

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	Land east of Guanockgate Road, Gorefield	Brief description of the project / development	Temporary ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) farm with battery storage along with continued agricultural use, ancillary infrastructure and security fencing, landscaping provision, ecological enhancements and associated works
Appellant	PACE		
LPA	SHDC		
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)		Click here to enter text.	
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?		Yes	
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?		3a	
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?		Click here to enter text.	
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?		Yes	
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?		0.5	
3. LPA/SOS SCREENING			
Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued)		No	
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?		N/A	
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?		N/A	
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?		N/A	

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	(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) (only if Yes in part 2a) – 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?	Yes	Elevation of electrically sensitive infrastructure.	No	Land could be re-profiled as part of decommissioning.
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?	No	The amount of excavation required would be very low and land can still be used for agricultural grazing land, being returned to arable use once decommissioned.	N/A	
1.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	Yes	The Agricultural Land Classification survey indicates that the majority of the site (87%) to be grade 3a with around 11% as grade 2.	No	Higher grade agricultural land is involved but there is the potential for grazing sheep, thereby allowing some agricultural activity to continue. Reversible after decommissioning and arguably more fertile.

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)	
2. WASTE				
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes		No	Waste production during construction phase would be limited as most components arrive at site ready-made/pre-assembled. During operation, only negligible waste (if any) will be created. During decommissioning, solar panels and the mounting structures can be recycled at the end of their operational life.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	Vehicles associated with the construction, operation (monitoring and maintenance) and decommissioning phases will generate emissions. The construction and decommissioning phases will result in some generation of dust.	No	Not likely to have a significant impact due to the number of vehicle trips concerned and control of dust can be addressed by means of a Construction Management Plan.
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	Possible generation of vibration and noise and potential for glint and glare from panels. Energy will clearly be created given the nature of the proposal.	No	Vibration will be limited to the construction period (excavation). Noise will also be generated during this period. However, only low levels of noise will be generated by electrical systems such as transformers and the substation during the operational phase. Solar panels only generate electricity in daylight hours and so there will be negligible noise in the evening, at night and early morning. It is considered that the issue of glint and glare can be appropriately considered by means of a glint and glare study to be submitted in support of any application.

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)	
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?	No	The proposed development does not involve the release of any pollutants on to the ground or into waters.	No	
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?	No		N/A	
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 construction, operation or decommissioning?	No		N/A	
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)	No	A Phase 1 Desk Study will identify any contamination risks and these can be remediated where relevant.	N/A	
5. WATER RESOURCES				
5.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground	Yes	IDB watercourses adjoin and lie within the site, as well as riparian drains.	No	Not likely to have a significant impact due to the nature of the development proposed and limited output/run-off. The relevant IDB

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)	
waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?				byelaws can be taken into account in the site layout.
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 their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project? (e.g. wetlands, watercourses or other water-bodies, the coastal zone, mountains, forests or woodlands, undesignated nature reserves or parks. (Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local))).	Yes	The Nene Washes (SSSI / SPA) is approx. 9.3km to the south and the site falls just within the Impact Risk Zone of that site, although outside the Goose and Swan Functional Land IRZ.	No	It is considered that ecology matters can be addressed by an appropriate ecology survey submitted with any formal planning application. Furthermore, given the size of the site, there is significant opportunity to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain through the development.
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	The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal concludes that the working assumption should be that water voles are present within the site boundary. No other protected species or habitats were identified as likely to be impacted by the project. Notwithstanding this, Lincolnshire Bat Group have highlighted that a full survey conducted in 2010, for the proposed Treadingfield Windfarm,	No	A water vole mitigation strategy can be secured to identify avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation measures. Emphasis should be placed on increasing invertebrate biodiversity in the dykes and drains that divide fields to benefit bats and birds.

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)	
		recorded common pipistrelles throughout the site, particularly along Lady Nunn’s Old Eau and the adjacent copse TF3812, and also at intervals along the Straight Reach Drain.		
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	
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?)	Yes	The site is located in the open countryside where there is a relatively flat topography and there is currently an absence of screening. There are some residential properties within 500m of the site and there are roads in close proximity. The site is also visible from PROWs that transect the site.	No	Whilst it is inevitable that there will be an impact on the current open landscape by virtue of the scale of the proposal, the size of the site means that substantial landscape mitigation can be incorporated to negate significant effects.
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	Yes	Part of the site has been subject to a previous archaeological evaluation related to a windfarm application, which did identify a number of undated archaeological features. Roman pottery	No	Effects not expected to be significant, however further trial trench evaluation should be undertaken as the previous evaluation is not sufficient to provide the Local Planning

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)	
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).		and settlement sites have been identified nearby within the surrounding landscape in both the Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Records. However, the previous evaluation only investigated a small sample of the site, with trial trenches located over the proposed turbine sites only, as well as some hand augering of sediments on a transect across the site.		Authority with sufficient or proportionate information to understand the impacts of the present proposal which would involve a very different form of development. The solar farm would involve many localised impacts but spread across a much wider area from each of the poles for the solar panels themselves as well as trenches across the site for cable runs, as well as new accesses and service 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	A public footpath transects the site (SuSE/8/1 and Tydd/4/1) in an east-west direction from Guanockgate Road and bridleway (238/13) intersects the site north-south on Elloe Bank. The site is served and adjoined by minor rural roads.	No	There is the potential for the proposed development to have an impact on views from these PROWs. However, the impacts are localised and could be mitigated by planting/screening. Only short-term disruption to the PROW would occur during construction.
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?	No		N/A	
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,	Yes	The site is within the countryside and only a reasonably small number of residential properties lie within 500m of the site.	No	Disturbance during construction and decommissioning phases but Construction Management Plan may be secured via condition. Disturbance during operation phase likely to be minimal.

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)	
farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.		The dominant land use in the area is farming.		In terms of visual impact, the majority of properties are screened by on-plot planting that would minimise views of the proposed development, or are sufficiently distanced from the site boundary such that there would not be a material impact on outlook.
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No		N/A	
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?	Yes	Site is located in Flood Zone 3.	No	It is considered that the matter can be dealt with adequately via a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment.
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	There are no existing or planned developments in the locality that, together with the proposed development, would result in a significant adverse cumulative impact during the construction/operation phase when taking into account the nature of the development proposed.	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	
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	N/A	Transboundary effects relate to possible effects on other nation states and this is not relevant to this proposal.	N/A	

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

5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

From the information submitted it is not considered that any impacts that may occur would be as significant as to require an Environmental Impact Assessment to be undertaken. The proposal would not create significant harm to historic or ecological assets and, with mitigation measures, could have limited visual impact on the countryside landscape (no landscape designations present). This development is considered to be fully reversible and could return to agricultural use in the future.

It is considered that the effects of the development can be adequately considered within the context of a planning application without the need for a full EIA to be supplied.

Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority, in line with Regulation 5 of the Regulations, has determined that the development proposed is not Environmental Impact Assessment development and does not require an Environmental Statement to be submitted. No further action is therefore necessary.

6. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	N/A	
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	Yes	
Is an ES required?	No	
7. 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	Lucy BATTERY – Principal Planning Officer
DATE	13 October 2022