative effects that "There are occasions where other existing or approved development may be relevant in determining whether significant effects are likely as a consequence of a proposed development".

There have been a number of major residential approvals within the local area in recent times (within the last 10-15 years) including a development of 44 homes on land to the immediate west, developments of 95 and 38 homes on two sites to the immediate south-west, a development of 75 homes to the North-west (other side of the railway) and 107 homes to the North (also the other side of the railway). Outline and reserved matters permission has been granted for 200 dwellings on a site on Church Lane approximately 450m to the west. This site is at construction stage.

With the exception of the 200 homes on Church Lane, all of the above have been built out and form part of the makeup of the area. The 200 homes on Church Lane are on a different road and not within immediate sight of the site. Whilst the cumulative traffic impacts on Yapton Road (between the Church Lane junction and the site access) will increase, the impacts will not be significant, and any harm will be local to Barnham.

It is material that the Screening Opinion given for the Church Lane site (which is for a similar quantum of houses) stated that there was no requirement for an EIA.

Conclusion

Having considered the above factors and having had regard to the nature & scale of the proposal, the development does not have the potential to result in significant impacts on the environment. The impacts would be relatively small-scale and localised and will be mitigated in accordance with standard methods including by conditions, a s106 legal agreement and the Community Infrastructure Levy. The proposal does not constitute EIA development and an Environmental Statement is not required in this instance.

This determination that an environmental statement is not required should not be seen as an indication of the Council's view on the planning merit of the proposal.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'NC' followed by a flourish.

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning