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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	25/70050/SCRE	**Brief description of the project / development**	Installation of solar PV panels, Battery energy Storage Systems (BESS) and Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure.
Appellant	Vivo Defence Services Limited		
LPA	Huntingdonshire District 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)	NA
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: 3 (a) Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water Column 2: the area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?	No
If YES, which area?	NA
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?	Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?	The area for development is 16.2 hectares in total (split across 3 distinct sites within the RAF base).

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?	NA
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?	NA

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

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

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 REFERING TO THE PROJECT / DEVELOPMENT.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and explanation of reasons (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 **(If answer in Part 2a / 2b is 'No', the answer to Part 3a / 3b is 'N/A')**		(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) 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**.	
1. NATURAL RESOURCES				
1.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	No	With the exception of the excavation for the EV canopy foundations and footings, there is not expected to be any changes to the existing topography of the site.		
1.2 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	The construction, maintenance and decommissioning operations of the project would likely consume energy deriving from natural/non-renewable resources, primarily in the form of fuels and manufacturing materials. The land required is located within the confines of the RAF Wyton site and has no Agricultural Land Classification.	No	While the construction phase will use some non renewable resources these are limited in scope and duration and must be weighed against the long term benefits of generating renewable energy. Given the scale, nature and location of the project, it is considered unlikely that the use of natural resources during construction and maintenance of the project will have significant effects on the environment for EIA purposes.
1.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, **high quality or scarce resources**	No	The land required is located within the confines of the RAF Wyton site.		

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)	
which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?		A Geo-Environmental Desk Study has been submitted which confirms the site has historically been used as an airfield and parts are currently used for vehicle storage and parking. The site is not agricultural land.		
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	It is anticipated that solid wastes will be produced during the construction phase of the project and during the decommissioning phase. This will include metal and electrical components during the decommissioning phase.	No	Given the scale of the project, it is considered unlikely that the quantities of solid waste produced during construction, maintenance or decommissioning phases would have significant effects on the environment for EIA purposes. Solid waste generated by the construction and decommissioning phases could be managed by the waste hierarchy, **in compliance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan.**
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	During the construction and decommissioning phases there may be release of pollutants and noxious substances into the air, most likely from vehicle and machinery emissions. Once operational the proposal is not expected to release pollutants, save for limited vehicle emissions generated by maintenance vehicles.	No	The release of pollutants/hazardous substances is considered to be unlikely to have a significant effect for EIA purposes, given the scale of the project and the nature of the associated construction/decommissioning phases **which will be subject to industry standard emissions reduction practices e.g. dust suppression**

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)	
				measures and proper equipment maintenance.
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Operations involved in the construction and decommissioning of the project will generate noise, vibration and the release of light and/or heat energy, most likely from construction machinery and traffic. Noise generated during operation will be limited. The inverters and cooling systems associated with the solar arrays and BESS will generate some low-level noise. The submission states that the proposal will release light and electromagnetic radiation during energy generation, but these are non-ionising and not harmful to health. There may be some heat release from equipment, but this is low level and localised.	No	Having regard to the type and scale of development proposed, the anticipated levels of noise, vibration, light and heat generated are not considered to be significant or uncommon for EIA purposes. Construction noise could be managed by Noise generated by a **Construction Environmental Management Plan and noise generating equipment will be housed in purpose-built cabinets which will reduce noise.**
3.3 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	A Geo-Environmental Desk Study has been submitted which indicates potential land contamination from the historical use of the site as an airfield and possible unexploded ordnance (UXO) risk. A preliminary risk assessment is required to evaluate risks further prior to construction works taking place, however no significant risks are expected. The submission advises that during operation the PV system and BESS are sealed and non-polluting with no routine discharges. Water pollution could occur if panel maintenance involves	No	These risks can be minimised by **further investigation of possible ground contamination prior to construction commencing, a risk assessment for UXO and standard pollution prevention measures.** The risk of a fire is considered to be very low owing **to fire monitoring, suppressant system and sprinkler protection which is built into the BESS cabinets. National Health and Safety guidance exists for BESS**

