



**Renfrewshire
Council**

Your Ref:

My Ref:

Contact: Katrine Dean

Telephone: 0141 618 7886

Fax: 0141 618 7935

Date: 15/11/2013

MEPC Hillington GP Ltd

The Hub
3 Earl Haig Road
Hillington Park
Glasgow
G52 4JU

Proposal: Screening opinion in respect of establishing a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ)

Location: Hillington Park, Glasgow

Application No. 13/0753/EO

Dear Sir/Madam

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT NOT REQUIRED

I refer to your request for a screening opinion received on 31/10/2013. I have examined your proposal and consider that it is unlikely to have significant environmental effects within the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (Scotland) Regulations 2011. Hence, it is determined that an environmental assessment is not required to accompany a planning application in respect of the above proposal.

I have attached for your information, a copy of the Screening Opinion.

Yours faithfully


Fraser Carlin

Head of Planning and Development



**Renfrewshire
Council**

SCREENING OPINION
In respect of

Planning Reference No: 13/0753/EO

Applicant: MEPC Hillington GP Ltd

Agent: Terence O'Rourke Limited

PROPOSAL

1. The proposal relates to the making of a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) Scheme at Hillington Park Industrial Estate.

BACKGROUND

2. The applicant and majority land owner at Hillington, MEPC, have submitted a formal request to Renfrewshire Council and Glasgow City Council on 28/10/2013 to prepare a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) Scheme at Hillington Park Industrial Estate. A screening opinion is sought by MEPC to determine whether an EIA would be required for this proposal. If granted the SPZ would be valid for 10 years and would include a series of development parameters and planning conditions.
- 2.1 There have been two previous screening requests submitted at Hillington Park (Renfrewshire) the details of which are as set out below:
 - 11/0734/EO – following a request for a screening opinion, for the demolition of 4 industrial buildings at Pegasus Business Park, it was decided on 17/11/2011 that an EIA was not required.
 - 09/0477/EO – a request for a screening opinion for the erection of a wind turbine at 1 Jubilee Court was registered on 09/07/2009. It was deemed on 11/09/2009 that an EIA was not required.
- 2.2 The applicant has submitted background information, including a site description, the general parameters of the proposed scheme; a location plan outlining the extent of the proposed SPZ boundary in relation to the surrounding areas; and a screening report. Draft technical information, including a draft transport assessment, has also been submitted for assessment prior to the submission of the formal request.
- 2.3 There are no national or international ecological, landscape or heritage designations affecting the industrial estate.
- 2.4 The industrial estate is of an urbanised character and covers approximately 199ha. It is situated to the south of Renfrew, to the east of Paisley and to the west of Glasgow. The estate is accessible by Junction 26 of the M8 at the north and two railway stations – Hillington East and Hillington West at the southern part of the site. Hillington Road (A736) bisects the estate, providing access from north to south.
- 2.5 Around two thirds of the Industrial Park falls within the administrative boundary of Renfrewshire, with the eastern third located within Glasgow City. The site is an existing industrial estate, comprising over 200 buildings, with mainly office, distribution,

warehousing, light manufacturing, commercial and trade uses occupying a total floor-space of around 432,005m².

EIA ASSESSMENT

3. The screening relates to a Simplified Planning Zone Scheme (13/0754/SZ), which is currently being considered by the Planning Authority. The Planning and Property Policy Board at its meeting on 12 November, 2013 agreed to a request that such a Scheme be progressed.

Is it Schedule 1 (Sch.1) development, for which an EIA is always required?

4. The proposal does not meet any of the descriptions of development for which an EIA is always required.

Is it Schedule 2 (Sch.2) development?

Schedule 2 development is development of a type listed in Column 1 of Schedule 2 which:

- a) *Is located wholly or in part in a 'sensitive area' as defined in regulation 2(1); or*
- b) *Meets one of the relevant criteria or exceeds one of the relevant thresholds listed in the second column of the table in Schedule 2*

| Column 1 Description of development | Column 2 Applicable thresholds and criteria |
|--|---|
| 10. Infrastructure Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Industrial estate development projects; | The area of the development exceeds 0.5 ha. |
| 13. Any change to or extension of development of a description mentioned in paragraphs 1 to 12 of Column 1 of this table where that development is already authorised, executed or in the process of being executed. | The thresholds and criteria in the corresponding part of Column 2 of this table applied to the development as changed or extended are met or exceeded and in such a case the change or extension may have significant adverse effects on the environment. |

5. Is the proposal for schedule 2 development?

As an industrial estate infrastructure project covering over 0.5ha and a proposal which represents a change to the existing Hillington Park industrial estate, this is considered to be a Schedule 2 development.

Is EIA required? - Selection Criteria for Screening Schedule 2 Development:

Given the range of Schedule 2 development, and the importance of location in determining whether significant effects on the environment are likely, it is not possible to formulate criteria or thresholds which will provide a universal test of whether or not EIA is required. The question must be considered on a case-by-case basis. The fundamental test to be applied in each case is whether that particular type of development and its specific impacts are likely, in that particular location, to result in significant effects on the environment (Circular 3/2011, Paragraph 52)

- a) Characteristics of the development - size; cumulation with other development; use of natural resources; production of waste; pollution and nuisances; and risk of accidents? (See Checklist)

- b) Location of the development - existing land use; the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area; and the absorption capacity of the natural environment, with regard to designated areas? (See Checklist)
- c) Characteristics of the potential impact - extent of the impact; trans-frontier nature; magnitude and complexity; probability of impact; and duration, frequency and reversibility of impact? (See Checklist)

CONCLUSION

6. It is concluded that although the works likely to be allowed through the making of an SPZ Scheme at Hillington Park fall within Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011, and based on the foregoing assessment, and in particular having regard to the characteristics of the development, the location of the development and the characteristics of the potential impact, the Scheme would not have significant environmental effects and would therefore not necessitate the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment to be carried out.

Signed...

Date.....

15/01/13

David Bryce
Development Standards Manager

[KXD/13/0754/SZ]

Appendix: Screening Checklist

Summary

Planning Context:

- Renfrewshire Local Plan (Adopted 2005)
- Proposed Renfrewshire Local Development Plan and the associated New Development Supplementary Guidance
- Glasgow City Plan 2 (Adopted 2009)
- Glasgow and Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan (Approved 2012)

Proposed Development:

- Formation of a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ) at Hillington Park Industrial Estate.

Environmental Context/Features:

- No ecological, historical or archaeological designations.
- Potentially land containing contaminants occupied by an existing industrial estate.
- Well connected and accessible site.

Potential Effects Considered:

1. Traffic and Travel Considerations

- The construction works associated with the SPZ would lead to increases in HGV movement; however, the development would be intermittent and would not involve a large-scale redevelopment of the site. This would limit the environmental impact of the proposal.
- Traffic modelling for the proposal has concluded that changes in traffic flows of less than 30%, as is the case here, would have no material impact beyond the limits of the site and would have no significant environmental effects which would require an EIA. The proposal would also be accompanied by a Sustainable Transport Strategy which would aim to reduce the reliance on the private car.

2. Cumulative Effects

- There would potentially be an accumulation of relatively small-scales of development in the area. These, however, would be controlled within the terms of the SPZ Scheme to an appropriate overall maximum of 579,045 sqm (or 20,749 sqm over the existing floorspace of 432,005sqm and consented floorspace of 126,291sqm), such that significant effects would not result.

3. Air Quality

- There is a city-wide Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for PM10 covering Glasgow. Traffic modelling has concluded that there would be no significant effects on Air Quality attributed to traffic related emissions.
- Furthermore, any industrial process emissions from the estate are currently regulated by SEPA through the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) (Scotland) Regulations 2012. This would continue to be the case if the proposal materialises, ensuring that no significant effects on the environment are incurred in relation to air quality.

4. Pollution and Nuisance

- Localised increases in noise and vibration would be incurred, which would be associated with construction/demolition/refurbishment works. These works would be intermittent and confined to existing industrial estate where there are no sensitive receptors, thereby having a minimal effect on the environment. A marginal increase in traffic noise along the road corridors would be incurred at the estate, however existing levels of noise along the M8 corridor are high and there would be no sensitive receptors to substantiate a significant environmental impact.
- There would be an increase in energy emissions (heat and light) and waste production associated with the intensification of use. However the environmental impact of this would not be significant.

5. Cultural and Natural Heritage

- There are no designated nature or heritage areas or assets in or around the industrial estate.
- A range of protected species, including bats, have been recorded within 2km of the site, however these will not be affected by the proposal. The design guide which will accompany the SPZ will include landscaping restrictions which would ensure native planting is increased; in order to allow the creation of planting to attract bats and birds.

6. Landscape, Design and Visual Impact

- The design guide accompanying the proposal will include hard and soft landscaping requirements to ensure that no significant visual impact is incurred.
- The building heights scale and massing would also be restricted to mirror the existing at the estate and reduce any potential visual impact.

7. Water Environment

- The groundwater beneath the site is classified by SEPA as Drinking Water Protected Area. Standard and good practice construction methodologies would minimise the any adverse impact on groundwater. A Construction Methodology would be agreed prior to any works on-site.
- The estate, and any existing impermeable areas, is already adequately drained. The operation of the estate under a SPZ would be unlikely to cause any significant effects on groundwater quality or hydrology.

Summary

The assessment set out in this report concludes that although the proposal would have some impact on the surrounding environment in relation to cumulative development effect and traffic increase, this is not considered to be significant and not to a level to require an Environmental Impact Assessment to be undertaken for the site.

| 1. Characteristics of the Development | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|---------------|--|---|
| (a) Size of the development | | | |
| Will the development be out of scale with the existing environment? | No | The SPZ would be based on parameters which would ensure that development is in-keeping with the surrounding environment. | |
| Will it lead to further consequential development or works (e.g. new roads, extraction of aggregate, provision of new water supply, generation or transmission of power, increased housing and sewage disposal)? | Yes | The SZP will have the potential to increase the existing floor-space by 34% and involve new build, demolition and refurbishment works. Specifically, improvement works to the entrance hub and additional construction and engineering works are likely to be required, associated with the intensification of existing permitted and additional complementary uses. | <p>It is not envisaged that these would have a significant environmental impact.</p> <p>The proposal would not involve a large scale redevelopment of the site, but instead piecemeal and localised regeneration.</p> |
| (b) Cumulation with other development | | | |
| Are there potential cumulative impacts with other existing development or development not yet begun but for which planning permission exists? | Yes | Notable developments within Renfrewshire: mixed use development at Braehead & other business and residential development at Braehead and Renfrew Riverside. Developments within Glasgow boundary: New South Glasgow Hospital; and waste management facility. | <p>Unlikely to have a significant environmental impact.</p> <p>All development would be confined to the existing road network; however, traffic modelling indicates that there would be no significant impact on the existing traffic flows.</p> <p>Sustainable Transport Strategy will accompany the SPZ. Also other developments are likely to be subject to travel plans to reduce the use of private car.</p> |
| Should the application for this development be regarded as an integral part of a more substantial project? If so, can | No | | <p>No significant impact on air quality monitoring.</p> <p>No protected sites in the vicinity.</p> |

| | | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|-----|--|---|--|
| related developments which are subject to separate applications proceed independently? | | | | |
| (c) Use of natural resources | | | | |
| Will construction or operation of the development use natural resources such as land, water, materials or energy, especially any resources which are non-renewable or in short supply? | Yes | The SZP will involve new build, demolition and refurbishment. The construction process will use the following resources. | IT is not anticipated that the use of resources for the construction or the operation of the development would have a significant environmental impact. | |
| • land (especially undeveloped or agricultural land)? | Yes | Brownfield land would be used. | Not significant | |
| • water? | Yes | Water will be used during the construction process and for serving new buildings. | Not significant | |
| • minerals? | Yes | May be used during construction. | Not significant | |
| • aggregates? | Yes | May be used during construction | Not significant | |
| • forests and timber? | Yes | May be used during construction | Not significant | |
| • energy including electricity and fuels? | Yes | Will be used during the construction process and for serving new buildings. | Not significant | |
| • any other resources? | No | | | |
| (d) Production of waste | | | | |
| Will the development produce wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning? | Yes | The SPZ would involve elements of new build/demolition/refurbishment and as a result there will be some demolition and construction waste. | This would not be significant. | |
| • spoil, overburden or mine wastes? | Yes | Soil waste | Not significant. | |
| • municipal waste (household and/or commercial)? | Yes | Once buildings are operational, the production of municipal and commercial waste would be increased | Not significantly. | |
| • hazardous or toxic wastes (including radioactive)? | No | The range of permitted activities would exclude high risk activities which could generate significant quantities of hazardous waste. | | |
| • other industrial process wastes? | Yes | There would also be a limited amount of industrial and liquid waste. | Not significant. | |
| • surplus product? | No | | | |
| • sewage sludge or other sludges from effluent treatment? | No | | | |
| | • | | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| • construction or demolition wastes? | Yes | Including rubble, bricks and other building materials. | Not significant. Construction/demolition waste can be minimised through good practice. |
| • redundant machinery or equipment? | No | The site is identified as potentially contaminated land. | A site investigation would require to be carried out. |
| • contaminated soils or other material? | Yes | The site is identified as potentially contaminated land. | Not expected to be significant. |
| • agricultural wastes? | No | | |
| • any other solid wastes? | No | | |
| • liquid or solid wastes in suspension? | No | | |
| (e) Pollution and nuisances | | | |
| Will the development release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air? Emissions from: | | | Not significant. |
| • combustion of fossil fuels from stationary or mobile sources? | Yes | Emissions from construction traffic and materials. | No receptors in that residential area are located some distance away. |
| • production processes? | No | No heavy industry would be covered by SPZ deregulation. | Not to a significant degree. |
| • materials handling including storage or transport? | Yes | Construction materials and waste would be transported to and from the site and also stored on-site during construction. | Not to a significant degree. |
| • construction activities including plant & equipment? | Yes | Emissions from heavy goods vehicles during construction/demolition/refurbishment and construction and demolition processes themselves would cause some pollution and nuisance. | Not to an unacceptable degree. Residential amenity would not be compromised due to a lack of relevant receptors within close proximity. |
| • dust or odours from handling of materials including construction materials, sewage & waste? | | | The SPZ would include a condition requiring a construction method statement to be agreed prior to any construction/demolition works on-site. |
| • incineration of waste? | No | Emissions of dust from construction traffic and during construction/demolition/refurbishment. | Not significant and none once construction/demolition/refurbishment process is complete. |
| • burning of waste in open air (e.g. slash material, construction debris)? | No | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| • any other sources | Yes | Any industrial process emissions would be regulated by SEPA as is the case in the existing estate. | Would not result in a significant increase over the existing. |
| Is there a potential risk from: | | | |
| • leachates? | No | Existing and future uses may have potential for emissions to air/water, associated with the function of commercial activity on the estate – these are controlled through the permits under the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 – (PPC consents & SEPA). | Not significant. |
| • Escape of wastes or other products/by-products that may constitute a contaminant in the environment? | No | Variable levels of light, heat energy and noise and vibration associated with the operations of the industrial estate. | A significant increase in these would not be expected under the SPZ and it is not expected that individual uses would be significant sources of noise, vibration, heat or light. |
| Will the development cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat energy or electromagnetic radiation? | Yes | Increased industrial operation and occupation of buildings will inevitably give rise to heat/energy use (air cons etc), light. | Not significant. |
| • from operation of equipment e.g. engines, ventilation | Yes | Possibly operational at present. The proposal may therefore give rise to an increase in such operations. | This would not have a significant impact on the surrounding environment. |
| • from construction or operational traffic? | Yes | Increased construction traffic and increased operational capacity of the estate. | Not to a significant degree – similar to the existing levels of operations of the industrial estate. |
| • from lighting or cooling systems? | Yes | Increased number of buildings would be occupied giving rise to increased lighting and cooling system use. | Not significant. |
| • from sources of electromagnetic radiation (effects on nearby sensitive equipment as well as people)? | No | | |
| • from any other sources? | No | | |
| (f) Risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances technologies used | | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| Will there be a risk of accidents during construction or operation of the development which could have effects on people or the environment? | No | There is a low risk of accidents at the site. The range of permitted activities under the SPZ will exclude high risk activities. | |
| • from explosions, spillages, fires etc from storage, handling, use or production of hazardous or toxic substances? | No | | |
| • from events beyond the limits of normal environmental protection e.g. failure of pollution control systems? | No | | |
| • from any other causes? | No | | |
| • could the development be affected by natural disasters causing environmental damage (e.g. floods, earthquakes, landslip, etc)? | No | | |
| Will the development involve use, storage, transport, handling or production of substances or materials which could be harmful to people or the environment (flora, fauna, water supplies)? | No | The range of permitted activities under the SPZ will exclude high risk activities such as these. | |
| • use of hazardous or toxic substances? | No | | |
| • potential changes in occurrence of disease or effect on disease carriers (e.g. insect or water borne diseases)? | No | | |
| • effect on welfare of people (e.g. change of living conditions) | No | No such receptors within close proximity to the site. | |
| • effects on vulnerable groups (e.g. the elderly)? | No | | |
| (Other characteristics: potential physical changes (topography, land use, changes in waterbodies etc) from construction, operation or decommissioning of the development) | | | |
| • permanent or temporary change in land use, landcover or topography including increases in intensity of land use? | Yes | Scope of works is unknown at present however there is likely to be permanent physical changes to the land uses, land cover and intensification of use. | Would not be significant. |
| • clearance of existing land, vegetation & buildings? | Yes | Some demolition of buildings is expected. | Insignificant. |
| • peat land disturbance and/ or degradation leading to: carbon release, damage to habitats, affecting land stability or hydrology? | No | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|---------------|--|---|
| • creation of new land uses? | Yes | The following new Use Classes 1, 2, 3, 7 & 11 would be introduced. | These would create more pedestrian/cycle/vehicular footfall, however is not considered that this would have a significant environmental impact. |
| • pre-construction investigations e.g. boreholes, soil testing? | Yes | Pre-construction investigation information would be required prior to any works commencing on-site. | It is unlikely that these works would have a significant environmental impact. |
| • construction or demolition works? | Yes | New build/refurbishment and some demolition would take place. | Not to a significant degree. The scale would be comparable to the existing operation and use of the Park. |
| • temporary sites or housing for construction workers? | No | New build/refurbishment and some demolition would take place. | Not to a significant degree. The scale would be comparable to the existing operation and use of the Park. |
| • above ground buildings, structures or earthworks including linear structures, cut & fill or excavations? | Yes | New build/refurbishment and some demolition would take place. | Not to a significant degree. The scale would be comparable to the existing operation and use of the Park. |
| • underground works including mining or tunnelling? | No | | |
| • reclamation works? | No | | |
| • dredging? | No | | |
| • coastal structures (seawalls, piers)? | No | | |
| • offshore structures? | No | | |
| • production and manufacturing processes? | Yes | This is an industrial site – permitted uses would be likely to include production and manufacturing processes. | These are not expected to have a significant environmental impact. |
| • facilities for storage of goods or materials? | Yes | Warehousing - Class 6 – storage and distribution would be a permitted use class. | This is not considered to have a significant impact. |
| • facilities for treatment or disposal of solid wastes or liquid effluents? | No | | |
| • facilities for long term housing of operational workers? | No | | |
| • new road, rail or sea traffic during construction or operation? | Yes | Increases in traffic would be likely. | Not significant. |
| • new road, rail, air, waterborne or other transport infrastructure including new or altered routes and stations, ports, airports etc? | Yes | Localised works to the transport network across various modes. | Not significant. |
| • closure or diversion of existing transport routes or infrastructure leading to changes in traffic movements? | No | | |
| • new or diverted transmission lines or pipelines? | No | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|---------------|---|---|
| • impounding, damming, culverting, realignment or other changes to the hydrology of watercourses or aquifers? | No | | |
| • stream crossings | No | | |
| • abstraction or transfers of water from ground or surface waters? | No | | |
| • changes in waterbodies or the land surface affecting drainage or run-off? | No | | |
| • transport of personnel or materials for construction, operation or decommissioning? | Yes | Construction traffic/ workers would be able to use existing infrastructure to access the site. M8, railway, bus routes from Glasgow to Hillington. | This is likely to result in increased traffic; however, no significant impact is expected. |
| • long term dismantling or decommissioning or restoration works? | No | | |
| • ongoing activity during decommissioning which could have an impact on the environment? | No | | |
| • influx of people to an area either temporarily or permanently? | Yes | There would be an increase of people on a temporary and permanent basis. | Not significant. |
| • introduction of alien species? | No | | |
| • loss of native species or genetic diversity? | No | | |
| • any other changes? | No | | |
| 2. Location of the Development¹ | | | |
| (a) Existing land use | | | |
| Are there existing land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the development e.g. homes, gardens, other private property, industry, commerce, recreation, public open space, community facilities, agriculture, forestry, tourism, water catchments, functional floodplains, mining or quarrying? | Yes | Residential areas are located to the south of the Park, beyond the Glasgow-Paisley railway, and to the north of the Park and beyond the M8. Further commercial uses are found to the east and agricultural to the west. | It is unlikely that these uses would be significantly affected by the proposal. Any affects would be confined to the receptors within the park, none of which are residential. |
| Are there any areas on or around the location which are occupied by sensitive land uses e.g. hospitals, schools, places of worship, community facilities, which could be affected? | Yes | The Southern General Hospital is located to the west of the Estate. Also there are schools and places of worship within the residential areas which could be impacted. | The impact would however be insignificant and not different to that already experienced by these receptors for the existing industrial estate |
| Is the development located in a previously undeveloped area | No | | |

¹ The items on this checklist are only indicative: ensure that all the characteristics of the development and its location are taken into account.

| Where there will be loss of greenfield land? | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|---|----------|---|---|
| (b) Relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area | | | |
| Are there any areas on or around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the development? | | | |
| • groundwater resources | Possibly | Ground water classified as good (quantitative) and poor (chemistry). | No substantial impact on the groundwater is expected. |
| • surface waters | No | | |
| • forestry | No | | |
| • agriculture | No | | |
| • fisheries | No | | |
| • tourism | No | | |
| • minerals | No | | |
| (c) Absorption capacity of the natural environment | | | |
| Are there any areas on or around the location which are protected under international or national or local legislation for their ecological, landscape, cultural or other value, which could be affected by the development? | No | | |
| Are there any other areas on or around the location which are important or sensitive for reasons of their ecology | No | | |
| • wetlands, watercourses or other waterbodies | No | | |
| • the coastal zone | No | | |
| • mountains, forests or woodlands | No | | |
| • nature reserves and parks | No | | |
| Are there any areas on or around the location in which species and habitats of Local Biodiversity Action Plan importance are present? | Yes | Phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken by the applicant identified low levels of bat activity but no roosts. | The proposal would have a limited impact on this. |
| Are there any areas on or around the location which are used by protected, important or sensitive species of fauna or flora e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, overwintering, migration, which could be affected? | No | | |
| Are there any inland, coastal, marine or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected? | Yes | Groundwater | No significant impact. |
| Are there any groundwater source protection zones or areas | Yes | The groundwater beneath the site is | There would be no significant impact on this. |

| that contribute to the recharge of groundwater resources? | Yes/No | Briefly describe classed as Drinking Water Protected Area by SEPA. | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|--------|---|---|
| Are there any areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected? | No | The M8; A736 Hillington Road and the Glasgow-Paisley railway may be affected. | Not significant. |
| Are there any routes or facilities on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected? | Yes | The location is visible from the M8, Hillington Road, Glasgow-Paisley railway and taller buildings in the vicinity. | The SPZ will restrict building heights and therefore there would be no significant impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding environment or the surrounding uses. Parameter included in the SPZ will minimise the potential for effects on views. |
| Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected? | Yes | Listed buildings/conservation areas are located a significant distance away from the estate. | The city of Glasgow and east of the estate is an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for PM10. |
| Is the development in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? | No | | There will be no significant effect on the AQMA. Industrial process emissions would be regulated by SEPA under the PPC Regulations. |
| Are there any areas or features of historic or cultural importance on or around the location which could be affected? | Yes | Yes already subject to pollution or environmental damage e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected? | |
| Is the location of the development susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme or adverse climatic conditions e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the development to present environmental problems? | No | | |
| 3. Characteristics of the Potential Impact | | | |
| (a) Extent of the impact | | Will the effect extend over a large area? | Yes 199 ha Businesses and places of work. No residential areas or the general public would be significantly impacted. |
| Will many people be affected? | | Will the wider environment be minimal. | |
| (b) Transboundary nature of the impact | | | |

| | Yes/No | Briefly describe | Is effect likely to be significant? |
|--|---------------|--|--|
| Will there be any potential for transboundary impact? ² | Yes | The development straddles Renfrewshire Council (RC) and Glasgow City Council (GCC) boundaries. | Not significant. |
| Magnitude and complexity of the impact | | | |
| Will there be a large change in environmental conditions? | No | | |
| Will the effect be unusual in the area or particularly complex? | No | | |
| Will many receptors other than people (fauna and flora, businesses, facilities) be affected? | No | | |
| Will valuable or scarce features or resources be affected? | No | | |
| Is there a risk that environmental standards will be breached? | No | | |
| Is there a risk that protected sites, areas, features will be affected? | No | | |
| (d) Probability of the impact | | | |
| Is there a high probability of the effect occurring? | No | | |
| Is there a low probability of a potentially highly significant effect? | No | | |
| (e) Duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact | | | |
| Will the effect continue for a long time? | Yes | The SPZ would be established for 10 years. | Not significant. |
| Will the effect be permanent rather than temporary? | | | |
| Will the impact be continuous rather than intermittent? | No | | |
| If intermittent, will it be frequent rather than rare? | No | | |
| Will the impact be irreversible? | No | | |
| Will it be difficult to avoid or reduce or repair or compensate for the effect? | No | | |

Source: www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/212607/0117167.pdf

² (NB: Development which has a significant effect on the environment in another Member State is likely to be very rare. It is for the Scottish Ministers to consider whether there is likely to be such an effect in each case).