


1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	2023/CM/0053/LCC	Brief description of the project / development	Proposed anaerobic digestion plant, associated infrastructure, lagoons, and feedstock clamps
Appellant			
LPA	Leicestershire 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?			11b
Is the development within, partly within, or near a 'sensitive area' as defined by Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations?			<p>No - The site is not located within a "sensitive area" in the context of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended), i.e. a SSSI, a National Park, the Norfolk Broads, a World Heritage Site, a Scheduled Monument, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or a European Site.</p> <p>However, the site does lie within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for the Great Bowden Borrowpit Biological SSSI (see here) as outlined below. The SSSI itself is approximately 650 meters to the west of the site. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in such significant impacts to the SSSI as to warrant EIA. There is potential for enrichment to soils within the SSSI via pollution to surface/ground waters but it is considered that sufficient mitigation measures could be put in place to ensure that the risks associated with this could be kept to a minimum.</p> 
If YES, which area?			N/A
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			11(b) Installations for the disposal of waste (unless included in Schedule 1)
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			11(b) (ii) The area of the development exceeds 0.5 hectare 11(b) (iii) the installation is to be sited within 100 meters of any 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			N/A

Regulation 37 notice been issued)	208
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?	
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)		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 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	There is a digester tank proposed to be installed under the gas holder of which part will be below ground level (2.8m into the ground to be precise). Please see here for plan. Outside of this, there is nothing to indicate significant physical topographical changes as part of the proposal. There is, however, little information relating to the construction phase of the project which could have given further insight to potential topographic changes.	No	It is not anticipated that the proposed topographical changes could be considered 'significant' in the context of the wider site to justify an Environmental Statement, especially as the topography has been considered within the design of the proposed development to ensure it is adequately screened.
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 anaerobic digestion process will use feedstock consisting of 15,000 tonnes of maize, 9,000 tonnes of poultry manure and 16,000 tonnes of straw. Water is also used within the process; the exact amount required does not appear to be disclosed but the water will be sourced from surface water on the site stored within a surface water lagoon. However, these resources are renewable in nature and have local adequate supply.	No	
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?	Yes	The development site lies within a Mineral Consultation Area for sand and gravel. The immediate surroundings in all directions are agricultural in nature.	No	Due to the previous use of the site, including the existing development on the western section and the made ground on the eastern section, it is likely that the pre-existing mineral has already been sterilised. As part of the proposal, some of the residue straw and poultry manure will be sourced from the local farm 200

				<p>meters away from the site enabling a mutually beneficial cycle of local supply and demand.</p> <p>As such, significant effects to these local resources are not anticipated.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

6. WASTE

6.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	Yes	<p>Construction- soils associated with the installation of foundations and the digester tank.</p> <p>Operation- At the end of the digestion process, a liquid digestate is formed, which consists of a liquid and solid fraction. The solid fraction is a fibrous material held in partial suspension that is separated from the liquid fraction via a screw press. It is compost-like in appearance and put back on the land where the feedstock is grown as an organic fertiliser and soil improver in a reciprocal arrangement with the maize producer.</p>	No	<p>The waste generated during the construction phase would be comparable to other development of a similar size and scale and is not considered significant.</p> <p>Once operational, and in consideration of the stated annual throughput, it is unlikely that the proposed development would result in the production of a significant amount of solid waste. Moreover, the resultant solid digestate can be used on land as a fertiliser/soil improver.</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))
7. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES		
7.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Potential associated pollutants include, but are not limited to, carbon dioxide, ammonia and methane.</p> <p>The combustion process can also generate trace amounts of air pollutants, including carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and sulfur dioxide (SO2).</p> <p>However, the submitted qualitative odour assessment highlighted the main potential sources of air pollution as emissions from road transport using the local road network. With regard to odour, the main potential source of emissions will be associated with the loading of feedstock into the AD Plant. Odour impacts may also arise during the spreading of solid/liquid digestate on agricultural land.</p> <p>Once operational, the AD plant has the potential to</p>	<p>No</p> <p>The carbon dioxide will be captured as part of the production of biomethane through the installation and use of a CO2 capture plant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitted qualitative odour assessment states that, "the proposed development is not predicted to result in a traffic increase above the relevant criteria during construction or operation and therefore, no significant effects on air quality, as a result of traffic emissions, are anticipated at existing receptors.</p> <p>The assessment results, based on a worse-case approach by applying the relevant Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) assessment method, concluded that the operation of the AD Plant is expected to have a negligible impact with regard to odour emissions. Impacts of these magnitudes would be considered to</p>

