

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX – 03/01/2023**

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	2022/93248	Brief description of the project / development	The development constitutes the Kirklees Cultural Heart Regeneration Project, a component of the Huddersfield Blueprint – a ten-year vision to transform Huddersfield Town Centre.
Applicant	Kirklees Council		<p>The development proposed within the red-line boundary of location plan -SK0184 Rev PO1 dated 15/07/22 includes the following operations and construction projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retention and reuse of Listed Buildings within the site, principally the Market Hall and the Library and Art Gallery. 2. Demolition of buildings within the site, including the parade of shops within the Piazza, elements of the Market Hall fronting onto Peel Street, the Shambles shopping arcade (including those fronting King Street/Queen Street) and the retail units fronting Princess Alexandra Walk. This demolition being necessary in order to facilitate the scope, scale and ambition of the project. Plan references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -LG-DR-A-022140 -UG-DR-A-022141 -01-DR-A-022142 -02-DR-A-022143 -RF-DR-A-022144 <p>Issued 29/11/22 and illustrated the extent of proposed demolition within the site boundary.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The demolition, adaptation and retention of service tunnels, where appropriate. 4. A new library, located within the Market Hall, (along with some extension works), of around 5,000sqm (Gross Internal Area). 5. A new museum of around 7,000sqm (Gross Internal Area), located within the existing Library and Art Gallery building, with an extension upon its northern elevation. 6 A gallery space fronting onto Queen Street of around 3000 sqm (Gross Internal Area). 7. A new venue space upon the site of the former multi story car park, accommodating around 2,200 people at approximately 9,000sqm of Gross Internal Area
LPA	Kirklees MBC		

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX – 03/01/2023**

			<p>8. A new food court, possibly located within the Market Hall, of around 2,000sqm (Gross Internal Area)</p> <p>9. A new multi storey car park below the new venue, accommodating around 350 spaces (including EV charging stations)</p> <p>10. A new food hall, located within the Market Hall, of around 2,000sqm (Gross Internal Area)</p> <p>11. Public realm, including an outdoor event space for around 3,000 people, linking the above-mentioned components of the scheme, including a new frontage to Queen Street (in lieu of the demolished buildings) and into the northern section of the site and leading up to King Street.</p> <p>12. Linked to the above, a scheme of hard and soft landscaping measures across the site, including the retention of existing features</p> <p>13. Measures, yet to be determined, to address surface water and other infrastructure (such as utilities) requirements; and</p> <p>14. Incorporation of sustainable development measures, in terms of energy efficiency through design and bio-diversity enhancements.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>N.B. The LPA has formed this screening opinion from the information provided within the planning application reference 2022/93248. This follows initial EIA Screening Opinion issued on 09/03/22 as the floorspace and red line boundary was amended.</p> <p>- This opinion/direction is formed from the information provided as to the scope and scale of the development project proposed. The opinion/direction should be read in the context of the available information cited above and does not apply to any redline boundary or design alterations that occur following adoption of the screening opinion. This Screening Opinion is without prejudice to any information pertaining to the development not provided to the LPA.</p>
--	--	--	--

2. EIA DETAILS	
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)	-
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?	Yes

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX – 03/01/2023**

<p>If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?</p>	<p>10. Infrastructure Projects (b) - Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas</p>
<p>Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?</p>	<p align="center">No</p>
<p>If YES, which area?</p>	<p align="center">n/a</p>
<p>Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>
<p>If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?</p>	<p align="center">(i)over 1ha of urban development</p>
<p>3. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT</p>	
<p>Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons) Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)	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)) 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 reliant on specific features or measures of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment these should be identified in bold .
4. NATURAL RESOURCES		
4.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes Topographical changes would likely be made. The level difference and 'natural' topography between the eastern and western sides of the site is >5m with an increase in elevation to the west towards Peel Street and Victoria Lane and a decrease experienced at Queen Street and Queensgate. It is anticipated that at least part of the development would respond to the natural topography with alterations made mainly to the previous interventions- the buildings. Levels within parts of the site would remain broadly the same due to the limitations of adjacent road levels within the urban setting.	No The 'physical scale of the development' statement within the cover letter states: " <i>The proposed development would not be substantial in its scale in the context of adjacent development and through good design would be appropriately accommodated into the surrounding townscape, integrating with Listed Buildings and the wider Conservation Area that lies beyond the site's boundaries.</i> " The specific scale of the development has not been stated with the submission, however if it responds to the townscape then it is anticipated that it would not result in a significant negative effect to the topography of the area. <u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> Similar to existing physical effect of the current buildings, but possibly lower effect due to larger outdoor space. No significant effect. <u>Spatial extent:</u> Limited/Negligible significant population effects as no residential properties (currently) located on site or immediately

