

13/05/24

Richard Moore
Enso Energy Ltd
Unit 1 & 2 Cirencester Office Park
Tetbury Road
Cirencester
GL7 6JJ

Dear Sir/Madam

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

REQUEST FOR A SCREENING OPINION UNDER REGULATION 6 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017 (AS AMENDED).

Proposed installation of a battery energy storage system, 400kv substation, associated infrastructure and works

Land at Greenfields Farm Thorney Edge Road Bagnall Staffordshire ST9 9LA

I refer to your request under 6 (1) of the above Regulations for an opinion as to whether the above proposal is EIA development requiring the submission of an Environmental Statement

The proposal is for a battery storage facility. The site extends to approx. 8.9 ha and the proposal would comprise of battery compound (details not provided but maximum height given to be 3m), 400KV substation (maximum height 13m but to sit partly underground), perimeter fencing, underground cabling, internal crushed stone tracks, access improvements to Thorney Edge Road, landscaping/biodiversity enhancements and surface water attenuation measures

The proposal is Schedule 2 development. It falls within Column 1 under 3a) Energy Industry: Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water (unless included in Schedule 1). For such development Column 2 refers to the applicable threshold and criteria being the development area exceeding 0.5 hectares. As this is exceeded in this case, a Screening opinion is required. It is confirmed that the site is not in a sensitive area as defined in the Regulations

In preparing this screening opinion the LPA has had regard to the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations. To assist in determining whether the project is likely to have significant environmental effects the LPA has also had regard to the Indicative thresholds in the Planning Practice Guidance. This advises that key issues to consider include emission to air, arrangements for the transport of fuel and any visual impact.

The LPA also has used the recommended Screening Matrix and this letter should be read in conjunction with that.

Characteristics of the development

The size of this proposal is significantly larger than the threshold area which may suggest an EIA could be needed. The nature of the proposal would be uncharacteristic to its surroundings introducing in effect an industrial compound to a pastoral rural landscape. Furthermore, the scheme includes changes to the local topography; the excavation of land by up to 3m to sink the substation to try and reduce its impact and bunding to screen the development which has the potential in itself to appear incongruous in this landscape. The unnatural land form proposed would change the character of the landscape.

In isolation, the scale of the development is such that it is unlikely to trigger EIA development. However this is now one of 7 energy schemes that are now either consented, pending consideration or subject to appeal and all within the immediate area. There are two consented battery storage schemes to the east of Cellarhead substation (SMD/2022/0444 and SMD/2022/0548). In addition, there are two undetermined applications for BESS schemes at Newfields Farm (SMD/2024/0019); and on land to the South of Cellarhead substation (SMD/2024/0055). There is an undetermined application for a solar array on land to the north of the Cellarhead Substation (SMD/2023/0523) and an appeal for a BESS scheme on land off Armshead Road (SMD/2022/0574) is currently in progress. All of these are within the locality of the subject site, focused around the existing Cellarhead substation and in the same receiving landscape. Together these developments total an area in excess of 100 ha of rural landscape lost to energy development. These would surround the large Cellarhead Substation, which in itself is an urban form of development in an otherwise rural environment. Cumulatively with the existing sub station, other approved developments, and those other energy developments in the area which are under consideration, it is considered that the development could result in a significant landscape and visual effects . A LIVIA would be required with the planning application to assess landscape and visual impact including the cumulative impact and sense of proliferation of energy infrastructure in the receiving landscape.

In terms of ecology and biodiversity effects, the ecology of the site is unknown. However the proposal has the potential to impact upon protected species and habitats. The Wetley Moor SSSI is within 450m. Individually, the development is unlikely to have any significant effect on this SSSI, although the cumulative effects with other schemes as outline above remain unclear. There are ecological considerations that will need to be addressed through the planning application regardless. The risk of a major fire occurring on the site (which could impact a large area in terms of pollutants and potentially cause habitat loss via fire spreading) would need to be included in the consideration in terms of appropriate fire avoidance and management design/ actions during operation.

There are houses nearby whose amenity could be impacted by the proposal as a result of noise emissions from the battery containers, substation and construction traffic. A Noise Impact Assessment will be required to demonstrate that any impact identified can be mitigated so as not to add to ambient noise levels or result in undue disturbance to the occupiers of nearby residential properties. A CEMP would also be expected to minimise noise and other disturbance to amenity during construction. In isolation the proposal is unlikely to lead to significant effects. However if this proposal were to be constructed at the same time as several or all of the other schemes described above, then the effect from construction traffic and construction on site (noise, dust, vibration etc) and noise from the plant and equipment on site once operational could have a significant effect on residential amenity

The proposal it is not anticipated to have any significant environmental effects in terms of use of natural resources, waste, heritage, human health, water resources, land use, land stability and climate change.

However for the reasons expressed above there are characteristics of the development that are considered likely to give rise to significant effects for the purposes of the Regulations

Location of the development

The site is not within a Sensitive area in terms of the Regulations. The site is however within 450m of Wetley Moor SSSI and within the Wetley Moor SSI impact risk zone. Whilst in isolation it may be concluded that the effects on biodiversity are unlikely to be significant, the cumulative effects of all the approved and proposed developments on the SSSI would require greater consideration.

The site is within the Green Belt which is not, in itself, a landscape designation, although the essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its openness and permanence.

The site is within a rural area of pasture land with isolated farmhouses and dwellings. The character of the landscape will completely change for the lifetime of the development. As identified above, there are cumulative effects which would need to be considered in great detail.

Characteristics of the potential impact

This development would be an uncharacteristic feature within the local landscape, although it is noted that similar developments have been approved within the local landscape. In isolation, the type and characteristics of the potential impacts are likely to be relatively localised.

However, this development is one of a number of energy developments in the area, both approved or currently under consideration. Cumulatively, the spatial extent of all of these developments is of a significant magnitude. This is in addition to the existing Cellarhead Substation. The sheer scale of all of the proposed developments, cumulatively, is likely to have a significant landscape and visual effects on the landscape. The developments would result in the loss of the use of agricultural land for the lifetime of the developments, which could have an affect on BMV land and productivity.

If approved, there is a high probability that the developments could be constructed at the same time. Given the cumulative scale of the developments this could lead to a significant scale and intensity of movements on the local highway network, with the site accessed via rural roads. Construction vehicles are likely to be required to move through local settlements to reach the site. The scale of the developments, and the intensity of vehicular movements necessary, could have significant impacts on the overall effectiveness of the highway network. Furthermore, there is a probability of cumulative issues relating to dust, emissions, noise and vibration during construction which could affect the living conditions of the local population and noise from batteries, invertors, plant and equipment once the developments become operational. These matters therefore need to be considered together to ensure the effects can be adequately minimised.

Overall, the LPA is of the opinion that, cumulatively, the potential impacts would be of a magnitude to suggest that an environmental statement is required.

Conclusion

For the reasons noted above, and expanded upon in the attached matrix, it is considered that the development would likely have significant effects on the environment by virtue of cumulative factors such as its nature, size or location.

Under regulation 6 (6) it is hereby confirmed that, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the above development is EIA development in terms of the Regulations.

Should you disagree with this screening opinion then, under 6(10) and 7 of the Regulations, you can request a screening direction from the Secretary of State.

Yours faithfully

13/05/2024

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

Head of Development Services

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	SMD/2023/0639	Brief description of the project / development	PROPOSED INSTALLATION OF A BATTERY ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM, 400KV SUBSTATION, ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS
Applicant	Enso Energy Limited		
LPA	Staffordshire Moorlands DC		
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?			Category 3 Energy Industry a) Industrial installations for the production of electricity
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?			Yes
If YES, which area?			The site is near to the Wetley Moor SSSI
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			Area of development 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)			Yes
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?			Yes
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			Yes
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the applicant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			No

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)	
	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 .	
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	The submission documents and e-mail of the 18 th April 2024 from the Agent confirm that the 13m high substation will be excavated into the ground by approx. 3m to reduce its visual impact. The won spoil will be used to create landscape bunds to further reduce visual impact	No	The effect of the changes to land levels are likely to be fairly localised.
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	Due to land level changes the scheme would use natural resources of land and soil during construction. The use of vehicles and plant during construction would use resources for fuel.	No	The effect on land and soil would not be significant and would be retained/re used on site. Fuel use for this scale of project would not be significant in terms of the Regulations
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 land comprises of fields. The applicant says that the Natural England Provisional Land Classification maps show the site to be located on Grade 4 land	?	NE’s maps tend to be broad scale. A site specific agricultural land classification survey would be expected with the planning application to rule out use of BMV land

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	Waste from the construction phase of development would arise. Operational waste would be unlikely due to nature of the development. The proposal has potential for significant waste on decommissioning unless the elements are re-useable or recyclable	?	Construction waste would be inevitable, and the scale of the scheme is such that the effects are unlikely to be significant. The effects of construction waste can be managed through a CEMP. By e-mail dated 18 th April 2024 the Agent says that on decommissioning all equipment will be removed and recycled ‘where possible’.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	Dust and pollutants from construction vehicles may be generated during construction. There is potential for fire outbreak which could result in air pollutants during the operational phase.	?	Dust and traffic emissions can be controlled through the implementation and agreement of an appropriate Construction Traffic Management Plan. In addition the effects of which would be temporary and limited to the construction of the development. The Fire Service now routinely require Risk Management plans and Emergency Response plans to be drawn up in consultation with the Fire Service to minimise and mitigate risk from fire The matter of cumulative impact is considered elsewhere but in isolation pollution from this project is not considered likely to have significant effects However if this scheme came forward at the same time as others which have been approved or are under consideration in the area, then the potential effects could be significant

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)	
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	During operational phase the development would result in noise from associated plant and machinery, etc. During construction, noise and vibration would arise through traffic, plant and machinery.	?	The rural nature of the site is such that the number of noise sensitive receptors would be limited. A site specific Noise Impact Assessment will be required with the planning application. It is anticipated that mitigation measures will be needed to control noise from the facility and ensure no increase to background levels and no adverse impact on residential amenity. The matter of cumulative impact is considered elsewhere but in isolation noise from this project is not considered likely to have significant effects. However if this scheme came forward at the same time as others which have been approved or are under consideration in the area, then the potential effects could be significant.
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	Potential for contaminants are considered to be limited to construction phase only. This could relate to, for example, fuel spills.	No	Mitigation measures will be required during the construction period in order to prevent any contamination of watercourses which run near to the site. This could be controlled through a CEMP and, in isolation, the effects are likely to be limited in the context of EIA.
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	No	No known existing pollution or environmental damage on or near to the site which could affect the project	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)	
standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?				
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?	Yes	The major accident risk known from such facilities (beyond normal construction risks) is from fire during operation	No	As noted by the Fire Service in a recent and similar project (SMD/2022/0076) there have already been a number of high profile incidents involving BESS sites and learning from these incidents continues to emerge. The Fire service now expects comprehensive Risk Management Plans and Emergency Response Plans to be in place to minimise risk from fire and have appropriate response plans in place It is not considered that with mitigation the effects would be significant in terms of the Regulations
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	There is a potential risk to population during operation due to the nature of the development.	No	The population density of the surrounding area is low, while appropriate management plans could be put in place. Therefore, in isolation, the effects would not be significant.
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	Yes	There is a small stream on the boundary of the south eastern field	No	Significant impacts unlikely, providing reasonable precautions are implemented e.g. pollution prevention, SuDS. A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy would be expected with the

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)	
could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?				planning application. Any effects, in isolation, are not considered to be significant.
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	No designated or non-designated sites are located within or adjacent to the site boundary. Wetley Moor SSSI is located to the south west, within 450m of the site The site is within a Newt Impact Risk Zone	No	Unlikely to be significant with adequate survey, avoidance and mitigation. A CEMP, which could be secured by condition, would ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to avoid, limit or mitigate the effects on any designated site.
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	Species of principal importance and/or their habitats may be affected by the proposed development. The site contains, or is connected to, native hedgerows, trees, ditches, while the fields could be terrestrial habitat.	No	It is likely that the effects could be avoided, mitigated or and compensated for, and as such could be reduced to a level that is not significant. The nature and scale of the development would require the delivery of BNG. A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) can be secured through condition.

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? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes	The site or surrounding is not in an area designated for its high landscape or scenic value. The site and surrounding local landscape lie within the Ancient Plateau Farmlands Landscape character type The site lies within the Green Belt, which is not a landscape designation. Nonetheless, its openness and permanence is an essential characteristic.	?	The development will inevitably result in change to the local landscape character by effectively turning open agricultural fields into an industrial compound. It has the potential to have an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly in the short term. Visual effects could also be adverse from Public footpaths Bagnall 35 and Cheddleton 49, 58, 60 all of which pass along or close to the site boundaries Given the moderate sensitivity of the site, the modest scale of the proposals and the context, the development is not likely to have a significant effect in the context of EIA Regs in isolation. However cumulative effects could be significant – see below
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 lies within a rural location and not adjacent to any major transport routes. However there is a network of public footpaths which pass alongside or close to the site from where there is potential for numerous vantage points. The surrounding area includes scattered housing and other country lanes. The site may be visible from Armshead Road to south/south- west and Thorney Edge Lane to the west across the existing landscape.	?	A LIVIA would be expected with the application to assess these viewpoints. There is scope for mitigatory planting and in isolation it is unlikely to lead to significant effects in terms of the Regulations. However cumulative visual and landscape effects could be more significant because of simultaneous or sequential views with other facilities nearby (either built as in the case of the existing substation, approved or proposed) which would influence the perception of character and appearance of the area

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. 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	The site does not contain any heritage assets. The Supporting Statement refers to the nearest Listed building being the Grade II Listed Stone post approx. 950m to the south east of the site The site is not known to have any potential archaeological importance.		A Heritage Assessment and desk based Archaeological report would be expected with the planning application
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	Various public right of ways on/near the application site, including: • Bagnall 35 • Cheddleton 49, 58, and 60 Bagnall 35 is on the proposed access and could be directly affected by the development, particularly during construction. .	No	Traffic affecting the public footpath would be mainly during the construction period. Traffic can be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted with the planning application to manage and minimise any risks to users of the footpath.
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	The surrounding routes are generally rural with no direct access from the site to main roads.	?	A routing agreement would be required as part of a Construction and Traffic management plan to determine the effect on the local transport network. Views of the Local Highways Authority

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)	
				and Highways England would be provided through the application proposes. In isolation the effects are not likely to be significant and would be short term. However if this project were to be constructed at the same time as 6 other energy schemes in the locality which are either approved or under consideration, then the effects could be significant
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.	No	No land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected.	N/A	
10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	There are no applications or allocations for future land uses which would affect the development.	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?	No	No anticipated issues in respect of land stability and/or climate	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)	
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?	Yes	There a number of submissions for similar developments within the wider area noting that all are either adjacent or close to an existing substation SMD/2022/0444 – Site to north east of Cellardhead substation. Planning permission approved (22/12/22) – facility for 196 battery containers, 98 inverter units, 49 transformer units, application site area 9.42ha (2.58ha of developed area) SMD/2022/0548 – Site to east of Cellarhead substation. Planning permission approved (27/06/23) - facility for 112 battery containers, and 56 transformers, application site area 5.4ha SMD/2022/0574 – Land Adjacent to Armshead Farm (south west of application site. Planning permission refused (26/06/2023). Refused on grounds of effect on Green Belt and landscape (individually and cumulatively). Appeal currently in progress SMD/2024/0019 – Land at Newfields Farm, Rownall Road. Application submitted (22/01/24). 14 battery storage racks, 14 skid solutions (inverters and transformers). Application site extends to 2.48ha (approx. 0.5ha to be developed).	Yes	<u>Operational Phase</u> The effects of the development, once operational is likely to be primarily limited to the cumulative landscape and visual effect of the developments Two scheme have been approved which are located to the east of the Cellarhead substation. Three further battery schemes are pending decision either through application or appeal. These three all lie to the south west of the Cellarhead substation IN addition to this a large solar farm located to the north of the Cellarhead substation is also under consideration. All of these scheme are in close proximity to each other and as such are generally within the same receiving landscape. Cumulatively, the approved and proposed developments, along with the Cellarhead substation itself, would undoubtedly result in an urbanising effect that would change the nature of the landscape in the area if they were all to be approved and constructed. The total land area which would be covered by the developments would amount to circa 97.7ha which is a significant amount of the local landscape. It is acknowledged that not all this land would be developed.

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)	
		SMD/2023/0055 Erection of a Flexible Energy Facility, associated works, landscaping and habitat creation – facility for 248 battery containers, 62 transformers and 124 invertors on a total site of 22.4 ha. The area of the facility where all proposed plant and machinery will be located extends to 4.45 ha. Application submitted (13/2/24) Other Proposals: SMD/2023/0523 - Land At Rownall Farm (to north of Cellarhead substation). Installation of a solar farm comprising ground mounted solar PV panels with a generating capacity of up to 49.99MW. Site 58ha in area. The proposals have the potential to give rise to cumulative effects both during construction (traffic, noise, disturbance) and at operational stage (landscape/visual effects) – if all approved.		The cumulative effects on the receiving landscape are likely to be significant in terms of the EIA regulations In addition to landscape and visual effects, other cumulative effects may arise from noise from the batteries, inverters, transformers if all sites listed opposite were to be developed given their close proximity <u>Construction</u> It is probable that the proposed development, if granted, would be carried out at a similar time to those already consented and those yet to be determined. These are likely to result in significant vehicular movements on the local highway network giving rise to matters relating to the effectiveness of the network and disturbance to residents. It is probable that routing would be through nearby settlements therefore having a greater effect on a wider population. While these matters would ordinarily be considered and controlled appropriately through a CTMP and/or CEMP, these would only consider the effects of the development proposed in isolation. Given the overall scale of the developments, and the nature of the surrounding roads, the effect of construction traffic on the local highway network could be significant. Furthermore, the effect on the local population

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)	
				through dust, emissions, noise and vibration on the local population from the construction traffic could be intensive. As such it is considered that the cumulative effects of the development in this regard would also trigger EIA development.
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	Will not have any impact on the environment of other countries	N/A	

5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

See attached letter

6. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?

Yes

Is it necessary to issue a SD?

Yes

Is an ES required?

Yes

7. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)**OUTCOME**

Is likely to have significant effects on the environment

ES required

✓

Not likely to have significant effects on the environment

ES not required

More information is required to inform direction

NAME Mrs Jane Curley

DATE 01 May 2024