

Enquiries to: Victor Grayson

Tel: 01484 221000 x77803

Email: victor.grayson@kirklees.gov.uk

Matthew Sheppard
Sheppard Planning

(by email)

David Shepherd
Executive Director
Place, Growth and Regeneration

Date: 03/07/2026

Our Ref: 2025/21188

Dear Mr Sheppard,

Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

I acknowledge receipt of your request for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion (your email dated 25/11/2025) in relation to the site at New Mills, Marsden.

The project has the potential to be EIA development, as it is a development which falls under Schedule 2 of the 2017 Regulations. However, having regard to the scale, nature, location and impacts of the proposal, and to other controls and relevant assessment criteria (please see the attached screening matrix), it is considered that the project is unlikely to have significant effects to the extent that they would necessitate EIA pursuant to the 2017 Regulations. I therefore formally confirm that the project is not considered to be EIA development, and that an Environmental Statement would not be required in connection with the project.

Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 018 Reference ID: 4-018-20170728 states that only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require EIA. Indeed, relatively few developments in recent years in Kirklees have required EIA.

The above conclusions are made without prejudice to the council's assessment of the project (or any component of it) under the current planning application 2026/90232 or any other formal regulatory process.

A copy of this Screening Opinion will be placed on Part 1 of the register.

Should you wish to discuss the contents of this letter, or require further information, please contact the case officer Victor Grayson on the number above, or by email.

Yours sincerely,

Victor Grayson

Victor Grayson, Development Management Masterplanner
for Mathias Franklin, Head of Planning and Development

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	2025/21188	Brief description of the project / development	Redevelopment of mill complex of 11,584sqm for mixed use development, including building demolition, site clearance, site remediation works, the removal of buildings and floor slabs to open up the River Colne, repairs to retained buildings, conversion of lower ground floor of western mill to Class E (food and non-food retail, restaurant and cafe), new buildings providing light industrial / R&D uses (limited to Use Classes Eg(ii)(iii)), the alteration and repair of an office building (Use Class Eg(i)), the creation of a new public square and associated hard and soft landscaping, circulation and servicing space, car parking and ancillary structures NOTE: As agreed with the applicant on 11/06/2026, the above description relates to the development proposed under application 2026/90232, and is not the (now-superseded) description included in the applicant's EIA Screening Opinion request letter of 25/11/2025. Of particular note, the development proposed under application 2026/90232 does not include the provision of residential units.
Applicant	Crowther Bruce and Company 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?		Column 1 10. Infrastructure projects (b) Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas Column 2 The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development	
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?		No a) Site of Special Scientific Interest – no b) National Park – no c) The Broads – no d) World Heritage Site – no e) Scheduled Ancient Monument – no f) National Landscape (formerly Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) – no g) European site – no	

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

	The site is within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the IRZ of the Dark Peak SSSI, but is approximately 800m away from the nearest parts of these SSSIs, and the proposed development does not fall under the descriptions/thresholds (of development within IRZs) that necessitate consultation with Natural England. Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that online Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 032 Reference ID: 4-032-20170728 (on the "Environmental Impact Assessment" page) 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. It adds that, in considering the sensitivity of a particular location, regard should also be had to whether any national or internationally-agreed environmental standards (e.g., air quality) are already being approached or exceeded. The nearest Air Quality Management Area to the site is 8 – Outlane, approximately 6km away. The site is within the Marsden Conservation Area, and is within the settings of listed buildings. Parts of the Wildlife Habitat Network exist to the east and south of the site (and, further away, to the north). Bats are known to be present in the area, a twite buffer has been designated, and protected species are understood to be present in the Huddersfield Narrow Canal to the north. The points raised in paragraph 032 are noted, however in this particular case it is considered that the relevant local designations and agreed environmental standards (where applicable to this site) do not necessitate EIA for the project. This is due to the limited extent and nature of the proposed development, and the site's distance from some of the above-listed designations.
If YES, which area?	N/A
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?	Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?	10(b)(i): the development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development. Where a 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 (which, in this case, the project does), the project needs to be screened to determine whether significant effects on the environment are likely and hence whether Environmental Impact Assessment is required.