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))
			<p>adjacent. Low/Negligible Significant Effects – Urban Area</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> Low/Negligible Significant Effects – Urban Area where such activities are common.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> Medium/High</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years, possibility of phasing, reversibility would require demolition in most instances.</p>
<p>4.2 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The project is highly likely to use land, water, materials/minerals and energy during its construction and throughout the lifetime of its use. The materials and energy used in construction could potentially be non-renewable.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The re-use of a brownfield site is highly sustainable. Water in Kirklees is not normally in short supply. Natural resources would be utilised in the manufacture of building materials used on the site and in the construction of site infrastructure.</p> <p>It is possible that sustainable materials could be used in the manufacture of the development. It is possible that the development could be partly-composed of local finishing materials (e.g. natural stone) alongside the inclusion of renewable energy production measures (e.g. photovoltaic panels) that could partly offset significant effects. It is also considered that the amount of natural resources used on site and as part of the development could be minimised through best practice to meet relevant targets, for example through waste recycling, modern methods of construction practice or reusing materials from the current buildings where</p>

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))
		<p>possible. Any development would need to comply with the Building Regulations and other legislation.</p> <p>On balance, given the re-use of an existing brownfield site and the possibility of utilising renewable/recycled/sustainable materials, and implementing modern construction practices, the development's reliance on natural resources could be significantly reduced such that significant effects would not be likely</p> <p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> Replacing the existing buildings is likely to be a negative impact in respect of natural resources, though the magnitude of this is dependent on the type of materials and methods of construction used as well as the complexity of the buildings proposed, all of which are currently unknown. It is also possible that significant effects of the development's use can be off-set or reduced through operational strategies (e.g., waste recycling) as well as the incorporation of renewable energy generation and saving products incorporated into the development. A reduction of significant effects could also be attributed to the provision of larger outdoor public spaces than exist on currently on the site. This would reduce the built area and the quantity of resources necessary for superstructures on the site.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> Beneficial population effects are possible from job creation, including benefits to</p>

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))
		<p>local businesses through the construction period and during the lifetime use of the site via increased footfall.</p> <p>Negligible impact due to the high-density urban setting of the development site. Possibility of improved effects from creation of larger open spaces within the site that would have greater capacity for habitat creation.</p> <p>Locating the proposed uses (that could attract larger numbers of visitors) in a highly-accessible town centre location (where public transport and opportunities for combined trips already exist) would help limit environmental effects when compared with a less accessible location that is more reliant on private motorised transport, and where other sensitivities (to noise etc) may exist.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The development is sited in an urban area where such activities are common and where transportation links are favourable - Low/Negligible Effect anticipated.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> Probability of the development using natural resources is high. The extent to which those resources are renewable/sustainable has a medium probability rating and will partly be dependent on financial constraints.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years</p>

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))	
				dependent on the development's phasing. The reversibility of the site would require demolition. The operation of the site, from a water and energy perspective, is likely to be for a significant period of time (decades).
4.3 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?	No	High-density Urban Location. The site is within an area safeguarded for sand, gravel, sandstone and surface coal resource, however given the site's size, town centre location, surrounding uses and heritage assets, it is highly unlikely that these resources would ever be extracted at this site.	N/A	-

5. WASTE

5.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	The proposed development, during both construction and operation, will produce standard solid wastes representative of the construction industry and of typical leisure and retail facilities.	No	<u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> Demolition of the existing buildings on the site and construction of the proposed development would likely generate significant volumes of solid waste material. The volume and type of waste produced would be dependent on the design of the building and comment cannot be made in detail on this specific matter given the limited information to hand. The magnitude of waste produced from the development's use is likely to be less than the existing uses of the site given that the site is to be used less intensively than the existing (i.e. more open spaces, less retail etc). Indeed the proposed museum, gallery and library would likely generate far less waste than the existing retail units though it is likely that this would be offset by the proposed food court and event space, which have the potential to generate large amounts of waste on a perpetual basis. That being said packaging
---	-----	--	----	--

