

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

<b>1. CASE DETAILS</b>			
<b>Case Reference</b>	24/00161/FUL	<b>Brief description of the project / development</b>	Construction, operation and subsequent decommissioning of a renewable energy park comprising ground mounted 49.9MW Solar PV with co-located battery energy storage system (BESS) at the point of connection, together with associated infrastructure, access, landscaping and cabling.
<b>Appellant</b>	N/A		
<b>LPA</b>	RBC		
<b>2. EIA DETAILS</b>			
<b>Is the project Schedule 1 development according to Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations?</b>		No	
<b>If YES, which description of development (THEN GO TO Q4)</b>			
<b>Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?</b>		Yes	
<b>If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?</b>		3 Energy Industry part a) Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water	
<b>Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?</b>		No	
<b>If YES, which area?</b>			
<b>Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?</b>		Yes.	
<b>If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?</b>		The area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare.	
<b>3. LPA/SOS SCREENING</b>			
<b>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)</b>		Yes 23/01010/SCREIA. Albeit the boundary of the site under this application was marginally different around the access point to the northern parcel of the site.	
<b>If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?</b>		Yes under ref 23/01010/SCREIA	
<b>If yes, is the SO/SD positive?</b>		No	
<b>4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT</b>			
<b>Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?</b>		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 REFERRING TO THE PROJECT / DEVELOPMENT.**

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)		C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))	
	Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)		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 <b>reliant on specific features or measures</b> of the project envisaged to avoid, or prevent what might otherwise have been, significant adverse effects on the environment <b>these should be identified in bold</b> .	
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	Gently undulating agricultural land	No	No likely significant effects
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	The project will not utilise above or below ground natural resources.	No	No likely significant effects
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	An Agricultural Land Classification Report has been included as part of the submitted information. All of the site is either in 3b or 4 grade land. None of the site constitutes BMV land.	No	There is no loss of BMV land.

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<b>6. WASTE</b>		
<b>6.1</b> Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes Decommissioning of battery storage. During the operational phase there are unlikely to be significant amounts of waste generated	NA No likely significant effects which could not be dealt with through good practice or condition.
<b>7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES</b>		
<b>7.1</b> Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes The construction and decommissioning phases will result in increased vehicle movements that will create emissions. Potential for dust generation mainly during construction.	No Construction related impacts. A CEMP would be required.  Normal operation is unlikely to result in pollutants.
<b>7.2</b> Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes The construction and decommissioning phases will result in increased vehicle movements that will create noise and vibrations. There is also the potential from noise and vibration from construction associated with ground works that may be required for driving panel mounts or constructing the compound area.	No No likely significant effects. The construction and decommissioning phases could be appropriately controlled via standard condition to restrict construction working hours etc, and incorporated into the CEMP and Decommissioning Plan.
<b>7.3</b> 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 Batteries would be contained within purpose built units, no pollutants would be released. There is some potential for pollution to ground at surface waters arising from spillages of oil/diesels from construction plans and equipment. However, this risk is considered to be consistent with all construction works. The normal operation of the site would not result in release of pollutants.	No The proposal includes a balancing pond basin to slow discharge into the existing Kingston Brook.  Surface water could be protected by condition relation to drainage strategy.

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
<b>7.4</b> 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	No known areas in close proximity to the site. There are no Air Quality Management Areas within the vicinity of the site.	No	No likely significant effects.
<b>8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>				
<b>8.1</b> 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>During the construction phase the contractor(s) would implement measures in accordance with Health and Safety legislation/requirements and good practice to minimise risk of accidents that would have effects on people or the environment. There are no anticipated significant risks of accidents during operation as the proposed development does not involve using hazardous substances. CEMP - no likely significant effects are anticipated.</p> <p>Any risk would be contained within the site through fire monitoring and contamination suppression measures.</p>	No	No significant effects are anticipated.
<b>8.2</b> 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>During construction potential adverse effects to the quality of surface and ground water and air will be minimised through implementation of the CEMP.</p> <p>During operation the proposed development will be of a type and scale not anticipated to cause any significant effects to human health.</p>	No	No significant effects are anticipated.

