

**PELHAM SPRING SOLAR FARM
ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT
TECHNICAL APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX 1.1 – UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
SCREENING OPINION**

On behalf of Low Carbon Solar Park 6 Limited

Date: December 2022



UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 4ER
Telephone (01799) 510510, Fax (01799) 510550
Textphone Users 18001
Email uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk Website www.uttlesford.gov.uk

Mr J Ellis
Pegasus Group
First Floor
South Wing
Equinox North
Great Park Road
Alondbury
Bristol
BS32 4QL

Date: 20/01/2022

Our Ref: UTT/21/3379/SCO
Your Ref: TB/P20-1300

Please ask for: Chris Tyler on

Email: [REDACTED]

Dear Jack Ellis

EIA Screening Opinion,

Land Near Pelham Substation, Maggots End Road, Manuden

Request for a screening opinion for a proposed solar farm with battery storage.

This letter provided a screening opinion for the above proposal, as required by Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) regulations 2017 (as amended). The purpose of the screening opinion is to clarify whether the proposal is "EIA development" requiring the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The assessment of the proposal outline in this letter is also in conjunction of the details set out in the attached Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 Screening Matrix.

It is first necessary to establish whether the proposal is "Schedule 1 development" or "Schedule 2 development". The proposal falls within the description of Schedule 2, paragraph 3(a) Industrial installation for the production of electricity, steam, and hot water (unless in Schedule 1). The proposal exceeds the threshold of 0.5ha as the size of the site exceeds 5ha, however the site is not located in wholly or partly within a sensitive area as defined in the Regulations.

Regulation 6(4) of the Act sets out how a screening request, where relevant, must take into account the criteria set out in Schedule 3 which consider the characteristics of development, the location of the development and the types and characteristics of the potential impacts. Schedule 3 of the Regulation sets out the separate headings and I shall deal with each in turn.

Characteristic of Development

The site consists of approximately 79 hectares of land near Pelham Substation, Maggots End, Bishop's Stortford. A project of this scale would require the use of natural resources, most notably the use of agricultural land and an application for this proposal is of such a scale that Natural England would likely need to be consulted, specifically on the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

In regards to the location of the site and the current use of the land, the proposal is likely to result in may not result in any significant harm to biodiversity however and the proposal may in fact have the opportunity to have significant net increase in biodiversity net gains and when taking into consideration appropriate mitigation of the proposal.

In terms of cumulative developments, this proposal would need to be considered in relation to existing and approved development taking into consideration the location of the development. Although a number of nearby screening opinions have been submitted to the Council the only current nearby solar farm application currently submitted is UTT/21/3356/FUL and the East Herts application 3/21/2781/FUL which considers a small part of the development outside the Uttlesford District.

The production of waste is unlikely to be significant. Noise, dust and vibrations nuisances are highly probable during the construction phase and during the decommissioning of the development. Some of the impacts can be mitigated by way of a Construction Management Plan, although this hasn't been included in the screening opinion. Noise will be generated as part of the operational phase, but is unlikely to be significant.

The risks of accidents should be low given the nature of the development. The site is not located within or adjacent a high risk flood zone and therefore, subject to appropriate to mitigation measures, should not give rise to increase flooding risks. Nonetheless due to the area coverage of the site a Flood Risk Assessment would need to be submitted together with any planning application.

The risks of accidents is considered to be low, however the risks to human health are required to be considered as part of the screening process. Whilst risks arising from potential pollution or water contamination are likely to be low, the main impact is likely to arise from noise during the operational phase. As noted above, the impact are likely to be low, but nonetheless considered during the assessment of any planning application.

Location of the Development

The site consists of approximately 79 hectares and comprises mainly of a large agricultural fields which provides habitat for certain species of wildlife particularly along margins of the site. A full Ecological Assessment would need to be submitted as part of any planning application.