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))
		<p>controls could be implemented to reduce this effect. Increasingly food production is utilising recycled and recyclable packaging and food premises (cafes, restaurants, pubs) are adopting schemes for re-using food containers and utensils. The significant effect of the scheme is consequently unlikely to be of a greater magnitude than the existing use and could generate lower waste production in the long-term dependent on wider waste planning at the local and national level.</p> <p>Demolition waste levies and other legislative measures would limit waste generated by the development, as would improved recycling targets and proportions.</p> <p>Given the above, it is considered that significant effects in relation to waste are not likely.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> No significant effects as the magnitude of waste is likely to be at the same level or lower than the existing.</p> <p>Negligible impact due to the high-density urban setting of the development site.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The development is sited in an urban area where such activities are common and where transportation links are favourable for safe and acceptable means of transporting waste - Low/Negligible Effect anticipated.</p>

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))
		<p><u>Probability</u>: Probability of the development producing solid waste in the construction and operational phases is high. However, the extent to which waste is managed in the construction and operational stages of the development to reduce its environmental impact has a medium probability rating. The medium rating is partly dependent on the design and financial constraints of developing the proposal.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility</u>: Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The reversibility of the site would require demolition and/or cessation of the proposed uses</p>

6. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES

<p>6.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The presence of hazardous, toxic or noxious substances (that could be released to the air) has not been confirmed.</p> <p>It is possible that the demolition of the buildings could involve the discovery of asbestos-related products. However, the removal of these products would be through controlled measures that would limit or prevent their spread in the air (subject to the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2021 and the Contaminated Land Regulations 2006).</p> <p>The development is within a High-Risk Coal Mining Area as designated by the Coal Authority. Given the site is currently developed, it is considered unlikely that mine gas or any other contaminants resulting from coal mining</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><u>N/A.</u></p>
---	-----------	---	-----------	--------------------

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))	
		<p>will be discovered. This is not to state that there is no risk of uncovering such substances, however the risk is considered very low and therefore unlikely to incur a significant adverse effect. The demolition and construction of the development would incur a release of particles into the air, but it is not anticipated that these would be more hazardous, toxic or noxious than those typically encountered during normal demolition and construction operations. A Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment would be required at the planning application stage to determine if there were any hazardous materials within the buildings on site that would need to be managed prior to demolition as well as any land beneath the site that would require remediation. The planning application process would manage such issues, and these are not unusual for removal of buildings that pre-date the 2006 Regulations.</p>		
<p>6.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The proposed development is highly likely to produce noise, vibration and release of kinetic energy effects during the demolition and construction phases. Noise and vibration is possible during operation of the event space and food court.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> Significant effects are likely to be experienced in respect of noise and some vibration in the immediate area surrounding the development site during the demolition and construction periods with some noise and vibration possible during the operation of the event space and food court.</p> <p>Currently very few, if any, residential properties exist adjacent to the development site at the time of this assessment. Six residential units have been granted planning permission at 24-26 Queen Street directly to the east, facing the</p>

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))
		<p>site under application 2019/92371, however addresses are not indicated for these properties within the Gazetteer at the current time. Two further residential planning applications are under consideration, one being for nine dwellings at 14-18 King Street (2021/93374) and another for 31 dwellings at 61-65 New Street (2021/93305 and 93306). These units, should they come forward, are subject to noise assessments and appropriate mitigation coming forward to deal with typical town centre noise levels.</p> <p>The General Permitted Development Order (2015) also has prior approval rights set out under Sch.2, Part 3, Classes M, MA, N, O and P which provides for the possible future conversion of surrounding buildings to dwellinghouses that could increase the potential for noise sensitive receptors, though class MA (which covers most Class E uses surrounding the site) requires impacts of noise to be considered as a part of the prior approval process.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> Low effect given location in an urban centre and low number of residents situated nearby. There is potential for the effect to increase during construction and reduce with intermittent effects during operation. An independent variable is the number of dwellings created/lost surrounding the site.</p>

