



Department for
Energy Security
& Net Zero

Department of Energy Security and Net Zero
3-8 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW
+44 020 7215 5000
energyinfrastructureplanning@energysecurity.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/desnz

Mr C Leach
Carlton Power Developments No.4
Carlton House
26 Ellerbeck Court
Stokesley
North Yorkshire
TS9 5PT

11 June 2026

Dear Mr Leach,

TRAFFORD POWER PROJECT, CARRINGTON, GREATER MANCHESTER

THE ELECTRICITY WORKS (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) (ENGLAND AND WALES) REGULATIONS 2017 – REGULATION 11 SCREENING DECISION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

1. Thank you for your e-mail dated 28 April 2026 on behalf of Carlton Power Developments No. 4 Limited (“the Applicant”) which provides a ‘Request for Screening Opinion Report’ in association with an application (“Application”) submitted to vary the consent for the Trafford Power Project (“the Power Station”). The Power Station was granted by the Secretary of State on 1 April 2010 under section 36 of the Electricity Act 1989 and previously varied on the 19 November 2014, and 19 October 2016 (‘the S36 Consent’¹).
2. The Application is for a Schedule 2 development under paragraph 3(a) of Schedule 2 of The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (“the 2017 Regulations”). An EIA screening decision is therefore required to determine if the changes proposed to the Power Station (“the Proposed Development”) constitute EIA development.
3. In accordance with Regulation 11(1) and 11(2) of the 2017 Regulations, the Secretary of State must make an EIA screening decision in respect of a Schedule 2 development before dealing further with the Application.

Application background

4. The Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero (“the Secretary of State”) received the Application on the 28 May 2025 to vary the Section 36 Consent for

¹ Reference 88572/CIR/16

the 1931 megawatt (“MW”) combined cycle gas turbine (“CCGT”) generating station at Carrington, Greater Manchester.

5. The Application seeks to:
 - a. transfer the S36 Consent from Wainstones Energy Ltd to Carlton Power Developments No. 4 Ltd;
 - b. reduce the generating capacity; and
 - c. operate using open cycle gas turbines (“OCGT”) or reciprocating gas engine (“RGE”) units that are capable of firing on natural gas and hydrogen, in place of CCGT.
6. The Secretary of State issued an information request on the 15 July 2025 (“the first information request”), requesting that the Applicant provide information to make an EIA screening decision, or to otherwise provide an EIA Report. The Applicant provided information and requested an EIA screening decision on 3 September 2025.
7. The Secretary of State issued a further information request on the 22 September 2025 (“the second information request”). The Applicant provided all additional information on the 28 April 2026. This comprised a ‘Request for Screening Opinion Report’ and a ‘S36C Variation Environmental Information Report’.
8. Officials on behalf of the Secretary of State met with the Applicant online on the 1 October 2025 and 21 April 2026. The purpose of these meetings was to provide the Applicant with the opportunity to seek any necessary clarification on the information requests made in respect of the EIA screening and the information that was required under Regulation 12 of the 2017 Regulations.

Local Planning Authority (“LPA”) consultation

9. Regulation 13 of the 2017 Regulations requires the Secretary of State to consult every LPA for the areas in which the Proposed Development will be carried out to seek its views as to whether an EIA should be undertaken in respect of the Proposed Development.
10. The Secretary of State consulted Trafford Council by letter on 5 May 2026 and the Council responded on 26 May 2026 (ref. 119173/EIASCR/26). Trafford Council considered that an Addendum to the previously submitted Environmental Statement could be an appropriate means to assess the proposed changes to the Power Station as set out in the Proposed Development and associated changes to environmental impacts. Trafford Council noted that it *“would expect to see the necessary pertinent technical documentation relating to noise, lighting, ecological, flood risk and air quality impacts (and potentially contaminated land impacts) accompanying a Planning Application. These assessments should consider impacts associated with the construction and operational phases of development, also taking into account the cumulative impact of existing and consented schemes nearby.”*

11. As Trafford Council did not state in its consultation response if it considered the Proposed Development to be an EIA development or not, the Secretary of State requested clarification via e-mail on the 4 June 2026. The Council responded on the 8 June 2026 that the proposed changes to the development would not constitute EIA development.
12. With respect to the environmental information sought by Trafford Council, the Secretary of State considers that the S36C Variation Environmental Information Report and the information provided enable the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Development to be understood such that an addendum to the Environmental Statement would not be appropriate or necessary.