The impacts of the proposals on these landscape elements will need to be considered as part of the application process, although they are not envisaged to be significant. However, careful consideration of the layout and ensuring appropriate buffer zones to the most sensitive areas should be considered to help provide appropriate mitigation of any potential impacts. It is likely it will be necessary to also provide sufficient information on non-significant impacts on Protected and Priority species and habitats at submission. This is necessary in order that the LPA has certainty of all likely impacts, not just significant ones, from the development and can issue a lawful decision with any mitigation and compensation measures needed to make the development acceptable, secured by condition.

It should be noted that the surrounding the development area there are potentially significant archaeological remains and a Scheduled Ancient Monument in relatively close proximity to the site. The known heritage assets would not in its own right require an EIA, however, it is recommended that an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment is undertaken to support any EIA or outline application. As part of this document there should be a detailed assessment of

the proposed construction technique proposed to be used for the development. The retention of all cables above ground can significantly reduce the heritage impact on below ground deposits for instance. This will clarify the significance of any archaeological deposits affected by the development and inform the planning application.

Built Heritage Assets

The location of the site is in close proximity to some built heritage assets and as such it is considered the proposal are likely to not result in any significant impact to heritage assets (listed buildings).

Aerodrome Safeguarding

In regards to aerodrome safeguarding and the proposal has the potential to conflict aerodrome safeguarding, there are two aspects of concern that will need to be scrutinised:

- The potential for the solar array to create a Glint and Glare hazard to pilots – we will need the developer to supply a Glint and Glare assessment from an aviation (Stansted Airport) perspective.
- Solar arrays are known to be attractive sites for birds. Manchester Airport Group (Stansted) would need to be consulted of the plans and any planning application to ensure that this problem is mitigated.

However due to the location of the development site and distance from airports it is likely that may not be any risk of solar glint or glare however statutory advice during the submission of a planning application would be taken into consideration and could be mitigated through the use of planning conditions.

Types and characteristics of the potential impact

The impacts are predicted to be localised, although cumulative visual impacts could arise from various vantage points within the landscape, in particular from the public rights of way. Although there would be some impact with the use of landscape mitigation this may not significant in terms of EIA impacts. No transboundary effects are envisaged. However nonetheless a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment could be beneficial as part of any application submission.

CONCLUSION:

Given the location of the proposal and taking into consideration the potential of cumulative impacts arising, it is considered that the proposals would not give rise to significant adverse effects. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Assessment is NOT required to be submitted with the application.

This Screening Opinion is given on the basis of the documents listed in the Screening Opinion request being submitted with the application.

In addition, you should ensure that you submit the documents required to be submitted in line with the Council's Validation Checklists.

Yours Sincerely



Interim Director of Planning

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

| 1. CASE DETAILS | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Case Reference | UTT/21/3379/SCO | Brief description of the project / development | Request for a screening opinion for a proposed solar farm with battery storage. |
| Applicant | Low Carbon Ltd C/o Pegasus Group | | |
| LPA | Uttesford 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) | | | |
| Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations? | | YES | |
| If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2? | | 3(a) Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water (unless included in Schedule 1) The area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare | |
| Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations? | | Yes, Schedule Monument The Crump, a ringwork 600m south of Berden Source: Historic England Source ID: 1009308 English Heritage Legacy ID: 20665 However it is noted as per the EIA Screening Regulations the development is not in or partly in such sensitive area that should be screened. Statutory Instrument No.571 advises Schedule 2 development" means development, other than exempt development, of a description | |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| | mentioned in column 1 of the table in Schedule 2 where— a) any part of that development is to be carried out in a sensitive area |
| If YES, which area? | N/A |
| Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met? | Yes |
| If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria? | The site exceeds 0.5 hectares. |
| 3. LPA/SOS SCREENING | |
| Has the LPA or SoS issued a Screening Opinion (SO) or Screening Direction (SD)? (In the case of Enforcement appeals, has a Regulation 37 notice been issued) | No |
| If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file? | N/A |
| If yes, is the SO/SD positive? | N/A |
| 4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT | |
| Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application? | No |

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 | (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 |
|----------|---|---|
| | 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') | Is a significant effect likely, having regard particularly to the magnitude and spatial extent (including population size affected), nature, intensity and complexity, probability, expected onset, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact and the possibility to effectively reduce the impact? If the finding of no significant effect is reliant on specific features or measures of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment these should be identified in bold. |