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))	
				<p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> High complexity, however air and noise effects can be mitigated through the application of construction methodologies.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> Probability of noise and energy effects occurring is high. The probability of a significant effect is low due to the low number of nearby residential properties.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The operation of the site would create noise and energy use throughout its lifetime (decades).</p>
<p>6.3 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>	No	<p>The site is in a High-Risk Coal Mining Area and existing buildings pre-date the Contaminated Land Regulations 2006. A Phase 1 Contaminated Land Assessment would be required at the planning application stage to determine if there were any hazardous materials within the buildings on site that would need to be managed prior to demolition, as well as whether any land beneath the site would require remediation.</p>	No	N/A
<p>6.4 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?</p>	Yes	<p>The site is within Kirklees Air Quality Management Area 9 (AQMA9). AQMA9 was declared across the entirety of Huddersfield Town Centre on the 1st November 2017 due to Nitrogen Dioxide levels (NO₂) being above acceptable levels across an annual mean measurement.</p>	No	<p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> The development would be subject to an Air Quality Assessment at the planning application stage that would review its impacts and what mitigation can be put in place to offset or improve local air quality. Overall the magnitude of the development's effect on air quality is likely to be low. Air quality is generally harmful for local residents over long</p>

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))
		<p>periods of time and it is unlikely that the development, during its operational phase, would result in adverse effects as there are few residential properties nearby and the development would mostly be composed of non-residential buildings and pedestrianised areas. The demolition and construction phases could create issues for air quality, but it is anticipated that these effects would be accounted for and dealt with via the Air Quality Assessment and implementation of its recommendations.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The number of people affected on site could be large on specific days when an event is held. However, it is likely that few people would be adversely affected given that the temporal period of people being on site for events would be for a matter of hours or days, not for months or years.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> The probability of the development contributing to air quality issues is anticipated to be high during the demolition and construction phases, and low during the operational phases. However, there are likely to be few residents who would be affected by the development in the long term.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The complexity of adverse air quality effects is subject to the management of the demolition and construction</p>

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))	
				<p>phases, details of which have not yet been shared with the LPA.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The operation of the site would be throughout its lifetime (decades).</p>
7. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
<p>7.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning? And 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)</p>	No	<p>Noting that criteria 1(f) of Schedule 3 refers to <i>major</i> accidents and/or disasters, given the scale and nature of the project, significant impacts (necessitating EIA) are not anticipated in relation to this criterion, including in relation to climate change. Construction and operation of the development would be required to comply with a range of controls and legislation (including in relation to construction management, pollution control, health and safety, structural soundness and the prevention of crime, anti-social behaviour and terrorism) intended to ensure the safety and wellbeing of staff and visitors, and to ensure the environment is suitably protected.</p> <p>The development could be subject to large numbers of people being present on the site and within its buildings given that an event space, food court, library and museum are planned to be constructed. However, the above-mentioned controls and legislation would adequately reduce risk to those people.</p>	No	N/A.

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))	
		Consideration of air pollution and water contamination is set out elsewhere in this document.		
8. WATER RESOURCES				
8.1 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?	No	The River Colne and Huddersfield Narrow Canal are located over 200m away to the south and east of the development site and they are outside of the notification mapping layer area for EIA Major Scale Development as set out by the Canal and River Trust. The site is also anticipated to be designed to provide a minimum surface water attenuation for a 1 in 100 storm event + 30% for climate change – the development, once constructed, should improve upon the current buildings on the site in relation to flood risk.	No	N/A
9. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
9.1 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	Yes	The site is within a 'Swift Nesting Record' area that covers most of Huddersfield Town Centre. The site record is 'local'. The development site is not within any other sensitive ecological area for flora or fauna given its town centre location. This does not preclude any other protected species being identified. This assessment is based on the information available at the time of analysis.	No	<p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> A detailed nesting bird check would be required in advance of demolition and should be submitted as a part of a planning application submission. The construction of the development would likely require biodiversity enhancements, such as bird boxes and bricks, which could provide on-site habitat for the Swifts.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The development constitutes a significant proportion of area within the town centre however it remains but a small part of the overall geographical area of Huddersfield</p>

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))	
<p>indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local)). And 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?</p>			<p>Town Centre. Consequently, the impact is unlikely to be significant given that the 'swift nesting' designation covers the entirety of Huddersfield Town Centre. Any identified impact is likely to be able to be mitigated and accounted for.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> Probability of a significant adverse effect on the local Swift population is unlikely, though this is subject to further site survey.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The complexity of mitigating effects upon the Swift population is low through the provision of adequate surveys and appropriate bird habitat boxes. The intensity will be subject to the survey results.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The operation of the site would be throughout its lifetime (decades). Enhancements would be for a significant period and would likely aid the protection of the Swift population and any other bird populations nearby that are not yet identified.</p>	

10. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

<p>10.1 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</p>	No	The site is outside of designated areas identified in the Castle Hill Settings Study. Affected Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas are assessed in Section 12.	No	N/A
--	----	--	----	-----

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))	
the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).				
<p>10.2 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?)</p>	Yes	From Queensgate Ring Road, Queen Street, King Street, Victoria Lane, Ramsden Street, Peel Street, Albert Yard, Princess Street and Alfred Street. Also visible in longer views from Castle Hill and other elevated vantagepoints.	No	<p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> The purpose of the development is to regenerate an area of the town centre. The existing buildings on the site are from the 1970s and though the retained market hall is of distinguished architectural merit, the remaining buildings on the site are of (subjectively) low/medium merit. Indeed, the materials used within the majority of the Piazza Centre, though modern at the time of its construction, have not aged well and have proven, over time, to be of poor quality in some instances. The Piazza Centre also has a predominantly retail function within a town centre that has surplus retail floorspace due to changes in shopping habits in recent decades and other buildings of greater heritage/cultural value exist in the town centre which are preferably retained.</p> <p>The proposed development seeks to provide a leisure-based offer that is to integrate more open space into this specific location alongside the provision of a museum, library, event space and food court along with the retention of the existing market hall. The principle alteration in terms of visibility would be from the Ring Road of Huddersfield Town Centre as significant</p>

¹ See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas.

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))
		<p>volumes of vehicle users would pass beside the site. It is likely that pedestrians from King Street, Queen Street, Peel Street, Ramsden Street and Alfred Street would also experience significant view alterations.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The development constitutes a significant proportion of area within the town centre however it remains but a small part of the overall geographical area of Huddersfield Town Centre.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> High probability of alterations to views across the cited highways/vistas that would be visible to many people given the high-density urban location.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The intensity of the impact is likely to be significant at first, but in a positive way as the proposed development seeks to improve the use of the area. The complexity of altering a brownfield site is often significantly higher than that of a greenfield site. However, as no design drawings have been provided, the complexity of the scheme is unknown at the time of this Screening Opinion being produced.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The views of the site would be throughout its lifetime (decades). It would not be possible to reverse the loss of the view of the Piazza Centre</p>

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))
			without significant, and likely, undesirable expense.
11. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY			
<p>11.1 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).</p>	Yes	<p>The development site includes two listed structures (The Huddersfield Library and Art Gallery and the Queensgate Market). Adjacent to the site, running across its western and eastern boundaries, is the Huddersfield Town Centre Conservation Area which includes several nearby listed buildings, the most notable being the Huddersfield Town Hall (II), the Laurence Batley Theatre (II*), Former Crown Court (II), St Paul's Hall (II) and the Ramsden Buildings of Huddersfield University (II).</p>	<p>No</p> <p><u>Magnitude and Nature:</u> The main significant effects would be in respect of the interaction of the proposed development upon the listed buildings on the site in terms of the structural interaction from a design perspective (i.e. would the proposed development necessitate alterations to the listed building). There would be a significant impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings within them, but this would not be of the same magnitude or nature to those within the site's red-line boundary.</p> <p>As the proposed development opens links to the Laurence Batley Theatre and increase footfall to the market and library, there would be some weight given to the increased communal value that the development would provide to these buildings. Visibility and appreciation of this often-overlooked heritage asset would certainly increase.</p> <p>The demolition plans indicate that the listed ceramics that front Queensgate would be retained, and those that are a part of the demolished Piazza centre (particularly the stepped access from Queensgate to Princess Alexandra Walk) would be re-sited.</p>

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))
		<p>The development proposal offers significant opportunities to improve the heritage value of the area, though it also has the potential to do harm if not managed appropriately.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The spatial extent of the effect would be experienced on the site, and from the buildings within the surrounding conservation area.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> The probability of effects on the historic area is high. The probability of a negative significant effect would be subject to the development of the scheme's design and how sympathetic it is to historic assets on and around the site.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The complexity of integrating the development with the heritage assets on and around the site is high. The intensity of the effect is to be most prevalent for the buildings on the site, but there would also be intense (possibly positive) effects for the Laurence Batley Theatre as this is a II* listed building of special interest. Removal of the Piazza centre which faces it would significantly reduce the overbearance of the Theatre from across Queen Street resulting in a significant improvement to the setting of the Theatre – subject to how the subsequent design responds to the opportunity.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. The</p>

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))
		<p>operation of the site would be throughout its lifetime (decades). The long-term effect of the development proposal, though significant, could undoubtedly be positive to the historic and cultural environment on and around the Piazza Centre. Negative effects are also possible, but it is anticipated these would be tempered or mitigated for through controls exercised via the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>Given the above, and in particular the statutory duties placed upon the LPA and the controls available to it in ensuring cultural and heritage assets are protected, significant effects are not anticipated.</p>

12. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS

<p>12.1 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The town centre location of the proposed development means that Princess Alexandra Walk is a main thoroughfare for pedestrians who transit to and from Queensgate between leisure destinations (restaurants, music venues, etc) across the town centre. The layout of Princess Alexandra Walk is likely to be disrupted/altered significantly.</p>	<p>No</p> <p><u>Magnitude & Nature:</u> The cover letter indicates that the proposed development will set out to improve routes and accessibility across the site. Indeed, the existing site lacks permeability for pedestrians, especially across its eastern boundary. Based upon the extent of the demolition plans submitted in support of the Screening request, there is scope for significant alterations to the layout of the site to aid its accessibility and this is likely to be a significant positive effect.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The site is unlikely to alter surrounding vehicular access routes significantly other than those used for entering</p>
--	------------	---	--

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))
		<p>the site for customer/visitor parking. Indeed 500 parking spaces would be retained in some shape or form. Overall, the spatial alterations to the routes within the site would change significantly but those bordering the site such as Queen Street, King Street, Queensgate, Peel Street, Alfred Street and Victoria Lane are unlikely to alter dramatically other than being widened or being subject to secondary routes into the development site.</p> <p><u>Probability:</u> High probability of effects occurring as a result of the development in respect of accessibility, though these are anticipated to be positive.</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The complexity and intensity of the effect would be subject to the design of the proposal, details of which are not provided by the applicant for this Screening Opinion. The demolition plans would indicate that there are opportunities to significantly intensify the complexity of pedestrian routes within and across the site.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years dependent on the development's phasing. During the construction period it is likely that the pedestrian routes would be temporarily blocked off for health and safety purposes. However, the permanent development would likely entail an increased number of routes that traverse the site.</p>

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))	
<p>12.2 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?</p>	Yes	See section 6.4 above.	No	N/A
13. LAND USE				
<p>13.1 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.</p>	Yes	<p>There are a significant number of E class uses surrounding the site. In terms of on-site uses, there are some temporary small art-focused retail units operating across the development site (particularly adjacent to Victoria Lane) alongside independent traders within the market. The site also includes the library's leisure/education function. All the above would be affected to varying degrees dependent on their location within or adjacent to the proposed development during both its construction and on-going operational periods. The area is not densely populated by residents, though this does not preclude conversions taking place prior, during or after development of the site given the change of use allowances.</p>	No	<p>Magnitude & Nature: There will be effects for businesses operating on the site who would need to find alternative premises. It is likely that the Council would attempt to find alternative premises for these businesses during the construction period, and possibly during the operation of the development if no alternative premises are provided in the final design.</p> <p>More holistically, there are a significant number of empty retail units in the Piazza Centre and though there would be an effect upon those businesses, the total number of businesses adversely impacted would be small overall. Indeed, there are a significant number of vacant units across the town centre, potentially in more advantageous locations, that could mitigate for the disruption caused to on-site commercial enterprises.</p> <p>The impact to businesses surrounding the site is identified to be of a magnitude and nature less severe than those on-site. The adjacent land uses are likely to encounter varying levels of disruption during the construction period, but could benefit from increased footfall once the</p>

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))
		<p>development is complete. There may also be some temporary benefits from the construction period for some businesses.</p> <p><u>Spatial extent:</u> The main significant effects of the development's construction period would be felt by existing commercial enterprises on the site, with some overspill to those businesses which face the site, though it is anticipated to be of a less than significant nature for the latter. The on-going effect of the development, once constructed, is likely to be beneficial for on-site and off-site businesses in the immediate area, though this is subject to the formal design and how it manages to incorporate existing on-site businesses (if that is an aim).</p> <p><u>Intensity and complexity:</u> The intensity of the effect for on-site uses would be significant and less intense for off-site businesses. Managing the (potential) on-site relocations would potentially be complex during the construction period, as would the expectations and knock-on impacts of disruption to off-site businesses immediately adjacent. As mentioned in the Spatial section, the design of the scheme is crucial in managing the long-term effects, and it is possible that those effects would be positive dependent on the output of the development's design.</p> <p><u>Expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility:</u> Construction expected within 5 years (approx.), likely lasting 2-3 years</p>

