

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

<b>CASE DETAILS</b>			
<b>Case Reference</b>	21/00681/SCREEN	<b>Brief description of the project / development</b>	SCREENING OPINION - Proposed Construction of a crematorium and associated service and administration building, function building, memorial garden, natural burial areas, pet cemetery, car parking, new vehicular access from the A142 to the north of the site and landscaping
<b>Applicant</b>	East Cambs Trading Co Ltd		
<b>LPA</b>	East Cambridgeshire District Council		
<b>EIA DETAILS</b>			
<b>Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations?</b>		NO	
<b>If YES, which description of development (THEN GO TO Q4)</b>			
<b>Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?</b>		YES	
<b>If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?</b>		10B	
<b>Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?</b>		YES	
<b>If YES, which area?</b>		MEPAL GRAVEL PITS CWS OUSE WASHES SSSI OUSE WASHES SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION OUSE WASHES SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA OUSE WASHES RAMSAR SITE	
<b>Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?</b>		YES	
<b>If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?</b>		SITE EXCEEDS 5 HECTARES	
<b>LPA/SOS SCREENING</b>			
<b>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)</b>		NO	
<b>If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?</b>		N/A	
<b>If yes, is the SO/SD positive?</b>		NA	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT</b>			
<b>Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?</b>		NA	

**WHEN COMPLETING THIS DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO AN ENFORCEMENT APPEAL, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICER HAS HAD REGARD TO THE PROJECT AS ALLEGED IN THE RELEVANT ENFORCEMENT NOTICE WHEN REFERRING TO THE PROJECT / DEVELOPMENT.**

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
	Briefly explain answer to Part 2a and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature and proximity to site <b>(If answer in Part 2a / 2b is 'No', the answer to Part 3a / 3b is 'N/A')</b>		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 <b>reliant on specific features or measures</b> of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment <b>these should be identified in bold.</b>	
<b>1. NATURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<b>1.1</b> Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	NO		N/A	
<b>1.2</b> 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	Use of materials during construction and energy demands during construction and operation.	NO	No Significant effect. The size of the development is not significant enough to warrant an environmental statement
<b>1.3</b> Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, <b>high quality or scarce resources</b> which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	YES	Records indicate that the proposed site contains a waterbody which is the result of quarrying prior to the introduction of planning permission.  The site is located within the Minerals Consultation Area (MCA) for a nearby quarry called Mepal Reservoirs, also known as Sutton Gault (M9W). In addition part of the site is located in a Waste Consultation Area (WCA) for	NO	No significant effect. The proposed use as a crematorium is unlikely to prejudice existing or future planned minerals and waste management operations which can be further assessed when further details are submitted to indicate how the proposal complies with CS27.  The MWPA, as part of any future planning application, would be consulted, which would include information on the identification, assessment and

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
		<p>the Block Fen/Langwood Fen Quarry.</p> <p>The Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) have commented they have no view to make on the proposed scheme. However, for information purposes, the haul road to the Mepal Reservoirs (Sutton Gault) development runs alongside the southern boundary of the proposed site. The current permission(E/3004/18/CM) requires mineral extraction to cease by 31/12/24. It allows up to 120 HGV movements per day (Monday to Friday) and 60 per day on Saturday mornings. A current application (CCC/20/052/FUL) for an additional reservoir at Mepal Reservoirs would, if approved, result in another 7 years of mineral traffic at the same rate.</p> <p>The Block Fen / Langwood Fen Quarry is comprised of a number of quarries run by three different operators all accessed via Block Fen Drove. Of relevance to this proposal is the Tarmac quarry permitted under F/02006/11/CM and the associated allocation as identified in the MWCS.</p>		<p>address of any potential effects arising from both the proposal and the minerals and waste operations.</p>
<b>2. WASTE</b>				
<p><b>2.1</b> Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Waste materials during decommissioning of existing buildings/construction and waste/recycling during operation.</p> <p>The facility will be used for the incineration of bodies, natural burials and pet burials.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Not significant effect as short term during construction and minor during operation, due to the size of the development.</p> <p>There may be a small amount of residual waste that cannot be reduced to ash or decomposition i.e. dental work or metal screws, however, these</p>

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				are considered minor in nature.
<b>3 .POLLUTION AND NUISANCES</b>				
<b>3.1</b> Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	<p>The incineration process will result in emissions to air.</p> <p>There would also be emissions from vehicles servicing the proposed crematorium and recreational uses.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proposed facility would accommodate five services per day with an allowance for 15 vehicle arrivals per service on average.</p>	NO	<p>Not significant. The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. The emissions must meet Government (DEFRA) standards in order for an Environmental Permit to be granted. An Air Quality Assessment would be required which would assess the air quality effect of the construction and operational phases with any required mitigation. The emissions from the process would be required to be filtered through specially designed filters to remove pollutants and would be virtually invisible and odourless following this filtration process.</p> <p>The Council’s Environmental Health Department have raised no concerns at this stage.</p> <p>The existing use as an Outdoor Centre generated 55 vehicular trips per day. The proposed use would generate additional vehicular trips although not in significant numbers to warrant an Environmental Statement.</p>
<b>3.2</b> Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	YES	<p>The site is directly adjacent to the A142 to the east and an anaerobic digester directly adjoining the site to the north.</p> <p>There would be noise and vibration during the demolition and construction phases and noise and light during the operational phase.</p>	NO	<p>Not significant. The site lies outside of the settlement boundaries of Sutton and Mepal which is 3km away from the site.</p> <p>A Noise Impact Assessment would be required which would assess any noise effects of the construction and operational phases with proposed mitigation. Mitigation in the form of a</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>Construction Environmental Management Plan can include measures relating to machinery causing vibration during the demolition and construction phases.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the use would be inherently noisy to warrant an Environmental Statement and any lighting can be controlled by condition.</p>
<b>3.3</b> 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	<p>This is previously developed land.</p> <p>The proposal should not lead to risks of contamination of land or water from pollutants.</p>	NO	<p>The development would be subject to conditions controlling contamination and remediation of soils.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue is very unlikely to be significant.</p>
<b>3.4</b> 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	No known areas of environmental damage.	N/A	
<b>4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>				
<b>4.1</b> 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	<p>Provided good health and safety practices are carried out then the risk should be very minor.</p> <p>The site is located away from any major densely populated settlements with the closest village of Mepal approximately 3km from the site.</p>	No	<p>Not significant if suitable health and safety measures are used.</p> <p>It is not anticipated during operation there would be risk to human health to warrant an ES.</p>
<b>4.2</b> Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human	NO	Provided health and safety practices are carried out then the risk should be very minor.	No	Not significant. An Air Quality Assessment would be submitted with the application.

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution)		The site is located away from any major densely populated settlements with the closest village of Mepal approximately 3km from the site.		It is not anticipated during operation there would be risk to human health to warrant an ES.
<b>5. WATER RESOURCES</b>				
<b>5.1</b> 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	<p>The site is located within Flood Zone 3a within an area protected by flood defences. An additional lake and drainage ditches lie within 500m to the west of the site on the other side of the A142.</p> <p>The Sutton and Mepal IDB have been consulted but no comments have been received.</p> <p>A disused quarry within the site has been converted for use as an outdoor water sports venue. However, this use has since ceased.</p>	NO	Not significant. The proposed use can be classified as a less vulnerable use and the Lead Local Flood Authority are satisfied that a suitably detailed Flood Risk Assessment containing mitigation plans as well as a detailed surface water drainage strategy would be able to mitigate the environmental impacts of the development without the need for an Environmental Statement.
<b>6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)</b>				
<b>6.1</b> 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	YES	<p>The following protected areas are located on and around the site:</p> <p>Mepal Gravel Pits CWS</p> <p>Ouse Washes SSSI (within 2km)</p> <p>Ouse Washes special area of conservation</p> <p>Ouse Washes special protection area</p> <p>Ouse Washes RAMSAR site</p>	NO	<p>Not significant.</p> <p>There would be increased emissions from the crematorium and associated vehicular trips made by visitors. However, the Wildlife Trust have reviewed the Air Quality Assessment and agrees with the findings of the report that the proposal would have negligible impacts on the Ouse Washes.</p> <p>The direct impacts to the Ouse Washes are</p>

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)
<p>coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, undesignated nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local)).</p>			<p>disturbance to overwintering and breeding birds utilising the lake.</p> <p>Winter bird surveys have been undertaken concluding the likely absence of notable species utilising the site and as such does not meet the 'Site of Biological Importance' criteria.</p> <p>Sufficient information on the potential impacts of the proposal on the designated sites/areas and protected species would need to be submitted with an application.</p> <p>Natural England have commented on the additional information submitted that the impacts are unlikely to be significant and as such an EIA would not be required. NE advises that sufficient information on potential impact should be submitted with any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>The Wildlife Trust has considered the submitted material and commented that this provides the evidence to rule out impacts of the Ouse Washes and that they agree with the conclusion of the report that an EIA would not be required on this basis.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to submit a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Ecological Impact Assessment and a Biodiversity Audit Survey and Management Plan.</p> <p>Mitigation measures may also be required to offset recreational use.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>In view of the fact that only a small percentage of the overall site would be affected by this scheme, and this land is already built on then the impacts would not be significant to warrant an ES.</p>
<p><b>6.2</b> 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>YES</p>	<p>Mepal Gravel Pits CWS  Ouse Washes SSSI  Ouse Washes special area of conservation  Ouse Washes special protection area  Ouse Washes RAMSAR site</p> <p>Habitats are considered to be of moderate to high ecological value and the presence of protected species has moderate to high potential.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>Not significant. The screening submission has informed this judgement. As the area within the site which is to be developed is already development land, it is agreed that the habitats to be lost as a consequence of the proposed development ie hardstanding, buildings and ephemeral vegetation are of negligible ecological importance.</p> <p>Vandalism at the site has reduced the potential for nesting birds and buildings.</p> <p>Eleven trees and five outbuildings ranged from low to moderate potential for roosting bats whilst habitats on site provide good foraging and traversing grounds for bats.</p> <p>The development design can include specific mitigation such as sensitive lighting and further biodiverse planting.</p> <p>Site design and SUDS would also contribute to mitigations, habitat enhancements and creations.</p> <p>Ecology surveys would accompany the planning application with additional surveys for a number of protected species. Mitigation measures and precautionary methods can be controlled by</p>



Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>Condition.</p> <p>Natural England requests that the developer must also provide information supporting this application sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected and, if they are, whether sufficient mitigation, avoidance or compensation measures will be put in place.</p> <p>Whilst there would be some impacts, on the basis of the information submitted, these are not considered significant to warrant an ES.</p>
<b>7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>				
<p><b>7.1</b> 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?<sup>1</sup> Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).</p>	NO	Not located with any AONB or local landscape designation.	NO	<p>No likely impacts based on the information submitted with the Screening Opinion. Further details would be required on the scale of the buildings proposed. The developer to provide information supporting the application in the form of an LVIA.</p> <p>The overall effect on long distance views would be lessened by the existing boundary treatment and topography of the site.</p> <p>An Environmental Statement is therefore not required.</p>
<p><b>7.2</b> 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	<p>The site lies behind mature hedgerow on the A142.</p> <p>There is a PROW to the west of the site</p>	NO	No significant impacts to warrant an Environmental Statement

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

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
<b>8. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY</b>				
<b>8.1</b> 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	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team have commented that to the west of the site is the nationally important 'Neolithic enclosures at Greys Farm' and a Scheduled Monument in the form of Bowl barrow of Horseley Fen Farm.</p> <p>Further non-designated heritage assets are within the vicinity including enclosures, linear features and barrows as well as ring ditches and further evidence of Bronze Age activity.</p>	NO	<p>Not significant as according to the County Council the vast majority of the site has historically been quarried for aggregate extraction resulting in the destruction of archaeological features and deposits. As such detailed consideration of the impact of the proposals on undesignated historic environmental assets need not form a required component of any EIA.</p> <p>Archaeological interest can be duly considered before submission and within the application without the need of an Environmental Statement.</p>
<b>9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS</b>				
<b>9.1</b> 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	PROW to the west of the site and the A142 located to the east of the site. These could be affected during the demolition and construction phases.	NO	Not significant. The retention and enhancement of landscape features would retain their setting. The County Asset Information Definitive Map Officer has been consulted and they have commented that it is their usual practice not to respond to Screening Opinions.
<b>9.2</b> 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	A142	NO	<p>Not significant. During demolition and construction which are only for a temporary period, mitigation measures can be put in place to limit the volume of traffic at certain times.</p> <p>During operation, the use would be operating outside of peak periods.</p> <p>A new entrance is proposed for the continued recreational use.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
				<p>The site is on a bus route.</p> <p>As this is a site previously operating in a recreational use, then historically there have been vehicular movements to and from the site. Proposed vehicular trips have been forecast and the impact assessed within the Transport Statement. The Highways Authority have no comments to make. Based on the above and the information submitted it is not considered to be significant to warrant an ES.</p>
<b>10. LAND USE</b>				
<p><b>10.1</b> 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>The site has an unallocated land use in the Proposal Map of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015.</p> <p>The last recorded use for the site was as an outdoor activity centre.</p> <p>Pretoria Energy is located to the north-west of the site.</p> <p>There are no immediate adjoining residential uses although pockets of commercial and residential uses lie to the south and east of the site.</p>	NO	<p>Not significant. Based on the information to hand there are not considered to be any significant effects worthy of an ES.</p>
<p><b>10.2</b> Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?</p>	NO		N/A	

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
<b>11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE</b>				
<b>11.1</b> 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		N/A	
<b>12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>				
<b>12.1</b> Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	NO	<p>The site has been vacant and all structures to be removed and the land levelled. It is surrounded by farmland with the closest settlement of Mepal located approximately 3km away.</p> <p>19/01707/OUM Land Adjacent 43 Mepal Road Sutton. Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 173 dwellings and provision of land for community facilities (sports pitches and burial ground), including access (not internal roads), open space, sustainable urban drainage systems and associated landscaping. All matters reserved apart from access. The scheme has a recommendation to approve.</p> <p>A current application (CCC/20/052/FUL) for an additional reservoir at Mepal Reservoirs would, if approved, result in another 7 years of mineral traffic at the same rate.</p>	NO	No significant effect such that an ES is required.

Question	<b>(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)		<b>(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a Significant Effect Likely?</b> (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
<b>13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS</b>				
<b>13.1</b> Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? <sup>2</sup>	?	Fenland District Council have not raised any concerns or drawn any matters to the attention of the Local Planning Authority.	N/A	

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3**

--

**6. SCREENING DECISION**

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

**7. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)**

	<b>OUTCOME</b>	
<b>Is likely to have significant effects on the environment</b>	ES required	
<b>Not likely to have significant effects on the environment</b>	ES not required	ES not required
<b>More information is required to inform direction</b>	Request further info	

<b>NAME</b>	Anne James
<b>DATE</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> August 2021

<b>NAME</b>	Rebecca Saunt
<b>JOB TITLE</b>	Planning Manager
<b>DATE</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> August 2021