5. NATURAL RESOURCES

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|-----|--|
| 5.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area? | No | Although the development of the site would result in a change of character to the location it is not considered that it will be extended or greatly alter the topography of the area. | N/A | No significant likely affect. Further information will be submitted as part of the planning submission. The proposed development is reversible and any planning permission would seek a decommissioning schedule of works. However this is not sufficient to require an EIA. |
| 5.2 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources above or below ground such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy which are non-renewable or in short supply? | No | There are no such resources linked to the area of the site or surroundings, as such it is considered this will be unaffected. | N/A | No significant likely affect. |
| 5.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, e.g. forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals? | No | Agricultural land will be removed from farming, this is not considered significant. | N/A | The nature of farming can be altered from arable to pastoral farming. The use is limited between 25-35 years. The cumulative effects of other solar schemes would need to be considered however overall no significant likely affect. |

| 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) | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 6. WASTE | | | | |
| 6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning? | No | The use and scale of the development does not include any result in any pollutants or hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air have been identified. | N/A | No significant likely affect. There may be some waste arising from the construction and decommissioning. A construction waste management plan would be required as part of the submission. However this is not sufficient to require an EIA. |
| 7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES | | | | |
| 7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air? | No | The use and scale of the development does not include any result in any pollutants or hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air have been identified. | N/A | No significant likely affect. |
| 7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation? | Yes | Noise, dust and vibration nuisances are highly probable during the construction phase. Some of the impacts can be mitigated by way of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, although this hasn't been stated in the Screening Opinion. Noise would be generated as part of the operational phase, but this is unlikely to be significant. | No | Given the low level of trip generation to the site is considered the proposal will not result in a material impact from noise that will have potential significant effects. Construction Environmental Management Plan would be required as part of the submission. However this is not sufficient to require an EIA. |

| 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) | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| 7.3 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 | Unlikely to occur and can be controlled by a Construction Environmental Management Plan and best practices. There is no identified risk to human health with regards to matters such as air pollution or contamination. In addition, there is no requirements for the transportation of fuel to site. | N/A | No significant likely affect. A contamination report would be required as part of any planning application of which would be assessed at that time. However this is not sufficient to require an EIA. |
| 7.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project? | No | None identified. | N/A | No significant likely effect |
| 8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH | | | | |
| 8.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning? | No | <p>Although not on the direct flight path of Stansted Airport, the site is in proximity of the airport. The development thereby may lead to potential impacts to airport safeguarding, including the attraction of birds and glint and glare impacts to aircraft. This may require further investigation/consultation with the airport during assessment of the application.</p> <p>The site would be adjacent to an existing battery storage facility therefor details of how this will operate along site each other and a construction management plan would be required as part of any submission.</p> | No | <p>Due to the location of the site and distance to the Stansted airport it is not considered that there would be any risk of solar glint or glare and does not fall within the Airports Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone.</p> <p>Statutory advice during the submission of a planning application would be taken into consideration and could be mitigated through the use of planning conditions.</p> <p>However this is not sufficient to require an EIA.</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) | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8.2 Will the project present a risk to the population (having regard to population density) and their human health during construction, operation or decommissioning? (for example due to water contamination or air pollution) | No | <p>The site is relatively isolated with limited residential properties close by. The village of Berden is situated to the north east of the site and Stocking Pelham to the north west. Dust and noise pollution are potential effects on human health associated with the demolition works.</p> <p>The site would be adjacent to an existing battery storage facility therefore details of how this will operate along site each other and a construction management plan would be required as part of any submission.</p> | N/A | Effects can be mitigated by way of working to best practices and with the implementation of a CEMP, which are standard forms of mitigation and can be secured by way of condition. |
| 9. WATER RESOURCES | | | | |
| 9.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, e.g. rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or underground waters on or around the location which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk? | Yes | The site is in flood zone 1 which has a low probability of flooding, that being said due to the scale of the site the development may result in flood risk due to surface water drainage. This would be fully assessed in the submission of a planning application. | No | A Flood Risk Assessment is required in the submission of a planning application due to the size of the site. It will need to be demonstrated that the proposed scheme will create a neutral affect or betterment and that it would not increase the risk of flooding to the area. |
| 10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS) | | | | |
| 10.1 Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for their terrestrial, avian and marine ecological value, or any non-designated / non- | No | The site is close to the woodland area of Battles Wood and Pump Spring. The development | No | This will need to be assessed as part of the ecological and arboricultural assessments to accompany the application. The effects could be mitigated by appropriate landscaping, site layout |