		<p>generate bioaerosols from feedstocks, as well as during the AD process.</p>	<p>have effects that are not significant, i.e., they would not be a deciding factor in planning determination and would not trigger the implementation of additional mitigation. It is concluded, therefore, that the odour emissions associated with the operation of the AD Plant are not considered to result in significant loss of amenity and consequently the resulting risk of potential odour complaints is negligible”.</p> <p>Little information has been provided regarding the location of the land where the digestate may be spread, although it is noted that the suggested dispersed location of the land as well as the likely small volume of digestate produced, whilst such impacts could occur, they are unlikely to be so significant as to warrant the production of an EIA. Any impacts arising would also be capable of being mitigated through the appropriate choice of land away from residential properties and not spreading during inappropriate weather conditions</p> <p>The report suggests that, “The Proposed Development is not predicted to result in any additional ammonia emissions in excess of the relevant assessment criteria at any of the sensitive ecological receptors within the relevant screening distances of the site, and therefore, will have a negligible impact at the closest designated ecological site, which results in a not significant effect”.</p> <p>The report also notes that agricultural odours, including those associated with livestock rearing, are likely to be an existing characteristic of the wider area.</p> <p>Poorly managed feedstock areas and inappropriate management of the AD plant may have the potential to result in significant impacts associated with bioaerosols, particularly when proximity to other employments uses to the proposed site (within 250m). Noting the annual throughput and the potential for mitigation measures such as abatement systems on the AD plant and appropriate storage of feedstock, these are unlikely to be significant, although do require further assessment.</p> <p>Thus, considering the above points, the potential impacts of noxious substances being released into the air are not likely to be significant enough to warrant an environmental statement.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>7.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?</p>	Yes	<p>Whilst the AD process itself is quiet, there are noise-generating processes involved in the production of the gas. Various HGV movements, telehandler movements, mechanical services compressors, pumps, crop processing, combined heat and power units etc. are in use on the land to facilitate the production.</p> <p>The construction phase of the development is likely to generate additional vehicle flows to and from the construction area. The use of machinery such as excavators and dumpers are also anticipated. This is likely to cause an increase in noise and vibration during this period.</p>	No	<p>The results of the submitted noise assessment demonstrated that the operation of the site will likely generate a sound impact of around +5dB, which is an adverse impact in BS4142 terms, but is a less than significant adverse impact. As such, this magnitude of impact can be considered acceptable in BS4142:2014 terms.</p> <p>For context, the 'British Standard 4142:2014' is a method for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.</p> <p>The applicant has also implemented a series of noise attenuation barriers to mitigate the potential of significant noise impacts near areas of concern.</p> <p>Furthermore, the increase in vehicle movements and construction machinery would be temporary in nature.</p> <p>Considering the context of the wider location, the proposal is situated within an largely agricultural/industrial setting, with the nearest site of residential developments being situated approximately 325 meters from the proposed development. This property, along with the village of Great Bowden, is buffered from the proposed development by the A6, which will already be creating light and noise impacts at a closer scale to these properties. The topography and pre-existing vegetation of the local area also acts as a natural screen for the proposed development.</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>	Yes	<p>It is noted that the growth of maize can cause excessive amounts of soil run off. Furthermore, the spreading of digestate on land can lead to a risk of nutrient saturation whereby the excess nutrients can pollute nearby water sources, changing the local ecology and causing algal blooms. As such, there is also the potential for enrichment to soils within the SSSI via pollution to surface/ground waters.</p> <p>The potential for plant failure/accidents does increase the risk of contamination. Please see chapter 8.1 for further information on the potential of accidents associated with this type of development.</p>	No	<p>Whilst there is risk of pollutants being introduced to various water and land sources, either through direct impacts associated with the anaerobic digestion process or indirect process associated with the growth of maize and the placement of digestate on land; it is considered that through appropriate planning conditions in conjunction with suitable management measures (such as adherence to the required Environmental Permit and fertiliser standards as set out by DERFA), the risk is considered to be low, and a significant effect is considered unlikely. Furthermore, the liquid digestate is proposed be stored within a covered lagoon when spreading is not permitted.</p>

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?	Yes	It appears that the eastern section of the site consists of made ground, potentially from the old infrastructure associated with the mushroom farm. There appears to be no information relating to the nature of such material or its depth. Furthermore, farms are a potential source of many forms of pollution that include fertilisers, asbestos, fuel oils, lubricants, and pesticides.	No	After liaising with environmental health officers at Harborough, it was decided that a land contamination assessment could be submitted as part of pre-commencement/ occupation conditions. Thus, significant impact can be mitigated through the regular planning process.
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?	Yes	<p>Toxic spills are possible across the anaerobic digestions process. The EA has tracked rising environmental incidents of serious pollution which can be caused by a range of manmade and mechanical faults. See here for the EA report.</p> <p>Furthermore, as the proposed development works with highly combustible biogas, there are reported incidents of gas explosions at similar anerobic digestion facilities.</p>	No	<p>Routine and diligent managing, operation and maintenance procedures should mitigate the potential of such events occurring.</p> <p>Regular and proper risk assessments in line with DSEAR should also mitigate the potential risk. Although this is the responsibility of the operator rather than the LPA.</p>
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)	Yes	<p>From increased vehicle movements associated with construction and operation of the proposed development.</p> <p>The potential of noxious air pollution resulting from the operation of the proposed facility such as ammonia and bioaerosols.</p>	No	<p>Potential issues associated with vehicle movements can be managed through the submission and implementation of a CEMP and draft travel plan. However, the submitted transport statement concludes that such issues should not be significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the submitted qualitative odour assessment found that the, "proposed development is not predicted to result in any additional ammonia emissions in excess of the relevant assessment criteria at any of the sensitive ecological receptors within the relevant screening distances of the site".</p> <p>Therefore, significant effects associated with this development are considered unlikely and manageable</p>

			to an extent which does not warrant an environmental statement.
--	--	--	---

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))
--------------------------------------	--	---

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?	No	<p>There is a pond within the north eastern section of the proposed site boundary.</p> <p>However, the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and has a low risk of flooding from rivers and the sea. The site is shown to be at a low risk of flooding from surface water, groundwater, sewers and artificial sources such as reservoirs.</p> <p>It is proposed that all surface water will be captured and stored on site for use within the anaerobic digester plant. Any shortfall in required water volume relies on taking potable water from the mains. It is therefore essential to capture as much surface water onsite as possible, to reduce reliance on the water mains. There is no positive outfall from the site, as all surface water is fed into the AD process.</p> <p>The harvesting of rainwater is critical for the AD plant to operate. As such, it is essential to keep the pipes flowing and the capacity of the whole system high. Therefore, there is a processing and financial incentive for the surface water drainage system to be kept highly maintained.</p>	No	
--	----	---	----	--

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>	Yes	<p>The proposed development lies within the Impact Risk Zone for the Great Bowden Borrowpit SSSI which is designated for its biological interest located approximately 650 meters west from the site.</p> <p>There are also 18 non-statutory designated nature conservation sites within a 2000-metre radius of the site.</p>	No	<p>The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states, "considering the localised nature of the works and wide level of separation between the application site and the abovementioned SSSI, there is no mechanism identified for the works to result in direct impacts upon interest features forming this statutory designated site. However, depending on the predicted levels of ammonia release during the operation of the AD plant, these could incur indirect impacts upon biological interest features pertaining to this SSSI. Subsequently, nationally designated sites are considered potential receptors with respect to the proposed development".</p> <p>However, the submitted qualitative odour assessment found that the "proposed development is not predicted to result in any additional ammonia emissions in excess of the relevant assessment criteria at any of the sensitive ecological receptors within the relevant screening distances of the Site, and therefore, will have a negligible impact at the closest designated ecological site, which results in a not significant effect".</p> <p>The above response is also pertinent for the non-statutory designated nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, suitable management measures through the requirement of an Environmental Permit means there is a low risk of enrichment of the poor-quality soils in case of leakage/polluted surface water run-off and a significant effect is considered unlikely.</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>	Yes	<p>The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies a range of fauna such as: amphibians, reptiles, birds, bats (roosting and foraging) and badgers.</p> <p>The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal did not identify any habitats of significant value to nature conservation (on a county, regional or national scale) within the footprint of the works. The habitats identified were appraised as having either 'negligible', 'low' or 'moderate' nature conservation value on a site of local scale. The report, however, did identify that measures should be employed to appropriately safeguard existing hedgerows and retain trees established on the application site.</p>	No	<p>There are a number of measures that are recommended within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which can be conditioned including further surveys. Thus, it is unlikely for there to be significant impacts which are unable be mitigated through the regular planning process.</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))
--------------------------------------	--	---

11. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

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 the location which could be affected by the project? ¹ Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes	At a national level, the site lies within Natural England's National Character Area (NCA) 94, Leicestershire Vales. At a regional level, the application site and its immediate surroundings fall into Group 3, River Valley Floodplains, more specifically into 3A, Floodplain Valleys landscape character type. At the local level it is possible to determine that the application site clearly falls within the Welland Valley Landscape Character Area as identified in the Harborough District Landscape Character Assessment, 2007.	No	The character of the application site and the immediate surroundings currently is one of dereliction and abandonment in an area of existing agricultural/ industrial development. It can be argued that the current condition of the site detracts from the wider open countryside setting. As such, it is considered that the landscape character of the site has capacity to accommodate sensitively designed development and that the susceptibility of the landscape resource to change is considered to be low. The typical value of the landscape character of the site is concluded to be low.
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	It was concluded from the baseline visual assessment (referenced within the submitted landscape and visual statement) that views from the wider setting in a northerly and north westerly direction from the south, from a south westerly direction north of Welham Bush Poultry Farm, and longer distance views in excess of 3km from the north are screened by topography and existing vegetation. It also suggested that the application site has a sense of enclosure with restricted views out and limited intervisibility. Views of the area of proposed development are largely restricted to occasional glimpses from a limited number of locations. Regardless, such built form is barely distinguishable and is perceived as part of other	No	

		<p>development in the local area, partially screened by intervening vegetation. From the majority of the viewpoint locations, elements such as overhead electricity cables, telegraph poles, pylons and highway signage form not insignificant detractors in the view.</p> <p>Furthermore, new native tree and hedgerow planting designed to reflect the distinctive local landscape character of the area is proposed on the existing site boundaries, the details of which can be secured through an appropriately worded condition.</p>		
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 on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes	<p>The Planning Design and Access Statement reads, “a consultation has been carried out with Leicestershire County Council which has indicated that post-determination archaeological evaluation will be required”. However, this can be considered and managed during the application process.</p> <p>The closest listed building is located approximately 560 meters southwest of the site and is screened by the pre-existing vegetation and topography. Thus, the proposal is not anticipated to impact the setting of the heritage asset.</p>	No	These are normal planning related issues of local significance and not large enough to warrant an Environmental Statement. Further surveys will be carried out in consultation with LCC Archeology.

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))
13. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS		
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?	No No public right of ways directly impact the site. No public facilities are located in close proximity to the site as the surrounding area is made up of private agricultural facilities.	No
13.2 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 scheme would generate additional heavy goods vehicle (HGV) trips on Welham Road, all of which would reach the site using the A6 to the south. HGVs would not use Welham Road to the north of the site or through Great Bowden village to the south.	No The submitted Transport Statement found, "the volume of HGV traffic generated throughout a typical day and during the peak 30-days of the development's annual operation cycle are not expected to result in any material increase in conflicts between vehicles travelling along Welham Road". "The development would not employ significant additional staff and would not receive regular visitors. Light vehicle traffic generation would therefore be negligible". "On this basis, there would be no adverse impact on the operation of the narrow section of Welham Road between the A6 link road and the site access". "There is no evidence of any road safety problems in the vicinity of the site or its access". Further consultation will be undertaken with LCC Highways and it is considered that potential issues associated can be managed through the submission of a CEMP, draft travel plan, and any additional information at LCC Highways request. Compliance can be assured through their associated conditions.
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.	Yes	Immediate land uses in all directions comprise, agricultural and industrial uses, with the nearest site of residential development being located approximately 325 meters south-west from the proposed development.	No	See previous sections including Pollution and Nuisances, Population and Human Health, Landscape and Visual, and Transport and Access for relevant consideration of significant impacts. For reasons already highlighted within this matrix, the impacts on such are not considered to be significant enough to warrant the request of an EIA.
14.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?	No	Not that LCC are aware of where potential significant impacts have not already been considered within this report.	No	

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	None which are currently known.	No	
---	----	---------------------------------	----	--

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))
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 Based on the information provided, it is unlikely that potential impacts associated with the proposed development would be so substantial, either singly or in combination, as to warrant EIA. Furthermore, those impacts that do arise would be capable of being mitigated or reduced through the imposition of conditions or through other regulatory regimes.	No
17. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS		
17.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No	No

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

To conclude, there is potential for the proposed development to have impacts for example in form of pollution and nuisances, population and human health, and transport and access. However, based on the information provided, it is considered unlikely that such impacts would be so substantial, directly and/ or indirectly, to warrant the submission of an EIA. Furthermore, these impacts can be suitably mitigated through the regular planning process including conditions, and appropriate management procedures through the relevant permits. Moreover, the indicative thresholds for Schedule 2 development under 11(b) (found [here](#)) are, "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 proposed development would take approximately 40,000 tonnes of waste annually on a site of 3.48 hectares which is below the indicative thresholds outlined.

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	N/A
Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	*
More information is required to inform direction	Request further info	N/A

21. REASON FOR SCREENING

As part of the planning process after submission of the application.

NAME	
DATE	

Name: Charlie Cookson

Date: 09/01/24

