

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	CCC/23/110/FUL	Brief description of the project / development	Farm-based anaerobic digestion renewable energy facility, construction of vehicular access/road to A1307, associated infrastructure and landscaping
Applicant	C Covey, Streetly Hall Farm		
LPA	Cambridgeshire County Council		
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)			
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?			Yes
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?			11 (b) Installations for the disposal of waste (unless included in Schedule 1) (ii) the area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare; and (iii) the installation is to be sited within 100 metres of controlled waters.
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?			No
If YES, which area?			
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			11 (b) (ii) The area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare; and (iii) the installation is to be sited within 100 metres of controlled waters
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?			
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			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) Briefly explain reasons and, if applicable and/or known, include name of feature(s) and proximity to site(s)	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)) 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.
--------------------------------------	--	--

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?	Yes	The proposed development site (the site) is land which is currently between 88 and 71 metres AOD from southeast to northwest. It would be graded to create an area of 6.7 hectares with a less steep gradient on which to construct the plant and buildings. Digestate and water storage lagoons would be constructed at the northwest of the site.	No	The relatively small changes in land levels would not be significant in the wider landscape and would be mostly obscured by the plant and buildings which would occupy most of the site.
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?	Yes	6.7 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land. The feedstock would be transported to the site in vehicles which would be fuelled by diesel. The construction phase would also use diesel-powered delivery vehicles and plant. The process would require a net input of 25,000 m ³ of water per year of which 15,000 m ³ is expected to be rainwater captured on site, the rest mains water. The water is combined with the feedstock as it enters the AD process and leaves as the moisture content of the digestate.	No	This is a very small proportion of the land within a 1,000 ha farm business, all of which is grade 2. Diesel, although non-renewable is not in short supply. Although the site is within one of the driest areas of the UK, the use of around 70m ³ of water per day, most of which is expected to be harvested from within the site, is unlikely to have a significant effect on the environment.

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))	
<p>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?</p>	Yes	<p>High quality agricultural land as 5.2 above.</p> <p>The site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk.</p>	No	<p>As 5.2 above.</p> <p>Chalk is abundant in the area and very little would be affected by the proposed development. Soil investigations and material testing show that in the area of the site the chalk is low quality and arisings could potentially be used a general fill.</p>
6. WASTE				
<p>6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?</p>	Yes	<p>The construction phase would produce some excavation waste comprising soil and underlying chalk and from building materials.</p>	No	<p>See 5.3 above in respect of chalk. The soil would be used in bunds which are part of the landscaping scheme. Many of components of the buildings and plant would be manufactured off site reducing the likelihood of construction waste.</p>
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
<p>7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?</p>	Yes	<p>The combined heat and power (CHP) unit and power to heat (PTH) module would produce combustion gases. A flare would be used to vent biogas if necessary. The feedstock and digestate storage could emit pollutants to air.</p>	No	<p>The applicant's Air Quality Assessment (Redmore Environmental ref. 5949-1r2 dated 21 August 2023) provides the results of dispersion modelling which predicts that impacts on pollutant concentrations would not be significant at any human receptor location. Emissions from the plant are predicted not to significantly affect existing conditions at designated ecological habitats.</p>
<p>7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?</p>	Yes	<p>Plant and machinery including delivery vehicles would cause noise during the construction phase.</p>	No	<p>The construction period would be temporary (approximately 62 weeks) and take place between 07:30 and 17:00 Mondays to Fridays and 09:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. Workers</p>

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))
		<p>The fixed and mobile plant including feedstock delivery and digestate collection vehicles would cause noise during the operational phase.</p> <p>Motion sensing lights would be used near gates, access points, technical control rooms and feed hopper locations. Temporary lights may be needed at the silage clamps during harvest.</p>	<p>would arrive from 07:00 and deliveries would be after 08:00.</p> <p>The proposed operating hours are 07:00 to 19:00 7 days per week, although some processes would be continuous. The applicant's Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) (Professional Consult ref. 22.095.1.R2 dated 4 August 2023) concludes that during the daytime, the rated level of noise from the operation of the project would not exceed the typical background sound level at the closest residential receptor and during the night-time period, the level of noise would be below the internal noise criteria level for bedrooms. During the construction phase the predicted noise level would be below the guidance contained in BS 5228 for rural areas. The noise from HGVs on the proposed new access road would be below the predicted level of noise from the A1307. The NIA indicates a low impact level of noise from the project and that mitigation measures are not needed.</p> <p>Any lights in fixed positions above doorways/entrances would have shrouds facing downward. It is unlikely that the fixed and temporary lights would have a significant effect on the amenity of the occupiers of the nearest dwellings or on ecology.</p>
<p>7.3 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The site is underlain by chalk and is within a groundwater protection zone. The AD facility involves the storage and handling of food and agricultural waste and farm crops which could result in contaminants reaching ground or surface water.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The proposed surface water drainage scheme would discharge all rainwater collected within hardstanding, surface water drains, concrete apron area and containment bund into an on-site holding lagoon, with no off-site outfall. It would be used within the plant processes.</p>

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))	
				The digestion process would take place in tanks from which there is little risk of escape of contaminants to land or water.
7.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g. where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?	No	It is intensively farmed arable land.	N/A	
8. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
8.1 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	The construction methods and operational processes are not complex or unusual. Any accidents would be of a scale that could be contained within the site.	N/A	
8.2 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	The site is in a sparsely populated rural area. See 7.1 and 7.3 above.	N/A	
9. WATER RESOURCES				
9.1 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	The site is in flood zone 1. A small stream runs along the northwestern boundary of the application site. The site is underlain by chalk and is within a groundwater protection zone.	No	The land closest to the stream would becoming a tree belt and wildflower meadow. See 7.3 above.

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))
10. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)		
<p>10.1 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))).</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p><u>National</u> Balsham Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) 1 kilometre to the northwest; and Over and Lawn Woods SSSI 2.2 kilometres to the east. The site is within the Impact Risk Zone for Balsham Wood SSSI and the proposed development is of type where consultation with Natural England is required.</p> <p><u>Local</u> Borley Wood County Wildlife Site (CWS) 1.3 kilometres to the west; Hare Wood CWS 1.9 kilometres to the southeast; and Leys Wood CWS 2.3 kilometres to the northeast.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The applicant's Ecological Assessment (Norfolk Wildlife Services 2022.095) considers that the separation distances and intervening habitats would act as buffers to any negative impacts of the proposed development on designated sites during the construction and operational phases. There is reason to dispute this.</p>
<p>10.2 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The applicant's Ecological Assessment identified a badger sett adjacent to the survey area; a moderate risk of hedgehog being present within the development area; and a high risk of nesting birds, brown hare and foraging bats being present.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>With mitigation such as the closure of the badger sett under licence from Natural England for the construction phase; covering trenches to prevent hedgehog and brown hare getting trapped; wildlife-sensitive lighting; and undertaking vegetation clearance outside the bird nesting season the impacts would not be significant.</p>
11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL		
<p>11.1 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</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The site is within the South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands National Character Area but is not protected by formal designation. It is a gently undulating, rural landscape typical of the area likely to be highly valued by those who live, work and spend leisure time in it.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The proposed development would include buildings and infrastructure similar in scale, design and purpose to large-scale agricultural development. Whilst there is likely to be some impact on the landscape it is not considered to be significant in EIA terms.</p>

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))	
the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).				
11.2 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?)	No	The site is within a sparsely populated rural area. The applicant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Broom Lynne October 2023) identifies that the most of the 16.1 metres high digesters and most of the 12 metres high feedstock storage barn would be theoretically visible from the higher land to the west and north of the site including from public rights of way. There are few properties within this zone, and all are at least 1 km from the site. It is acknowledged that parts of the proposed development would be visible, but not to many people and from long distances.	N/A	
12. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
12.1 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	Yes	<u>National</u> (listed buildings) Streetly Hall Farmhouse (Grade II) 300 metres southeast; Horseheath Lodge (Grade II) 1 km southwest; Church of St Mary, West Wickham (Grade II*) 1.25 km northeast; and West Wratting Park House (Grade II*) 3.25 km north	No	The applicant's Historic Environment Desk-based assessment (GHC Archaeology & Heritage Ltd August 2023) concludes that the proposed development site makes no contribution to the significance of the Grade II* listed buildings and that the impact of the proposed development would be neutral on Streetly Hall Farmhouse. There would be no

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

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))
<p>on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).</p>	<p><u>Regional</u> The proposed access road would cross the Via Devana, a Roman road. The nearest section designated as a scheduled monument is Worstead Street 4.7 km to the northwest.</p> <p><u>Non-designated</u> A geophysical survey of the proposed development site has identified several features of potential archaeological interest, probably boundary feature.</p>		<p>visibility between Horseheath Lodge and the proposed development site.</p> <p>The part of the Roman Road that would be directly affected by vehicles serving the proposed development is approximately 10 metres in length, overlain by a metalled track which is already used by farm vehicles. The impact from use by additional traffic is not considered likely to be significant.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that the impact of the proposed development on features of archaeological interest would be significant in the context of EIA.</p>
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS			
<p>13.1 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?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The access from the site to the A1307 would cross public bridleway No. 21, Horseheath changing its surface in this location.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>During peak operational months (June, July, September & October) there would be 46 vehicle movements Spread across a 12-hour working day would amount to an average of about 4 per hour.</p> <p>During the 62-week construction phase there is likely to be up to 185 HGVs per week accessing and egressing the site i.e. 370 crossings of the bridleway. Over a 5½ day working week this would be 13 crossings per hour.</p> <p>The impact on each use of the bridleway would be of short duration and not be significant.</p>
<p>13.2 Are there any transport routes on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The A1307 from which the proposed development would derive access is not susceptible to congestion in this rural area.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

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))	
environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?				
14. LAND USE				
14.1 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	The site is in a sparsely populated rural area where the principal land use is agriculture.	N/A	
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	None known. The site is in a rural area where land uses not connected to agriculture are not generally supported.	N/A	
15. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
15.1 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	The site is not in an area of extreme climatic conditions or susceptible to earth movements.	N/A	
16. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
16.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No	The site is in a rural area where existing development is domestic or related to agriculture.	N/A	

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))
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS		
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No The site is not near a national boundary and any impacts would be local to the site.	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.

18. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

The proposed development is an anaerobic digestion (AD) facility which would use 60,000 – 75,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of agricultural waste and energy crops from the applicant's and other local farms to generate approximately 750 cubic metres of biomethane per hour for export to the gas grid. The principal elements of the development would be four digester/post digester tanks (30 metre diameter x 16.1 metres high including dome); four silage clamps; feedstock storage building (80 x 36 x 12.6 metres high); straw barn (50 x 20 x 11.6 metres high); covered digestate lagoon (15,260 m²); and surface water lagoon (1,100 m²).

The proposed development meets the criteria in Schedule 2 paragraph 11 (b) (ii) and (iii) so needs to be screened.

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that in general, the more environmentally sensitive the location, the lower the threshold will be at which significant effects are likely. The proposed development would not be in a sensitive area as defined in the Regulation 2 (1) or likely to affect one (see 10.1 and 12.1 above in respect of SSSI and scheduled monuments).

The PPG Annex: Indicative screening thresholds provides further criteria to help determine whether significant effects are likely from Schedule 2 development. For installations for the disposal of waste: "Installations (including landfill sites) for the deposit, recovery and/or disposal of household, industrial and/or commercial wastes where new capacity is created to hold more than 50,000 tonnes per year, or to hold waste on a site of 10 hectares or more. Sites taking smaller quantities of these wastes, sites seeking only to accept inert wastes (demolition rubble etc.) or Civic Amenity sites, are unlikely to require Environmental Impact Assessment."

The PPG goes on to indicate what the key issues to consider are. For waste management installations these are the scale of the development and the nature of the potential impact in terms of discharges, emissions or odour.

The proposed development would create new capacity of 60,000 – 75,000 tpa which is 20 – 50% above the indicative criterion of 50,000 tpa. The application site area is 11.17 hectares which includes 3.8 hectares of trees and wildflower meadow to deliver biodiversity net gain.

It is considered that the capacity of the proposed plant alone would not necessarily give rise to significant environmental effects. Discharges to air, land and water have been considered in the responses to questions 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 8.2, 9.1, 10.2 and 13.2 above. For the reasons set out in questions 5.1 to 17.1 above it is considered that the construction and operation of the proposed AD plant would be unlikely to give rise to significant effects on the environment.

19. SCREENING DECISION

If a SO/SD has been provided do you agree with it?	N/A
Is it necessary to issue a SD?	N/A
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	✓
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	
21. REASON FOR SCREENING		
Planning application for Schedule 2 development		

NAME	Helen Wass
DATE	7 November 2023