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

	When screening Schedule 2 projects, the local planning authority must take account of the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the 2017 Regulations. Each case should be considered on its own merits in a balanced way. When issuing its opinion the local planning authority must state the main reasons for the conclusions therein with reference to the relevant criteria listed in Schedule 3. Where it is determined that the proposed development is not Environmental Impact Assessment development, the authority must state any features of the proposed development and measures envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment. For 10(b) projects, the Government's indicative thresholds and criteria (annex at Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 058 Reference ID: 4-058-20150326) states that Environmental Impact Assessment is unlikely to be required for the redevelopment 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. It is considered that such scenarios are not applicable to the proposed development. The impacts of the proposed development are not likely to be markedly different (to those previously caused at the site when it was operational), except perhaps in respects of transport impacts (which can be adequately assessed under application 2026/90232 without the need for EIA). Regarding contamination, although the council's records indicate that the site is potentially contaminated, the Phase 2 Site Investigation report submitted with application 2026/90232 found no elevated levels of contamination, and states that "Given the site's proposed commercial land use, the levels of contamination recorded on site are unlikely to pose a risk to the current and future users of the site".
3. LPA/SOS SCREENING	
Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued)	No
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?	N/A
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?	N/A
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT	
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?	No (in respect of application 2026/90232)

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?	Yes Changes to levels are proposed under application 2026/90232, including as part of the proposed deculverting of the River Colne. The topography of the wider area would not change.	No Changes to levels would be confined to the application site, close to the valley bottom. The visual effects of these changes would be limited by the surrounding topography and existing buildings. These effects are to be considered under application 2026/90232. In relation to topography, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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?	Yes Land, water, materials, minerals and energy would be required to carry out the development. These natural resources are finite and/or may be from non-renewable sources. Energy would be used during the operation of the project.	No The use of natural resources during construction would be limited to an extent, as existing roads and infrastructure would be used. Significant quantities of new material would not need to be used, given the proposed conversion of existing buildings. No agricultural land would be the subject of a change of use. Soil may be imported to enable the creation of soft landscaped areas, however quantities are likely to be limited. The use of natural resources during subsequent use and maintenance is unlikely to be significant due to the scale and nature of the project. Large

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))
		volumes of water would pass through the site, but would not be used by the project, during its operational phase. The use of energy from non-renewable sources is expected to reduce over time as the national grid is decarbonised. The new and converted buildings would be required to meet present-day energy efficiency standards. In relation to natural resources in the area, including soil, minerals, groundwater and natural light, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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?	Yes Development is proposed within an area Where minerals (in this case, sandstone) are safeguarded. No Water Abstraction Licences have been issued by the Environment Agency at locations close to the site. There is no land in use for forestry or agriculture within or close to the site. No significant fish farming currently takes place at the site.	No Given the size, shape, accessibility and context of the affected land, and the presence of heritage assets, it is highly unlikely that mineral resources would ever be extracted from the project site. Furthermore, minerals at this site are not known to be of a particularly high quality, and there are other opportunities for extraction of these minerals within Kirklees. In relation to resources on/around the project site, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
6. WASTE		
6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes The project will generate solid waste as a result of the proposed demolition. The project is otherwise likely to generate wastes typically associated with newbuild and conversion schemes involving employment uses.	No Demolition and construction waste is not expected to be significant to the extent that EIA would be necessary. During the operational phase, the proposed uses are unlikely to produce significant volumes of solid waste. The applicant has stated that the developer will be contractually required to manage any construction related waste in accordance with