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)	
		chemical cleaning agents. Likewise in the event of a fire in a BESS, this could release pollutants into the ground via contaminated water used to extinguish the fire. An impact on coastal waters/the sea is unlikely given geographic location. Nevertheless, it is likely that the project, in particular the works carried out during construction and decommissioning, including storage and use of fuels and lubricants for plant/machinery, and chemicals used during construction, will all carry some risk of entering the ground.		**and a Fire safety Strategy can be prepared.** Unmitigated risks of contamination are considered unlikely to have significant environmental effects for EIA purposes given the scale and nature of the project.
3.4 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	A Geo-Environmental Desk Study has been submitted which indicates potential land contamination from the historical use of the site as an airfield and possible unexploded ordnance (UXO) risk. A preliminary risk assessment is required to evaluate risks further prior to construction works taking place, however no significant risks are expected. Huntingdon Air Quality Management Area is located circa 4.3km to the southwest.	No	**Subject to further assessment / risk assessment, the proposal is not likely to worsen any existing pollution or risk of contamination on site.** The proposal is not expected to generate significant air pollution which would impact upon Huntingdon Air Quality Management Area. The construction and decommissioning phases would be subject to **industry standard emissions reductions practices.**
4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
4.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during	Yes	The Geo-Environmental Desk Study identified a risk of UXO as the site may have been a Luftwaffe Target during WWII. However, the risk is considered low.	No	Risks of accidents during construction/decommissioning can be minimised by **standard accident prevention measures including risk assessment for UXO**. The risk of accidents is not considered

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A)	
construction, operation or decommissioning?				likely to have significant environmental effects for EIA purposes given the location (within the RAF base which is not accessible to the public), scale and nature of the project.
4.2 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	Construction/decommissioning phases carry a level of intrinsic risk with regard to plant / machinery operation and accidents can occur 'on-site'. In addition, there is a risk of UXO owing to sites history. It is considered that the operation phase of the project is likely to involve minimal risk.	No	Risks to human health can be minimised by **standard accident and contamination prevention measures and a risk assessment for UXO**. The risks of accident/contamination is not considered likely to have signficant environmental effects for EIA purposes given the scale and nature of the project.
5. WATER RESOURCES				
5.1 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	There are no waterbodies within the development site. There is a small pond adjacent to the southeast and a small stream approx. 800m southeast. There are no flood zones within the site and the Geo-Environmental Desk Study suggests that shallow groundwater is unlikely to be found.	No	Risks of contamination are likely to be highest during construction/decommissioning. A low level of risk of contaimination is likely during operation. These risks can be minimised by **standard pollution prevention measures**. Unmitigated risks of contamination are not considered likely to have signficant environmental effects for EIA purposes given the scale and nature of the project.
6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
6.1 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	Yes	No internationally, nationally, or locally designated ecological areas are located on the project site. The nearest statutory designations are:	No	Given the nature and scale of the development and the separation distances from the protected sites it is considered unlikely that the project will have a significant environmental effect on these protected areas for EIA purposes.

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)	
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))).		Godmanchester Eastside Common SSSI (circa 2.7km south) Great Stukeley Railway Cutting SSSI (circa 4km west) Houghton Meadows SSSI (circa 2.7km south east) Portholme SSSI and SAC (circa 4.9km south west) In addition, there Are a number of County Wildlife sites within 5km.		
6.2 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	A Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) has been submitted which confirms that the site largely comprises neutral grassland, developed land/surfaces and modified grassland. Further surveys are recommended for great crested newts due to the presence of waterbodies within 500m of the site. The PEA outlines specific sensitive terrestrial fauna that may be affected by the proposed development, including: Bats: Risk of temporary disturbance from construction lighting near potential roosting habitats in nearby buildings. Further assessments and lighting mitigation are recommended.	No	Given the scale of development proposed it is not considered that the proposal will result in significant effects for the purposes of EIA. **A number of mitigation measures have been proposed to minimise the risk of harm to protected species, as set out within the PEA.**

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)	
		Badgers: No setts were found, but the habitat is suitable, and badgers may move in. Pre-construction walkover is required if works are delayed beyond 12 months. Birds: Nesting habitat present (hedgerows, grassland, trees). Works may disturb breeding birds; mitigation includes timing clearance outside nesting season or using an ecologist. Reptiles: Suitable habitat for slow worm and common lizard present. Risk of injury during works; no further survey is needed, but mitigation is required. Great Crested Newts (GCN): Suitable terrestrial habitat in some areas; nearby waterbodies tested negative or unsuitable. Mitigation is required to avoid harm. Notable Mammals: Hedgehog, brown hare, and rabbit may be present. Risk of injury during works; mitigation measures outlined. Other species, such as dormice, otters, water voles, fish, notable ants, invertebrates, and invasive species, are considered unlikely to be impacted and require no further action.		

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)	
7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL				
7.1 Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project?[1] Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	No areas in the vicinity of the site are formally designated as features of high landscape value (e.g. AONB). The site is within the confines of the existing RAF base. Whilst the landscape character of the wider study area is predominantly rural the Site itself is defined by its current 'developed' use which has a bearing on its existing character. Abbots Ripton Hall, a registered park and garden site, is located approx. 4km northwest of the site. The LVIA confirms its setting would not be impacted by the proposal. The submitted LVIA found that the proposal would have no significant landscape or visual impacts.	NA	
7.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what direction, and what distance?)	No	The site is within the confines of the existing RAF base. The submitted LVIA found that the visual envelope/ extent of visibility of the site is limited by the topography, existing development within the RAF base and wider	NA	

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

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)	
		landscape, and existing hedgerow and tree belts within the landscape. Having regard to the baseline conditions and the nature of the development proposed (the height of development will be restricted), the site is not likely to be highly visible from a significant number of premises or receptors.		
8. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
8.1 Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	There are no designated heritage or known archaeology assets on the site. There are 14 Scheduled Monuments within 5km of the site, the nearest being the Moated site 130m northeast of Manor Farm (approx. 3km northeast). There are 536 listed buildings within 5km of the site, with the closest being the Old Rectory (approx. 1.6km south). There are 12 conservation areas within 5km of the site, with the closest being the Houghton and Wyton conservation area located approx. 1.8km south. No direct impacts on these cultural heritage designations are anticipated. Visual and landscape effects on designated heritage sites have been assessed in the	NA	

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)	
		submitted LVIA. The site is within the confines of the operational RAF base and therefore development will be viewed in this context. The LVIA confirms that there is no view of the development from the nearest conservation area or from any of the listed buildings.		
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
9.1 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	There are no public rights of way on or immediately adjacent to the site itself. The site is within the operational RAF base which is not accessible to the public. No detailed traffic assessment was available, but construction is expected to cause moderate, localised traffic increases, primarily from heavy vehicles. Operational traffic will be negligible. Peak disruptions may last 12 months, beginning two weeks after construction starts. Risks include road wear and increased accidents on narrow roads	No	No significant impacts on routes used by the public are anticipated. **The impacts associated with construction and decommissioning vehicles could be mitigated by best practice working and a coordinated traffic management plan.**
9.2 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	Access to the RAF base is via the B1090 which joins the A141.	No	Whilst roads in the vicinity are susceptible to localised congestions at peak times, the project is not considered to affect transport routes such that a significant environmental effect for EIA purposes would result. **The impacts associated with construction and decommissioning vehicles could be**

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)	
				mitigated by best practice working and a coordinated traffic management plan.
10. LAND USE				
10.1 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	There are no community facilities/land uses on the project site. The nearest settlements are: Wyton on the Hill (immediately south of the RAF base) Houghton (circa 1.5km south) St Ives (circa 1.8km south east) Huntingdon (circa 2.4km south west) The submitted LVIA confirms that the proposal would be visually very well contained within the existing RAF base.	No	Having regard to the scale and nature of development proposed, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant effects for nearby residential properties. Disturbance to existing residents is most likely to occur during the construction and decommissioning phase which is temporary and can be managed by way of a **Construction Environmental Management Plan.** No impacts on existing land uses are considered to be significant for EIA purposes.
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	Yes	Wyton airfield was considered for development during the preparation of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan to 2036. Whilst redevelopment of the site was supported in principle, the site was not allocated for development in the Local Plan owing to development constraints around the deliverability of road infrastructure required to serve any residential redevelopment of the site. Subject to resolution of the transport infrastructure challenges the council considers	No	The proposed development is temporary in nature and would be removed at the end of its lifetime or could be removed sooner if the site was required for alternative development.

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)	
		that the site could make a contribution towards housing supply in the future.		
11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
11.1 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	Whilst the project would likely be impacted by an extreme climatic condition/occurrence, the location is not considered to be susceptible to the occurrences described.	NA	
12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
12.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No	It is considered unlikely that the project would result in significant environmental effects for EIA purposes, either in isolation or in conjunc-tion with the other uses/activities in the locality given the scale and nature of the project.	NA	
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?[2]	No	No national transboundary effects are anticipated.	NA	

[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.

14. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

Characteristics of development

The project site comprises 16.2ha of land (split into 3 distinct parcels) inside the operational RAF Wyton base, including former runway land (some of which is currently used for vehicle storage) and an operational staff car park. It is proposed to install a solar farm, comprising solar PV panels, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and associated infrastructure and Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure (in the form of solar carports).

The site is located within the existing RAF base and will therefore be viewed within the existing built envelope at the base. It does not involve development of greenfield or agricultural land.

The proposed development will not require any works which are unusual or complex and accordingly no significant effects are anticipated with regard to production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents or risks to human health. Any risks in this regard can therefore be adequately assessed and controlled, without the need for EIA.

Having regard to the type and scale of development proposed, it is anticipated that effects (both individual and in combination effects) would be relatively localised and therefore would not be significant in EIA terms.

Location of development

The project site does not form part of any of the environmentally sensitive areas listed under 2 (c) i-vi of Schedule 3 Regulation 5(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

The project site is located within the confines of the RAF base and is brownfield land. Owing to the sites historical use as an RAF airfield the site may have been a Luftwaffe Target during WWII and therefore is therefore a risk of UXO. However, the risk is considered low. Having regard to the location of the project within the RAF base, which is not accessible to the public, the project is unlikely to have a significant impact in EIA terms on any existing densely populated areas.

Sections 7 and 8 (above) address the anticipated impacts of the proposal with regard to the local landscape and cultural historical assets. Owing to the existing and former use of the site the potential for any undesignated archaeological assets to be present is low. The project is considered unlikely to have a significant impact in EIA terms upon the landscape and any historical assets.

Characteristics of the potential impact

The environmentally sustainable nature of the project is noted. The majority of the project is temporary in nature and considered to be reversible (PV arrays can be dismounted and removed). Accordingly, the project is considered to impart a medium to long term (but ultimately temporary) direct impact upon the landscape of the project site.

Given the scale of the project, its location within the existing RAF base and the limited visual envelope outside of the project site, any impacts are expected to be localised and largely confined to the construction and decommissioning (as opposed to operational) phases. The environmental impact of the project on neighbouring residents is considered to be low and the population size affected by the proposals would not be significant in EIA terms. The likely extent of impacts associated with the proposal is not therefore considered to be strategic or substantive in EIA terms.

Traffic generated by the project is not likely to cause significant environmental effects over a wide area, both on its own and in combination with planned developments, particularly when mitigation is taken into account. The highway impacts associated with the construction and decommissioning phases can be adequately managed by best practice working and/or a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Pollution generated during construction and decommissioning is not expected to be unusual or hazardous and could be controlled by best practice measures. During operation there are low risks of pollution / contamination which can be adequately managed by best practice working methods and following national health and safety guidance.

Overall, the probability of a significant environmental impact upon human beings, flora, fauna, soil, water, air and the wider climate is considered to be low given the scale, nature and location of the development. The effects likely to arise would be largely confined to the construction and decommissioning phases (which are time limited) and would not extend over a wide geographical area. Cumulative significant environmental effects in the wider locality are unlikely. No transboundary impacts are envisaged.

It is anticipated that the project could be absorbed into its surroundings without significant environmental effects.

Conclusion
It is considered, in light of available information, that the proposal would not have a significant impact in EIA terms and that any impacts would be more localised to the site. As a result, the Local Planning Authority consider that an ES is not required to accompany any future planning application under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 as amended.

15. SCREENING DECISION	
If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	NA
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	Yes
Is an ES required?	No

16. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)	**OUTCOME**	
Is likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES required	
<u>Not</u> likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	✓
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	

NAME	Hollie Renney
DATE	27 May 2025