

Sibley, Sally

From: Simmonds, Mark
Sent: 24 February 2015 17:21
To: _planningadvice
Subject: FW: Adams Farm Screening
Attachments: Screening Opinion Adams Farm.docx

Please scan to H02-0019-15 – 3EIA

Thank you

Mark

From: Simmonds, Mark
Sent: 24 February 2015 17:20
To: 'Lewis Smith'
Subject: Adams Farm Screening

Dear Lewis,

Please find attached the Screening Opinion for Adam's Farm.

Regards,

Mark

Mark Simmonds | Planning Officer | South Holland District Council
DDI: 01775 764502 | www.sholland.gov.uk

SCREENING OPINION

Screening Opinion requested by Robert Doughty Consultancy on 19 February 2015

Part 1 – Particulars of case

Reference Number: H02-0019-15

Description of Development: Anerobic Digestion Plant

Location: Adams Farm, Common Drove, Crowland.

Part 2 – Particulars of decision

South Holland District Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 that in its view the development referred to in Part 1 hereof is Schedule 2 development but that this is unlikely to have significant effects on the Environment. **The Council has therefore adopted the screening opinion that the development is not EIA development** having regard to the relevant criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations and the advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance 'Environmental Impact Assessment'. The Council's reasons for reaching this conclusion are set out in the statement overleaf.

Paul Jackson, Planning Manager



Date: 20/2/14

Planning
South Holland District Council
Council Offices
Priory road
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE11 2XE

Statement of Reasons

The proposed development is considered to constitute development identified in Schedule 2, category 3 (a) + (c) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (the “EIA Regulations”) and the site area covered by the proposal exceeds the 0.5 hectare and 500m² respective size criteria relevant to each of these categories.

Further advice and guidance to support the EIA Regulations is contained within the planning Practice Guidance ‘Environmental Impact Assessment’ which was issued in March 2014.

The PPG expands upon the EIA Regulations and provides further guidance in respect of indicative criteria and thresholds which can be used to help determine whether significant effects are likely.

For Category 3 the advice in the regulations is very clear on which levels of development are likely to fall within EIA:

3. ENERGY INDUSTRY			
(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.	Thermal output of more than 50 MW. Small stations using novel forms of generation should be considered carefully.	Level of emissions to air, arrangements for the transport of fuel and any visual impact.
(b) Industrial installations for carrying gas, steam and hot water;	The area of works exceeds 1 hectare.		
(c) Surface storage of natural gas; (d) Underground storage of combustible gases; (e) Surface storage of fossil fuels;	(i) The area of any new building, deposit or structure exceeds 500 square metres; or (ii) a new building, deposit	Storage of more than 100,000 tonnes of fuel. Smaller installations are unlikely to require Environmental Impact Assessment unless hazardous chemicals are stored.	Scale of the development, discharges to water, emissions to air and risk of accidents.

	or structure is to be sited within 100 metres of any controlled waters.		
--	---	--	--

This application is for a much smaller scale development than those set out in the guidance to the EIA regulations as being likely to be EIA.

The development would comprise a small scale anaerobic digestion plant on an existing farmholding to partly serve the needs of that farm and to put surplus into the grid. Whilst the development is over the Schedule 2 threshold for screening it is well within the levels at which PPG advice would indicate for EIA development.

The issues to be considered are: amenity of residential properties through noise and odour; traffic movements; the visual impact of the development.

There would be no **wider significant** impacts outside the immediate vicinity of the site and surrounds and the issues mentioned above can all be assessed by normal Development Management work and any impacts controlled by the use of conditions.

The issues which arise such as highways, amenity, visual impact, etc are all straightforward Development Management (DM) issues pertaining to almost every development site and capable of being assessed and addressed in totality through the normal DM process with any local impacts being mitigated by the imposition of conditions.

The Council does not consider this Schedule 2 development to be of more than local importance, to significantly affect an environmentally sensitive location or result in complex or hazardous effects and therefore it is unlikely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its size, nature or location.

There would be no impacts upon the wider environment and the development is NOT EIA development.