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 Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. In relation to solid waste, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES		
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes Regarding contamination, although the council's records indicate that the site is potentially contaminated, and although the applicant has separately stated that the site has elevated levels of PAH (polyaromatic hydrocarbon), TPH (total petroleum hydrocarbon), chromium, zinc and copper, the Phase 2 Site Investigation report submitted with application 2026/90232 found no elevated levels of contamination. The submitted Phase 2 Site Investigation report also notes the presence of asbestos at the site (as found in one sample), although quantities are not confirmed. The report also notes that further asbestos may be present at the site. Construction vehicles and machinery using diesel or petrol would generate emissions at the site. The presence of other pollutants or hazardous, toxic or noxious substances (that could be released to the air) has not been confirmed. Once completed, emissions associated with the development's traffic are expected to decrease over time, as the use of electric vehicles increases.	No The submitted Phase 2 Site Investigation states "Given the site's proposed commercial land use, the levels of contamination recorded on site are unlikely to pose a risk to the current and future users of the site". Any asbestos found at the site would need to be disposed of in compliance with the Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012. Emissions from construction vehicles and machinery are unlikely to be significant or prolonged (to the extent that air quality would be significantly affected). The site is not close to an Air Quality Management Area. Should permission be granted, a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (including provisions regarding emissions) would be imposed. In relation to the release of pollutants, hazardous, toxic or noxious substances, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.

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))
7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes The project is likely to produce noise and vibration during the construction phase. Currently, the site is mostly vacant, and is in darkness. External lighting may be necessary during the construction phase. The project would involve the illumination of parts of the site (in the form of external illumination, and light from windows) during the operational phase. No releases of heat, electromagnetic radiation or other forms of energy are expected during the construction or operational phases.	No Noise and vibration during construction would be temporary and localised. Following completion, noise and vibration generated by vehicles is unlikely to be significantly greater than that generated when the site was previously operational. External lighting would be required to be designed and directed so as to limit environmental effects (affecting wildlife and neighbouring residents, for example). Should permission be granted, a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (including provisions regarding noise and vibration) would be imposed. In relation to noise and vibration and the release of energies, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
7.3 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?	Yes Demolition and deculverting close to and above a watercourse inevitably risks contamination of water. Construction activity could risk adversely affecting surface waters through the accidental release of pollutants from routine runoff and accidental spillage. Regarding the potential contamination of land, although the council's records indicate that the site is potentially contaminated, the Phase 2 Site Investigation report submitted with application 2026/90232 found no elevated levels of contamination.	No Careful demolition and construction management can help ensure contamination of the River Colne is minimised or avoided. Should permission be granted, a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (including provisions regarding dust) would be imposed. A condition regarding temporary drainage (including provisions ensuring contaminated run-off does not enter watercourses) may also be imposed. In relation to risks of contamination of land and water, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.

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))	
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?	Yes	The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report notes that the invasive signal crayfish is present in the River Colne. Although the council's records indicate that the site is potentially contaminated, the Phase 2 Site Investigation report submitted with application 2026/90232 found no elevated levels of contamination. The site is not within or close to an Air Quality Management Area.	No	Measures may need to be implemented during the construction phase to ensure the further spread of signal crayfish is not enabled. In relation to existing pollution and environmental damage, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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?	No	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, and given the absence of hazardous uses, activities or infrastructure at the site or nearby, significant impacts (necessitating EIA) are not anticipated in relation to this criterion, including in relation to climate change. The project will be required to adhere to relevant highway design guidance (and the safety standards therein). Safety risks during construction (including in relation to HGV movements needed to remove demolition waste from the site) would be mitigated through standard health and safety measures.	N/A	
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)	Yes	There are nearby local residents and human receptors in close proximity to the site. Due to the extent of demolition proposed, there is a risk of fugitive dust adversely affecting human health.	No	Should permission be granted, a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan (including provisions regarding dust) would be imposed. Fugitive dust from construction sites is also subject to control under environmental health legislation.

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))
	Due to the scale and nature of the project, it is considered that it would not give rise to other significant impacts (relating to human health and wellbeing) that would necessitate EIA.	Emissions from construction vehicles and machinery is unlikely to be so great as to significantly affect human health. Contamination of the River Colne is unlikely to adversely affect human health via drinking or bathing water. Other risks to human health during construction would be mitigated through standard health and safety measures. In relation to risks to the population and human health, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.