Screening decision

13. As outlined above, the Secretary of State considers that the Proposed Development is 'Schedule 2 development' requiring screening, as no EIA report was provided, and the Proposed Development is development to provide a change to a generating station which is already authorised and operational, and which may have significant adverse effects on the environment.
14. When considering whether an EIA is required for the Proposed Development, the Secretary of State has taken account of information as required under Regulation 15 of the 2017 Regulations, including the selection criteria in Schedule 3 and the views of the LPA. The Secretary of State concludes that the documents provided with the Applicant's e-mail of 28 April 2026 are sufficient and meet the requirements of Regulation 12, and that the Proposed Development **is not EIA development** under the 2017 Regulations as it is unlikely to have any significant effects on the environment. Therefore, no EIA is required for the Proposed Development.
15. In coming to this decision, the Secretary of State particularly notes the following:
 - The Secretary of State sought in the second information request to clarify the proposed layouts of the OCGT and RGE units which were provided by the Applicant to confirm the size and design of the Proposed Development. There would be no increase in the development footprint; the key physical difference in the consented scheme under the S36 Consent ("the consented scheme") and the Proposed Development is that there is no requirement for heat recovery steam generators and there will be a reduction in the maximum stack height from 85m to 44m.
 - There are no environmental, geological and heritage designations within the Proposed Development site, with the nearest statutory designated nature conservation site over 2km away. There is no pathway to aquatic ecology receptors as a result of abstraction or discharge as no water cooling is now required as part of the Proposed Development.
 - Impacts on designated sites due to atmospheric emissions have been assessed, with no changes to the conclusions for the consented scheme (no likely significant effects identified).

- Existing access will continue to serve the Proposed Development during construction and operation, with a small decrease in the construction and operational traffic required compared to the consented scheme.
- The Proposed Development site consists of private, fenced land with no formal rights of way crossing it, nor any permitted informal recreational use and as such there are no new or different effects identified for public rights of way.
- A comparison on noise emissions between the consented scheme and the Proposed Development demonstrates that noise limits can continue to be met, also noting the OCGT and RTG units would only operate intermittently compared to the consistent noise source of the consented CCGT units. This assessment also considers changes to the baseline since the time of consent and cumulative projects.
- A landscape and visual impact appraisal has been undertaken which demonstrates that there would be no new or different likely significant effects in respect of landscape and visual amenity. This includes the consideration of the potential for visual plumes which are not predicted to occur, as confirmed in updated information following the second information request.
- Broad construction activities associated with the OCGT and RGE do not differ from that previously assessed.
- The flood risk potential remains unchanged as well as the impacts of surface water quality and land contamination.
- Regarding the production of waste and exhaust gasses, it is noted that for the OCGT, when firing on Natural gas, the air quality impacts from emissions of Carbon monoxide (“CO”) and nitrogen dioxide (“NO₂”) would be below the levels predicted for the consented scheme (using CCGT). For the RGE, there would be an increase in NO₂ and CO emissions compared to the consented scheme (using CCGT) or proposed OCGT units. However, air quality modelling demonstrates that these emissions levels would not result in any likely significant effects on human or ecological receptors, and would not change the conclusions of the original EIA for the S36 Consent, that the air quality impacts would be negligible.
- The Secretary of State sought further clarity concerning the emissions associated with the combustion of hydrogen. The Applicant has confirmed that the Proposed Development will be designed to achieve the relevant emission limit values (“ELVs”) if it is fuelled by hydrogen or a hydrogen mix, and the Proposed Development would not have a significant effect on local air quality. It is acknowledged that secondary Nitrogen oxides (“NO_x”) abatement (such as selective catalytic reduction (“SCR”)) may be required to achieve the ELVs when firing on hydrogen. This is subject to the final selection of generating equipment for the Proposed Development. If an SCR system is included in the final development, this may result in a small ammonia slip. An assessment of the impact of ammonia emissions has been undertaken, with the conclusion that the potential additional impact of emissions of ammonia would not change the conclusions that emissions from the Proposed Development would not have a significant effect on local air quality. The Secretary of State considers that the Environmental Permitting regime as administered by the Environment Agency provides a means of ensuring compliance with emission limits.

- Design principles and mitigation measures are in place as part of the consented scheme, which remain relevant and, in most cases, do not require updates (e.g. maximum height of construction equipment, access scheme, scheme for the suppression of dust, scheme for monitoring noise and vibration).
- The scheme for artificial lighting will be resubmitted to the LPA to reflect the new layout but the principals remain the same.
- An Ecological Management Plan has been discharged under Condition 29 of the S36 Consent, further ecological surveys have been undertaken between 2020 and 2024 and revised plan will be produced to refine the landscaping and mitigation to the Proposed Development design to ensure appropriate levels of ecological mitigation are achieved. The Applicant has consulted with relevant stakeholders on this matter.
- No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the Proposed Development (this includes regard to the use of natural resources; the production of waste; pollution and nuisances; major accidents and/or disasters); or, present significant risks to human health.
- It is considered unlikely there would be a potential for any residual effects to accumulate with the effects of other developments to lead to a significant effect. The Secretary of State notes that noise modelling has shown that all cumulative projects could meet their operational noise limits.
- The LPA has stated it considers the Proposed Development (the proposed changes) not to be an EIA development.

This screening decision is provided without prejudice to the outcome of the Secretary of State's consideration and determination of the Application to vary the Section 36 consent.

A copy of this letter has been sent to Mr Jeff Davies at Trafford Council and published on the GOV.UK [Energy Infrastructure Development Applications](#): Decisions webpage for information.

Yours faithfully,

Claire Rannard

Head of Environment and Networks
On behalf of the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero