



Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
Lincolnshire PE11 2XE

Via email: james@greenenergy-int.com

10th December 2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

PLANNING: PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE

Reference: PE-00298-20 **Case Officer:** Lucy Buttery
Location: Caudwell Farms, Holbeach St Matthew
Proposal: Proposed 49.9MW solar PV development at Caudwell Farms

I am writing in reply to your pre-application enquiry regarding a proposed 49.9MW solar PV development at Caudwell Farms, Holbeach St Matthew.

The starting point for assessing such a proposal is Policy 31 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (2019) (SELLP) - Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. Part B of that policy sets out the circumstances in which renewable energy facilities, associated infrastructure and the integration of decentralised technologies will be permitted. Such development "will be permitted provided, individually, or cumulatively, there would be no significant harm to:

1. visual amenity, landscape character or quality, or skyline considerations;
2. residential amenity in respect of: noise, fumes, odour, vibration, shadow flicker, sunlight reflection, broadcast interference, traffic;
3. highway safety (including public rights of way);
4. agricultural land take;
5. aviation and radar safety;
6. heritage assets including their setting; and
7. the natural environment.

Provision should be made for post-construction monitoring and the removal of the facility and reinstatement of the site if the development ceases to be operational."

Assessing the proposal against the above:

1. South Holland lies within the Fens National Character Area, which is notable for its large-scale, flat, open landscape with extensive vistas to level horizons. It is noted that there are long views of and over the site, thus the development of a solar farm of this scale will have some degree of visual impact on landscape character. However, there is scope to incorporate mitigation in the form of landscaping given the scale of the site. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will be required to identify sensitive receptors and appropriate

mitigation.

2. It is noted that there are a small number of residential properties in the vicinity of the site. There is the potential for there to be disturbance during the construction and decommissioning phases, therefore a Construction Management Plan detailing how disturbance during these phases through noise, dust, vibration etc. will be minimised. Disturbance during the operation phase is likely to be minimal as only low levels of noise will be generated by electrical systems such as transformers and the substation. Solar panels only generate electricity in daylight hours and so there will be negligible noise in the evening, at night and early morning. Vibration will be limited to the construction period (excavation). Although not generally considered a material planning consideration, there is the potential for the outlook of residents to change but a site of this scale provides scope to mitigate any impact beyond the immediate term through landscaping. There are no properties located to the south of the site for some distance, thus glint and glare should not be a problem.

3. The operational vehicle movements associated with solar farm developments are typically very few in number. Rather it is the construction phase and the decommissioning phase that have the greatest impact upon the local highway network. It is therefore suggested that any application for the proposed development should include a Construction Traffic Management Plan which describes how delivery vehicle movements will be programmed so as to manage their frequency and the routing of movements to minimise the disruption to other road users. Delivery vehicles must not be queuing on the public highway whilst waiting to be unloaded so the Construction Traffic Management Plan should also cover the measures for unloading and storage within the site prior to the arrays and hardware being transported to their eventual mounting position. It is expected that there will be several delivery points. Corresponding arrangements will need to be made for the removal of components upon decommissioning of the facility. The Highways Authority have been consulted and have raised no objections subject to an appropriate Construction Traffic Management Plan.

4. The solar farm would occupy a large proportion of Grade 1 agricultural land (various land areas are quoted in the supporting document). However, there is the potential for grazing sheep, thereby allowing some agricultural activity to continue. Furthermore, as the development is decommissioned, effects should be reversible and the land arguably more fertile.

5. No conflict anticipated. There are already ground mounted solar panels (albeit in a smaller number) installed at Caudwell Farm.

6. The Historic Environment Officer at Lincolnshire County Council has been consulted as part of the pre-application enquiry process. It has been advised that they are not aware of any below ground archaeology in or around the site, and thus would not recommend any archaeological input be required. However, Hartley House Farm is a historic farmstead, which is located just outside of the site to the north, and can be considered as a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 189 and SELLP Policy 29(f), it is recommended that any application be required to describe the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, assess the impact of the proposal on the setting and, if necessary, suggest mitigation measures.

7. The site is close to wildlife reserves with statutory protection, as well as a priority habitat. As such, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust have been consulted on the proposal. They have highlighted that there is a significant opportunity to create a biodiverse site that becomes part of the nature recovery network for the area and biodiversity net gain is expected, with the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 being utilised. A full ecological report should be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist to support any planning application. This should include a desk

study, with a data search from the Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre to identify protected species or habitats on site and in the vicinity. It should also assess any features of the site that may support protected species. More detailed surveys may be required if any potential disturbance or displacement of protected species or their habitat is highlighted. We would also expect to see that local provenance seed mixes, trees and hedging plants are specified and used. Advice on maximising biodiversity benefits through solar developments is available in *BRE (2014) Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments*, Eds G E Parker and L Greene. This guidance document recommends that a Biodiversity Management Plan should be produced for each solar farm, which should detail the conservation objectives for habitats and species present, provide information on how new habitats are to be established, and the ongoing management and monitoring practices required to achieve the objectives. In addition to the impacts of the solar farm itself, the ecological report should also assess any potential consequences of the construction stage and any transport scheme, such as road widening which may be required and should include details of how potential impacts may be avoided, mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

I have attached the full RSBP response due to its length and will forward Natural England's comments when received.

Policies 2, 3 and 30 of the Local Plan reiterate a number of the criteria referenced above.

I hope the above will be helpful in taking the proposal forward.

For large scale and unique applications we do offer applicants the opportunity to present the proposal to members of the Planning Committee prior to the submission of a planning application in order for them to highlight any concerns they may have early on. If this is something you may wish to do, please let me know.

Please note: This planning advice is given in good faith but is an officer opinion only and therefore is not binding on any formal decision the Council may make following the receipt of a planning application.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'L. Buttery'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name 'L.' and the last name 'Buttery' clearly visible.

Lucy Buttery, Principal Planning Officer
lbuttery@sholland.gov.uk

PROPOSED SOLAR PARK CAUDWELL FARM, HOLBEACH ST MATTHEW

RSPB Comments

In summary we feel that it is unlikely there will be any impacts caused by loss of agricultural land, as a result of disturbance during construction phase and from the park following completion.

The location and size of the farm and proposed solar park within the wider landscape suggests any birds currently using the land and features where the solar park is proposed will adapt and move elsewhere within the farmed landscape.

A few measures, should be considered which might enhance the final product and provide net gain and which would attempt to soften what might otherwise be an artificial, relatively sterile installation:

- Sowing the area with a wildflower/grass mix to provide nectar-rich plants to support pollinator insect species, as opposed to the usual rough grass seed mix which is used.
- Providing nest boxes for small birds along the perimeter fence.
- Planting native hedgerow species to both create and connect habitat. Mention is made of planting ivy and clematis to conceal the perimeter fence! We strongly suggest this idea is not pursued.
- Ensuring as part of aftercare hedgerows are managed sympathetically, are allowed to mature and not flailed indiscriminately.
- Ensuring as part of aftercare that maintenance of the field layer isn't over-zealous and allows species such as skylark and small mammals to colonise enhancing the biodiversity value. Presence of small mammals might attract species such as barn owl and kestrel. Provision of owl and/or kestrel nest boxes might be a positive step.

The way the document is structured doesn't help the reader to understand the proposal and glean essential facts and details from the outset. Adding an overview or summary at the start would be extremely useful. The reader needs to read to:

- Page 39 to find out the proposed area of the solar park, and the area quoted (200acres) is an estimate
- Page 43 to learn the likely power generation
- Page 47 to learn about decommissioning, page 49 to learn how long the construction phase will last.

There are inaccuracies throughout the document, which make it difficult in some cases to understand the true intent of the proposal, and in some instances affects the credibility of the information within the proposal document.

- One such example is the area of the proposed development. Four different extents are quoted – 388ha, c200 acres, 11ha and 69ha. The final figure of 69ha as presented on the site schematic on Page 44 seems to be the most reasonable. **Can this be confirmed?**
- Three primary impacts are identified within the proposal- those on nearby settlements; those on RAF Holbeach and those on the South Holland landscape. We would add the potential that there might be a likely significant effect on the Wash SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar.

- The predominant wind direction is quoted as coming from the north east. Most of the UK is influenced by the jet stream with an associated wind direction from the south west. We don't think this point has a material influence on the proposal but question the accuracy.
- The Wash is referred to as a nature reserve. The Wash is a designated and protected site, some parts of which are classified as a nature reserve. It is important to recognise the reasons for which the site has been designated and to consider how the proposed solar park might impact or have a likely significant effect on protected species.
- Bird species which might be affected might be:
pink footed goose, which feed on sugar beet tops following harvest
species such as ruff, lapwing and golden plover displaced from the intertidal mudflats on high tide.
- We suggest some winter bird surveys could be carried out to confirm presence or absence of species and provide information on their use of and distribution across South Holland adjacent to the proposal.
- We also suggest breeding bird surveys might help target positive conservation measures, enhance the development and provide additional information for future solar park proposals.
- The South Holland Internal Drainage Board are responsible for managing and maintaining the network of drains and operation of drainage pumps within the area, which controls and regulates the water levels across the whole area.
- The Wash is described as 'being composed of swamp and marshland.' It isn't. It is made up of intertidal mudflats and saltmarsh. It is doubtful whether anyone using the path on the main floodbank on the south side of the Wash, would notice the solar park, which would be 2km away and if the solar panels face to the south.

Other comments

Section 05.3, third paragraph refers to the terrain as being swampland! The soils in the area are fertile not because the coastline creates mineral-rich soils and fertile land, but because of geology and because pre-industrial age the fens hadn't been drained.

Section 06.1 makes mention of landscaping and biodiversity enhancements, but there is no subsequent section which expands on or describes these enhancements.

Page 43 – mention is made of a Biodiversity Management Strategy and ecological enhancements, but there is no subsequent information in the document

06.2 page 45 quotes a gap of 10cm between the bottom of the perimeter fence and ground will allow unhindered movement of badgers and foxes across the site. We suggest this is changed to a more realistic 30cm.

Page 46 – use of acronyms; RAL green, HV room and DNO – define the term when it is first used along with the acronym to enable the reader to better understand and process information.

Page 47 – mention of decommissioning but not how the decision will be made and by whom.

Page 51 5th paragraph – suggest any screening plants are of native origin and clematis isn't used!

Page 56 – it would be helpful if the acronyms in the glossary were put in alphabetical order.

Ian Robinson 2nd December 2020

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	Caudwell Farm, Holbeach St Matthew	Brief description of the project / development	49.9MW Solar PV Development
Appellant	Green Energy International Ltd		
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?		Yes	
If YES, which area?		The Wash	
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)		(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	Elevation of electrically sensitive infrastructure and/or construction of a bund as a flood mitigation measure.	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		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	Site comprises of Grade 1 agricultural land.	No	Higher grade agricultural land 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 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?	No		N/A	
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	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.
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	Possible raising of ground levels to elevate electrically sensitive infrastructure and/or construction of a bund as a flood mitigation measure.	No	Any issues may be controlled by condition.
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		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?	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		N/A	
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 could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	Yes	IDB and High Priority Watercourses adjoin and run through the site. The site is also approx. 2.8km from The Wash coastline.	No	Not likely to have a significant impact due to the nature of the development proposed and limited output/run-off.
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	Yes	The Wash (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar site and NNR) is approx. 2.8km to the north.	Yes	Natural England have previously highlighted that the site is within 'functional land' for the SSSI. Functional land are areas of land outside of the boundary of a European site that may be important ecologically in supporting 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)
<p>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))).</p>			<p>populations for which the site has been designated or classified. Impacts to functional land can potentially have a significant effect upon the species interest of such sites, where these habitats are considered to be functionally linked to the designation. Such land is therefore 'linked' to the European site in question because it provides an important role in maintaining or restoring the population of qualifying species at favourable conservation status.</p> <p>The site is within a zone marked as a feeding and roosting area for Pink Footed Geese and functionally linked with the Wash Special Protection Area. This agricultural and pasture land which borders the SPA also provides overspill foraging for curlew, oystercatcher, dunlin and black-tailed godwit during high tides (see SPA citation).</p> <p>Detailed bird surveys would therefore be required to enable an assessment of the potential impacts of the solar farm and whether it would result in a likely significant effect on the integrity of the European site. The assessment should include a strategy for mitigating any identified impacts on this species and provide sufficient information for the Council to undertake a Habitats Regulation Assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>The RSPB have also raised concerns about the potential for an effect on birds such as Pink-Footed Geese and Curlew.</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)	
				<p>Winter bird counts will be needed to determine bird usage in and around the proposed development. The RSPB advise that to capture the essential information counts would likely be required during each of the months between September and April as absolute limits, but more important between November and February.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal is in an area that is likely to be sensitive by virtue of the avian species located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project. Given that both the RSPB and Natural England have indicated that further surveys are required to determine the likely impacts of the proposal it must be assumed that a significant effect is possible.</p>
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	See above	Yes	See above
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	No		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)	
the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).				
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	<p>There are a very small number of properties within a 1km radius of the site.</p> <p>The Holb/4/3 Public Right of Way (PROW) runs through the site, however introducing further planting/screening would reduce its prominence. Approximately half of the PROW is already screened by hedgerow which could be continued along the rest of its length within the site.</p>	No	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 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).	Yes	Although it is unlikely that there is any below ground archaeology in or around the site, Hartley House Farm is a historic farmstead and can be considered a non-designated heritage asset.	No	Effects not expected to be significant given the intervening screening (trees, hedgerows and buildings) and the farmstead is considered in the context of the modern obtrusive farm buildings within the farm complex, as well as the existing solar arrays and reservoir to the south.

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)	
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	The Holb/4/3 Public Right of Way (PROW) runs through the site.	No	There is the potential for the proposed development to have an impact on views from the PROW. However, the impacts are localised and could be mitigated by introducing further planting/screening. Approximately half of the PROW is already screened by hedgerow which could be continued along the rest of its length within the site.
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, farm/agricultural holdings, forestry, tourism, mining, quarrying, facilities relating to health, education, places of worship, leisure /sports / recreation.	Yes	The site is within the countryside and only a small number of residential properties lie within 1km 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. In terms of visual impact, the majority of properties are either screened by on-plot planting or there is intervening screening that would minimise views of the proposed development.
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	

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)	
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	
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 a significant effect is likely on natural resources, residential amenity/human health, waste, water resources, transport routes, historic 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.

However, the proposal is in an area that is likely to be sensitive by virtue of the avian species located on or around the location and which could be affected by the project. Given that both the RSPB and Natural England have indicated that further surveys are required to determine the likely impacts of the proposal it must be assumed that a significant effect is possible.

Accordingly, the Local Planning Authority, in line with Regulation 5 of the Regulations, has determined that the development proposed is Environmental Impact Assessment development and will require an Environmental Statement to be submitted.

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?	Yes

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 Buttery – Principal Planning Officer
DATE	30 April 2021