A Screening Criteria Question	B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)	C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))
	It is considered that there are no significant effects on human health in relation to water contamination or air quality.	
<b>9. WATER RESOURCES</b>		
<b>9.1</b> 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?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The site is entirely within FZ1, with the exception of part of the access to the southern parcel which is within FZ3.</p> <p>There are pockets of high surface water flood risk within the site. Surface water run off will need to be managed during construction and once installation is complete.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy has been submitted in support of the application which details the drainage strategy.</p> <p>All proposed electrical infrastructure is located within flood zone 1.</p> <p>A balancing pond is included in the proposal which collect surface water and would slow discharge to Kingston Brook.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Assessment will be had during the application.</p> <p>No significant effects are expected due to all electrical infrastructure are outside flood zone.</p> <p>A drainage strategy would be included to deal with surface water and conditions to secure measure to any grant of planning permission.</p>
<b>10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)</b>		
<b>10.1</b> Are there any protected areas which are designated or classified for	<p>No</p> <p>The searches found no statutory designated sites within 2km of the proposed development.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Assessment will be had during the application.</p>

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
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))).		<p>Preliminary Ecology Survey has been submitted in support of the application.</p> <p>No objections raised by Ecology Officer.</p> <p>Recommendations made in relation to RAMS and Enhancement measures</p> <p>Applicant would be advised to enter into DLL in relation to Great Crested Newts.</p>		No significant effects are anticipated. Mitigation and enhancement can be conditioned.
<b>10.2</b> 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	An Ecological Assessment report has been submitted with the planning application which identifies habitats or species of importance on site.	No	<p>Mitigation and safeguarded measures have been included in the proposal.</p> <p>No significant impact is anticipated.</p>
<b>11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>				
<b>11.1</b> 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? <sup>1</sup> Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	No	The site is not located within any statutory protected landscape areas and is not covered by a landscape policy. It is not within a 'sensitive area'.	No	It is not within a 'sensitive area'.

<sup>1</sup> See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas.

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<p><b>11.2</b> 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?)</p>	Yes	<p>The rising land to the north of the site will be visible from a number of public rights of way and from residential properties.</p> <p>Although the site would be visible from the public realm and not completely contained, it is not considered highly visible from the surroundings. Views would be limited and localised to the immediate context, including from within the public right of way that crosses the site.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The existing landscape fabric would be retained as there would be no substantial changes to land required, and existing vegetation would be protected during construction. Planted mitigation can be used to provide landscape integration and visual screening. An alteration of the land management regime for boundary vegetation to allow this to grow taller. The public right of way would be maintained within the site. Whilst there would be an impact from the scheme, this is likely to be localised and insignificant. Over the long term, the impact of the development would be reversed upon decommissioning.</p> <p>Impacts and mitigation can be considered as part of the application.</p>
<b>12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY</b>			
<p><b>12.1</b> 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	<p>Identified listed properties within or close to Wysall to the west of the site.</p> <p>Holy Trinity Church grade I listed Manor Farm house grade II listed</p> <p>Highfields grade II listed</p> <p>Conservation Areas are located in the nearby villages of Costock, Wysall and Wymeswold.</p> <p>A heritage appraisal has been submitted in support of the application</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The ZTV illustrates that the proposed development would not be highly visible from the heritage assets.</p> <p>An archaeology investigation would inform appropriate mitigation measures which could be secured by condition to any grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Mitigation such as landscape screening and archaeological field evaluation and recording would be able to be secured through planning conditions.</p>



<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
		There is potential for unknown buried archaeology to be present on the site and an archaeology desktop survey has been submitted with the application. Nottinghamshire County Council has been consulted on the application with supporting information to identify archaeological studies at the site.		
<b>13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS</b>				
<b>13.1</b> 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	Midshire way runs through the site connecting to small footpaths.	No	<p>The footpath would be maintained as part of the proposed site layout. Impacts on public routes would be temporary and insignificant.</p> <p>A construction traffic management plan would highlight measures to ensure the footpaths are not impacted and remain free from obstruction.</p> <p>The submitted LVIA assess the levels of perceived impact for users of nearby routes and inform mitigation landscape strategy.</p>
<b>13.2</b> 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	<p>The site is in a rural location that is not typically susceptible to congestion. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be prepared on support of a future application and this would include details of how traffic would be managed on approach to the site.</p> <p>Construction traffic would be modest and short term. Once operations access would be infrequent for maintenance visits only.</p>	No	<p>Construction traffic is Not intended to go through the village.</p> <p>Existing access points to the site would be used where possible.</p> <p>There would be traffic generated during construction and decommissioning. Any impact on the public highway during the construction phase would be temporary in nature. A Construction Access Plan could be secured by</p>



<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>		<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>	
				planning condition. It is not envisaged that significant effects will arise.
<b>14. LAND USE</b>				
<b>14.1</b> 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	The site is currently in agricultural use. This use may continue around the panels once installed. Therefore the existing land use will not be adversely effected.	No	Construction and decommissioning impacts would be temporary and managed through CEMP and Decommissioning Plan. The proposal would be largely self-contained once operational. Significant effects on the operation of neighbouring land uses are not expected.
<b>14.2</b> Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	The site is currently in agricultural use. This use may continue around the panels once installed. Therefore the existing land use will not be adversely effected.	No	No significant impact is anticipated.
<b>15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE</b>				
<b>15.1</b> 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	The location is not identified as one with land stability or climate implications that would affect the proposed development	No	No significant impact is anticipated.

<b>A Screening Criteria Question</b>	<b>B Response to the Screening Criteria Question in Column A (Yes/No and explanation of reasons)</b>	<b>C Is a Significant Effect Likely? (Yes/No and explanation of reasons (nb if the answer in Column B is 'No', Column C is not applicable))</b>
<b>16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>		
<b>16.1</b> Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	Yes  Careful consideration of cumulative impact will be required. Planning permission has been given on the site adjacent to the west ref 22/00303/FUL.	No  A landscape and visual impact assessment has been submitted which considers cumulative visual impact of this and other approved development in the surrounding area. 22/00303/FUL  The LVIA concludes that cumulative visual impact is limited to longer range views of the site and when travelling closer to the site on the highway at speed.  Assessment during the course of the application and conditions where appropriate.
<b>17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS</b>		
<b>17.1</b> Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? <sup>2</sup>	No  It is not considered to result in any transboundary effects.	

<sup>2</sup> 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

Taking account of the characteristics of the development and location of the development away from sensitive areas, as listed within schedule 3, the development is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment.

The site is not located within a 'sensitive area' as defined within Regulation 2(1). The site boundary has been reduced compared to the previously screened site.

Overall, based on the information submitted by the applicant, the previous Screening Opinion and Officers independent assessment of the site and proposal, it is considered that the main impacts arising from the operation of the scheme would comprise the landscape and visual impact of the proposal, and any potential archaeology and ecology at the site. Impacts arising during construction and decommissioning, such as changes in traffic patterns, noise and vibration, although these would be temporary in nature.

In view of the character of the project, its location, the types and characteristics of potential impact, and mitigation measures that would be employed to manage its impacts which could be secured by planning conditions, it is considered that the development would be unlikely to have significant effects in EIA terms. As such an environmental impact assessment is not required for the project.

## 19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	NA
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	No
Is an ES required?	No

## 20. 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	X
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	

## 21. REASON FOR SCREENING

The project proposed is screened, in accordance with current practice, under Schedule 2 Section 3 (a) as it is an energy industry development for an industrial installation for the production of electricity and the area of the proposed development project exceeds 0.5 hectares.

<b>NAME</b>	Gareth Elliott
<b>DATE</b>	22/05/2025

<b>NAME</b>	Andrea Baxter
<b>DATE</b>	04/06/2025