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?	Yes	The River Colne runs through the site, and beneath some of the site's existing buildings. A further, culverted watercourse runs beneath the site, close to its eastern edge. Reshaping of the river corridor (following the proposed deculverting) could affect river flows and capacity. Demolition debris falling into the river channel could block river flows, reduce river channel capacity and increase flood risk.	No	Deculverting of rivers can help to reduce flood risk. The application and deculverting would be informed by appropriate assessment (Flood Risk Assessment) at application stage, and would be subject to scrutiny by the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, with any necessary mitigations securable via planning condition. Demolition would need to be carried out carefully to avoid debris falling into the river channel. Arrangements for the prompt removal of fallen debris would need to be devised. The project includes the provision of a surface water attenuation tank within the site. Impermeable surfaces would be reduced across the site through the provision of soft landscaped areas. This may result in flood risk being reduced.
---	-----	---	----	---

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))
		In relation to risks to water resources, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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).	Yes The site is within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the South Pennine Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the IRZ of the Dark Peak SSSI. Parts of the Wildlife Habitat Network exist to the east and south of the site (and, further away, to the north). A twite buffer has been designated, covering a wide area that includes the site.	No The site is approximately 800m away from the nearest parts of the SSSIs (and the related Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas), and the project does not fall under the descriptions/thresholds (of development within IRZs) that necessitate consultation with Natural England. Ecological effects are to be thoroughly assessed under application 2026/90232. Should permission be granted, ecological enhancements would be secured at the site. In relation to areas of ecological importance and sensitivity, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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?	Yes Bats are known to be present in the area, and protected species (white clawed crayfish and floating water plantain) are understood to be present in the Huddersfield Narrow Canal to the north.	No The site is at a lower level than the Huddersfield Narrow Canal, which limits potential for direct impacts. Downstream effects (caused by contamination of the River Colne, which runs alongside the canal) would be limited by effective demolition and construction management. A Bat Survey Report has been submitted with application 2026/90232. This states that the proposed demolition and refurbishment works would result in the loss of a minimum of up to seven separate bat roosts, and recognises that a European Protected Species License would be required in order to lawfully mitigate and

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))
		compensate for the loss of the roosts and to mitigate potential impacts on bats in the wider area. Other ecological effects are likely to be limited, and impacts would be mitigated through careful design and implementation of the project. In relation to risks to protected, important and sensitive species, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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).	Yes Although not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty / National Landscape or a National Park, the site is visible from the Peak District National Park (at Shooters Nab, for example) and from the Green Belt. The site is highly visible from public vantagepoints, and Marsden is located within an area with relatively high landscape and scenic value. There are no other areas or features at or around the site which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, nor are there any other non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value that could be affected by the project.	No The proposed demolition could, in some respects, positively change the effect the site currently has on the surrounding landscape. In other respects, the proposed surface-level parking areas and newbuild elements could create negative or different effects, if not carefully designed and/or mitigated. The completed project would, however, be seen (from the National Park and from the Green Belt) within the context of the surrounding built-up centre of Marsden. Fully rendered images of the project have been submitted with application 2026/90232. In relation to areas of landscape and scenic value, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
11.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to	Yes The site is immediately surrounded by streets that are accessible to the public, and from	No Users of the surrounding access land and public rights of way would not be significantly affected

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))
many people? (if so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)	streets further away within Marsden. The site is also highly visible in longer views from public rights of way and access land to the north, south and west.	by the project to the extent EIA would be necessary. Impacts upon nearer receptors (including adjacent residents/occupants, and users of the streets surrounding the site) can be adequately assessed under application 2026/90232 without the need for EIA.
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).	Yes No buildings within the site are listed. The nearest listed buildings are the Grade II listed tenter posts to the north of the site (on the opposite side of Crowther Bruce Mill Road) and the Marsden Mechanics Institute. The site is entirely within the Marsden Conservation Area. No archaeological sites are designated within or close to the site. The applicant has stated that the extent of modern disturbance at the site suggests that any remains would be severely truncated or destroyed. There are buildings within and surrounding that are non-designated heritage assets.	No Some effects are possible in relation to the identified heritage assets. Harm to, and loss of, some heritage assets would occur as part of the project. For other heritage assets, their settings, visibility and appreciation may be improved. However, these effects can be adequately assessed under application 2026/90232 without the need for EIA. In relation to cultural heritage and archaeology, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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 site is surrounded by streets that are used by the public to access recreation and other facilities including schools and the retail and community uses within the Marsden District Centre. In the surrounding area, public rights of way, and the towpath of the Huddersfield Narrow Canal, are well-used recreational routes.	No Public access to surrounding streets may need to be partly and temporarily restricted while works take place, however no significant permanent restrictions (such as stopping up of the full width of a highway) are anticipated. In relation to public access to routes and land, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.

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))
		There are no publicly-accessible routes through the site.	
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?	Yes	Due to on-street parking, opportunities for two-way traffic to pass on Brougham Road are limited, and this can result in congestion. Other streets surround the site and nearby are susceptible to temporary congestion, due to inadequate turning space. Large vehicles, waste collection, and school-related traffic can contribute to these existing problems.	No Although the project would result in an increase in vehicle movements to/from the site (when compared with the current situation, where the site is mostly vacant), measures (such as making the west section of Brougham Road one-way) are intended to improve movement, which in turn may result in less congestion. These and other effects related to congestion and transport-related environmental problems can be adequately assessed under application 2026/90232 without the need for EIA. In relation to transport and access matters, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
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.	Yes	The site is within relatively close proximity to residential properties, commercial properties, a school, and a community/recreation facility. Marsden District Centre is immediately to the west of the site.	No The project's effects upon nearby residential properties and the nearby school would be limited and mitigated through effective construction management practices, and controlled under environmental health legislation. Should permission be granted, a condition securing a Construction Environmental Management Plan would be imposed. Further away from the site, commercial properties and a nearby community/recreation facility are not expected to experience significant effects during construction. During the operational phase, no significant negative effects (upon existing uses and

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))
		facilities) are expected. Some positive effects are likely. In relation to existing uses, the project would not give rise to significant effects that would necessitate EIA.
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No No future land uses (that could be affected by the project) are proposed for the site. In the surrounding area, improvements and major projects are proposed as part of the Marsden Blueprint, however these are intended to complement the redevelopment of the site, and do not involve new land uses on a major scale. Development proposals are currently no being progressed at potential development land to the south and northeast of the site.	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 land is not known to be unstable or susceptible to subsidence. The site is not known to be susceptible to unusually extreme/adverse climatic conditions which could cause the project to present environmental problems.	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 No other existing and/or approved developments, together with the project now proposed, would result in a cumulation of impacts to the extent that significant effects would occur and EIA would be necessary. The Transpennine Route Upgrade is currently under way, and affects railway lines and a	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))
	railway station (Marsden) to the north of the site, however these works – when completed – are expected to complement the project. Appropriate co-ordination measures may need to be implemented if works overlap with those of the project.	
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS		
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No The project is located well away from local authority boundaries and from West Yorkshire's border with Greater Manchester, however 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) is only 880m away from the site. It is, however, understood that references to "transboundary effects" in EIA legislation are in fact more related to state / international boundaries. The proposed project is located well away from any such boundaries. Given the size, nature and location of the project, its impacts are not expected to be transboundary at borough, regional or other level to the extent that EIA would be necessary.	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.

18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 018 Reference ID: 4-018-20170728 states that only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require EIA. Indeed, relatively few developments in recent years in Kirklees have required EIA.

Although it has been identified that the project has the potential to create environmental effects in some respects, these are anticipated to be moderate and potentially positive in some areas, subject to the design of the scheme. Those effects from the site that could potentially be adverse/negative can be managed through the development management process and other legislation.

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 and under application 2026/90232.

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



Not likely to have significant effects on the environment

ES not required



More information is required to inform direction

Request further info



21. REASON FOR SCREENING

Request received (letter from Sheppard Planning, CROW0001, 25/11/2025).

NAME

Victor Grayson, Development Management Masterplanner, Kirklees Council

DATE

03/07/2026