

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX**

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	2025/92867	Brief description of the project / development	Variation of conditions 2 (plans), 8 (car park works), 35 (HGV access), 36 (site access gates) of previous permission 2018/91605 for variation of conditions 2 and 27 of previous permission 2012/90558 for variation of conditions 24 and 29 (D) of previous permission 2006/92787 for variation of condition 2 relating to IDO permission 426A in order to allow changes, (movement of the access from the north to the south, adding a temporary landscaped soil bund and substituting clock paving within car park with aggregate base) to the approved phasing scheme.
Applicant	Marshalls Mono Ltd		
LPA	Kirklees Council		
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)	N/A		
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?	Yes		
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?	<p>Column 1 2 Extractive industry (a) Quarries, open cast mining and peat extraction (unless included in Schedule 1)</p> <p>Column 2 All development except the construction of buildings or other ancillary structures where the new floorspace does not exceed 1,000 square metres.</p>		
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?	The site does not fall within or near a sensitive area		
If YES, which area?	N/A		
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?	N/A		
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?	N/A		
3. LPA/SOS SCREENING			
Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)?	Yes		
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?	Yes on 2018/91605		
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?	It was concluded that an EIA was not required		

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS
2017 SCREENING MATRIX**

4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT	
Has the applicant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?	No

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.
--------------------------------------	--	--

5. NATURAL RESOURCES

5.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	No	<p>The minor relocation of the track and the formation of a short soil bund would be entirely within the already engineered restored area of the site. The surrounding landform, shaped by historic extraction, would remain unchanged.</p> <p>No gradients, contours, void margins, or engineered slopes are to be modified. The temporary bund would not interact nor form part of any stabilising feature and given that is to be removed on complete restoration of the site, there would be no changes to the topography of the area.</p>	N/A	
5.2 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?	No	<p>Resource use would be limited to small quantities of aggregate surfacing and redistribution of soils already on site.</p> <p>No new mineral extraction, water abstraction, or material importation would be required. The scale of resource consumption would be insignificant relative to previous site activity and would have a neutral impact on the supply of non renewable resources.</p>	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))	
5.3 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	The site's underlying mineral resource has previously been extracted from this part of the site. No further extraction or subsoil disturbance is proposed in this part of the site.	N/A	
6. WASTE				
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	No	The amendments would not produce wastes as the restoration for this part of the site has been carried out and the variations proposed are minimal.	N/A	
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	No	No new activities capable of generating dust or air emissions would be introduced. Track movement and aggregate placement would occur at low intensity and within existing dust-controlled areas. Existing dust suppression requirements in the extant permission continue to regulate all airborne effects. The risk of fugitive dust release remains negligible.	N/A	
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	No	No additional plant, extension of hours, or increased activity frequency is proposed. Existing attenuation from the quarry void and bunding would remain effective. Sensitive receptors at Carr Lane and Lane Head Road would retain the same separation and acoustic shielding as before. Vibration would be negligible due to the absence of excavation or heavy compaction.	N/A	
7.3 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or	No	No excavation of the previously restored ground is proposed within this part of the site. The works would take place on restored surfaces	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))	
into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?		well above groundwater. Existing drainage and sediment controls would remain unchanged, eliminating any pathway for contamination of soil, surface waters or groundwater.		
7.4 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?	No	There are no known contaminated land parcels within or adjacent to the phase 1 restoration area. There are no areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage which could be affected by the project.	N/A	
8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
8.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?	Yes	It is impossible to rule out the risk of major accidents during the development. However, the proposals are low-hazard works and would be confined within an enclosed, controlled site operating under established management protocols. No hazardous substances, deep excavations, unstable landforms, or high-risk operations are to be introduced. Public access would be excluded, and traffic levels would remain unchanged, resulting in no increased accident risk. Any accidents associated with this proposal are likely to occur on site during the carrying out of works/operations.	No	Health and safety risks are managed under separate complementary systems of regulation. Subject to adherence to any relevant health and safety requirements there is not considered to be any reason to believe that the development would pose any significant risk of causing, or being affected by, any major accidents to the extent that a significant effect upon the environment would apply and would necessitate EIA.
8.2 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)	No	Subject to adherence to all relevant conditions it is not considered that the project would present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning. Residents would remain sufficiently separated from the restoration platform, and all operational controls from the	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))	
		main permission would continue to apply. Human health risks are negligible.		
9. WATER RESOURCES				
9.1 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 wider site includes two open surface water areas. The variations proposed would not involve works near these areas nor involve any modification to drainage ditches, attenuation lagoons, or sedimentation ponds. No excavation below the restored surface is proposed and no new impermeable areas would be created. There is unlikely to be any risk to the two surface water areas within the site or flood risks in the area.	N/A	
10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
10.1 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 indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local))).	No	The site falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the Dark Peak site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), which lies southwest of the site. The Dark Peak is a nationally important site. However, as the proposed works would occur solely on previously disturbed ground without extending into woodland edges, hedgerows, or any feature identified as ecologically sensitive. No effects on designated sites would arise.	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))	
10.2 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?	No	The restoration platform provides little habitat structure and limited ecological value, as confirmed by the baseline ecological assessments. No vegetation or habitat with suitability for protected species would be removed. No disruption of flightlines, foraging areas or nesting locations would occur. Disturbance risk would be negligible.	No	
11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL				
11.1 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 the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	There are no 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, that could be affected by the project.	N/A	
11.2 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?)	Yes	The site itself and the surrounding area is Green Belt, in a location which is highly visible to a large number of people immediately surrounding the site from the south and west. The site is on high ground, the workings are not prominent within the local landscape and the site is not easily overlooked from the surrounding countryside and distant vantage points. The variations proposed would not alter the visual character, and the site would retain	No	The scale and the scope of the visual impact would be relatively localised and contained within the envelope of the site, where the visual and landscape impacts would be reduced by the perimeter landscaping. It is therefore considered the potential magnitude of the landscape and visual effects associated with the development would not necessitate EIA.

¹ See question 12.1 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))	
		its character which reflects that of the surrounding landscape.		
12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
12.1 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).	No	There are no 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 proposals.	N/A	
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
13.1 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?	Yes	The internal track works would not affect any public rights of way, permissive routes or informal access corridors. Public access to the recreational pitch (which forms part of the phase 1 restoration) would remain physically separated from the remainder of the operational working site. No diversions, closures or safety risks would be introduced.	No	The proposal are unlikely to affect existing routes / areas used for recreation and would not create significant vehicular traffic. Existing access to the remainder of the operational working site would be used without the need for new access routes to be created. EIA would not be necessary in relation to this criteria question.
13.2 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?	No	As 13.1 (B and C) above. Adverse impacts are not anticipated from the proposals.	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))	
14. LAND USE				
14.1 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.	No	Neighbouring land uses, including residential properties, farmland and woodland would not be affected by the variations proposed, due to their scale and the site being largely surrounded by landscaping to all sides.	N/A	
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	The amendments would not interfere with any allocated uses or Local Plan designations. The end state restoration landform and after-use would remain unchanged. Long-term land use planning objectives would be unaffected	N/A	
15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
15.1 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	The site is largely within a low risk area as defined by the Mining Remediation Authority. The site and its surroundings is not known to be unstable or susceptible to subsidence.	N/A	
16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
16.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No	The variations proposed are minimal. Restoration of the wider site would continue to progress, reducing the scale of disturbed land over time. The variations proposed would not overlap temporarily or spatially with other developments in a way that could amplify environmental effects, nor would the proposals create cumulative impacts necessitating EIA.	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))	
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No	The site is not close to any boundaries of other local authorities or national boundaries. Due to the scale and nature of the variations proposed, there are unlikely to be any environmental effects which would extend beyond the local level.	N/A	

² The Regulations require consideration of the transboundary nature of the impact. Due to England's geographical location the vast majority of TCPA cases are unlikely to result in transboundary impacts.

18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Planning Practice Guidance states that only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require EIA.

The variations proposed (to a previously-approved restoration phase of this site) are minimal, and would not alter traffic movements, or create additional noise, dust and environmental impacts over and above what was approved under the extant permission. Having regard to the above, the location of the site, and the previous EIA screening, it is considered that the associated environmental impacts likely to result from the current proposal would be of minimal local significance only. Therefore, the proposed development would not have significant effects to the extent that they would necessitate EIA pursuant to the 2017 Regulations (as amended).

For the reasons explained in this Screening Opinion, the council formally confirms that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in respect of the above proposals, and an Environmental Statement does not need to be submitted.

Footnote – Storage Building Requiring Separate Planning Permission

For clarity, the storage building shown to be included in the variations proposed does not form part of the assessment that informed this Screening Opinion. This structure is development that requires separate planning permission in its own right, as it does not fall within the operational parameters of mineral extraction or the restoration operations assessed under this screening or the previous extant planning permission. The provision of such a building/structure must be the subject of a standalone planning application.

19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	N/A
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	No
Is an ES required?	No

20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)

	OUTCOME	
Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	X
Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	✓
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	X

21. REASON FOR SCREENING

To accord with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

NAME	Farzana Tabasum, Senior Planner, Kirklees Council
DATE	27/11/2025