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))	
				dependent on the development's phasing. The views of the site would be throughout its lifetime (decades). The impact upon businesses is not necessarily 'reversible' though the management of local business impacts could be positive if conducted in a coordinated and targeted manner.
13.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	The Huddersfield Blueprint includes the proposed Kingsgate Cinema and Leisure Complex alterations to the adjacent Kingsgate Shopping Centre as well as public realm improvements to King Street, Zetland Street and Cross Church Street – the proposed development which is the subject of this Screening Opinion is understood to be coming forward concurrently with this scheme, and any effect is not likely to be adverse. The various Huddersfield Blueprint schemes are intended to complement each other and would not introduce uses that would then increase a greater risk of significant effects caused at the Piazza site.	No	
14. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
14.1 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	No critical stability or subsidence issues known. The site is in a High-Risk Coal Mining Area designated by the Coal Authority, however the development would be subject to detailed surveying to establish the level of risk from land stability issues that may otherwise be unknown. The site is not susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides or erosion. Climatic extremes are also limited, and the effects of predicted extremes (resulting from climate	No	N/A

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))	
		<p>change) would be addressed through submissions at planning application stage.</p> <p>Two residential planning applications are under consideration, one being for nine dwellings at 14-18 King Street (2021/93374) and another for 31 dwellings at 61-65 New Street (2021/93305 and 93306). These units, should they come forward, are subject to noise assessments and appropriate mitigation coming forward to deal with typical town centre noise levels. Construction effects are not a material planning consideration and the ongoing use of this site is unlikely to cause consistent long term effects other than infrequent events that will take place on the development site that would be managed under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.</p>		

15. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

<p>15.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?</p>	No	<p>The proposal is a part of the wider Huddersfield Blueprint which covers large swathes of Huddersfield Town Centre. It is unknown to what extent the impacts of the development could cumulatively occur alongside other planned development constituted from the Blueprint regeneration plans, however there are no other planning applications in the immediate vicinity that the development could interact with. There is an approved development for Huddersfield University at Southgate under 2021/91544. The application under 2021/91544 is at least 300m distant from the Cultural Heart site and separated by a dense urban area, which includes the Kingsgate Shopping Centre. These and other developments have been considered, however it is not anticipated that</p>	No	N/A
--	----	--	----	-----

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))	
		their cumulative impacts are likely to result in adverse cumulative effects of a significant nature.		
16. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
16.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No	The site is located well away from boundaries shared with adjacent boroughs, counties and nations, and well away from the part of Kirklees that is within the Peak District National Park (and where the Peak District National Park Authority is the local planning authority). Transboundary impacts are therefore not anticipated.	No	N/A



² 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.

17. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Though it has been identified that the proposed development has the potential to create environmental effects in some respects, these are anticipated to be moderate and potentially positive in some areas (i.e. heritage, access and commercial land use) subject to the design of the scheme. The proposed design has not been disclosed to the Local Planning Authority in any form other than the areas of the site to be demolished. Those effects from the site that are adverse/negative are anticipated to be able to be managed through the standard Development Management process under the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Management Procedure Order 2015 (as amended), the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 (as amended), Contaminated Land Regulations 2006 and the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

For the reasons explained in this Screening Opinion assessment, the development is not required to provide an Environmental Statement. This conclusion is contingent on the information submitted for the purpose of this Screening Opinion.

18. SCREENING OPINION DECISION

Is an ES required?	No	
19. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)	OUTCOME	
Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	

20. REASON FOR SCREENING

Planning application received and request for EIA screening received (Pegasus Group letters/emails 23/05/2022 and 04/01/23) and EIA Regulations 2017 – Sch.2 Development – 10. Infrastructure – (b) Urban development projects, (i) the development includes more than one 1 HA of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development.

NAME	<i>David Wordsworth</i> (Team Leader -Majors and Minerals Team)
DATE	04/01/2023