| 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) | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| 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))). | | process will ensure due consideration is made to the appropriate legalisation. | | and possible translocation or other appropriate mitigation measures in relation to protected species. Further information is required as part of the planning submission. However this is not sufficient to require an EIA. |
| 10.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, e.g. for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering, or migration, be affected by the project? | No | The site as existing could provide nesting and breeding habitat for Sky Larks and therefore it is likely mitigation of biodiversity off setting will be required. That being said due consideration should be made during the development process. | N/A | This would need to be assessed by way of an ecological appraisal and accompanying surveys. Appropriate mitigation could be secured by way of condition and this is standard mitigation for these types of effects. As above. |
| 11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL | | | | |
| 11.1 Are there any areas or features on or around the location which are protected for their landscape and scenic value, and/or any non-designated / non-classified areas or features of high landscape or scenic value on or around the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ | Yes | The site is not situated within or near a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In addition, the site is not within a Countryside Protection Zone or any other locally protected landscape designation. The site is in close proximity to Important Woodland Area. | No | The maximum height of the solar panels will be around 3m, given the its isolated location and the significant level of screening afforded by the existing vegetation between the site and the nearest properties it is highly unlikely to be visible to any residential receptors. |

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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) |
|---|---|--|--|
| Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local). | | | <p>Although the site will be in close proximity to an Important Woodland and the other non-statutory designated sites the development will likely not harmfully affect the landscape and due consideration should be made during the development and any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>The depth of the woodland and tree belts surrounding the proposed site is such that they provide some screening in winter conditions, as well as they would in summer conditions, even from more elevated locations.</p> |
| 11.2 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 | <p>The panels would be visible from surrounding highways and PROW that adjoining and intersect the site in addition to adjoining properties.</p> <p>It is not considered the visual impacts would be sufficient to require the submission of an EIA however a landscape and visual impact assessment should be submitted taking in account of the public vantage points.</p> | <p>No</p> <p>The proposal has the potential to be visible from the nearby public right of way. There is a strong chance the site could be viewed through the landscaping of the foot paths. There are public rights of way along or adjacent the boundary of the site which means that there would be extensive impact to the character of the rural area for the users of these networks of PROW.</p> <p>It is not considered the visual impacts would be sufficient to require the submission of an EIA however a landscape and visual impact assessment should be submitted taking in account of the public vantage points.</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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | |
| 12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY | | | | |
| <p>12.1 Are there any areas or features which are protected for their cultural heritage or archaeological value, or any non-designated / classified areas and/or features of cultural heritage or archaeological importance on or around the location which could be affected by the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).</p> | Yes | Due to the location of the near archaeological sites there may be the potential to contain significant archaeological remains, however this will be assets in the submission of a planning application. | No | <p>As advised by the Council's Archaeological consultant initially a desk based assessment will be required and depending on its results, there is the potential that a programme of archaeological evaluation will be needed to assess the significance of any heritage assets on the site to inform the planning application.</p> <p>As part of the desk based assessment it is recommended that the cropmarks be digitally rectified as part of this process. Also, there should also be an assessment of the proposed construction technique to be used for the solar farm and how much ground disturbance is proposed.</p> <p>The retention of all cables above ground can significantly reduce the heritage impact on below ground deposits for instance. Depending on the results of the desk-based assessment there is the potential that a programme of archaeological ground truthing evaluation will be needed to</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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>assess the significance of any heritage assets on the site to inform the planning application.</p> <p>The known heritage assets would not, in its own right require an EIA, however, an assessment of these issues in advance of a planning approval may be required.</p> |
| 13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS | | | | |
| <p>13.1 Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?</p> | No | <p>As shown on the submitted plan the main access appears to be connect onto Manuden Road.</p> <p>There is a substantial network of public footpaths in the area and several pass through the site. The proposed development will not result in the closure of any public rights of way, and they will be kept open during construction.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant impacts. The main traffic generated will be during the construction phase with less movements throughout the proposal's operations.</p> <p>It is considered if planning permission is sought then a transport statement should be included.</p> | N/A | <p>A Transport Assessment would need to be carried out as part of any application submission to assess whether the scheme is acceptable and if there would be a detrimental impact in terms of highway and safety.</p> <p>Any future planning application should be accompanied by a Construction Traffic Management Plan, developed in correspondence with the Lead Local Highway Authority, to ensure that construction traffic has a negligible impact on the local highway</p> |
| <p>13.2 Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause</p> | No | <p>The main highways routes surrounding the site are not susceptible to any existing congestions</p> | 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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| environmental problems, which could be affected by the project? | | | | |
| 14. LAND USE | | | | |
| 14.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? E.g. housing, densely populated areas, industry / commerce, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation. | Yes | <p>The Natural England Agricultural Land Classification Map highlights that the site may encompass Grade 2 land, which is considered to be BMV land.</p> <p>The application proposal would also include a package of landscape, ecological and biodiversity benefits. Land between and beneath the panels will be used for biodiversity enhancements.</p> <p>There are several individual or small clusters of dwellings within the vicinity of the site.</p> | No | <p>Soil surveys should be commissioned to assess the grading of the land. The results will be presented in a report that will accompany any future planning application. However, due to the large amount of BMV land within the authority and clear unprecedented need to rapidly increase the amount of renewable energy provides significant weight.</p> <p>Taking this into account and due to the proposed scale of the development and location of existing residential development nearby, this would need to be assessed as part of a LVA to be submitted with the application.</p> |
| 14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project? | No | Not identified | N/A | |
| 15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE | | | | |
| 15.1 Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme /adverse climatic conditions, e.g. temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the | 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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| project to present environmental problems? | | | | |
| 16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS | | | | |
| 16.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase? | Yes | <p>There is currently no similar proposed development in close proximity to this site that have been identified although the Council are currently assessing a couple of applications within the district for similar developments. These are ongoing assessments still awaiting formal decisions and relate to:</p> <p>UTT/21/3356/FUL - Construction and operation of a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar photovoltaic (PV) arrays and battery storage together with associated development, including inverter cabins, DNO substation, customer switchgear, access, fencing, CCTV cameras and landscaping – at Land Near Pelham Substation Maggots End Road Manuden currently being considered</p> <p>UTT/21/0688/FUL- Land At, Cole End Farm Lane, Wimbish UTT/21/2846/FUL- Chesterford Park, Little Chesterford. UTT/21/1833/FUL- Land West Of Thaxted, Cutlers Green Lane, Thaxted</p> | No | <p>These applications are materially the same, Planning permission has been submitted to East Herts because part of the application is with this authority.</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) (<u>only if Yes in part 2a</u>) – Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No or Not Known (?) or N/A) | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | |
| 17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS | | | | |
| 17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ² | Yes | The proposals will result in a cross boundary scheme with the adjoining authority of East Herts. | No | The proposed cross boundary application (above) will reflect the development that crosses over to East Herts authority. |

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

18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

The proposal is Schedule 2 development and taking into account the selection criteria at Schedule 3, it is not considered that there is not likely significant effect. It is therefore concluded that the proposal in not EIA

19. 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 |

20. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)

| | OUTCOME | |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Is likely to have significant effects on the environment | ES required | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Not</u> likely to have significant effects on the environment | ES not required | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| More information is required to inform direction | Request further info | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| NAME | Chris Tyler |
| DATE | 20/1/2022 |

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



Pegasus_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus_Group

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK