

**Our Contact:** Kim Langford-Tejrar  
**Direct Dial:**  
**Email:**

05 April 2024

The Environment Partnership

401 Faraday Street  
Birchwood Park  
Warrington  
WA3 6GA  
FAO Juan Murray

Dear Sir/Madam

**Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017**  
**Regulation 5: Request for a Screening Opinion**

<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion - Undergrounding of approximately 7km of Overhead Line and associated works.</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Land At Parcel 7230 Postlip Winchcombe Cheltenham Gloucestershire</b>

I refer to your correspondence dated 18.12.2023 requesting an EIA screening opinion in respect of the above development.

This is the adopted screening opinion of the Local Planning Authority in respect of the proposed development identified above.

The reason for this decision (statement as required under Reg. 5(5) of the EIA Regulations 2017) is that the development proposals have been assessed in relation to the selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 development as set out in Schedule 3 of the EIA Regulations 2017. I can confirm that, based on the information submitted the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the submission of an Environmental Statement in connection with this development at this time is **not required**.

The Local Planning Authority has taken into account the size and nature of the proposed development, the location of the potential development site and the likely impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, the potential increase in traffic, the potential effects on biodiversity, heritage assets, trees, hydrology (including flood risk), land contamination, noise and air quality, and the potential socio economic implications of the development including cumulative impacts on the local area. Further details and reasons for this decision are set out in the attached report.

I can confirm that in accordance with the regulations, a copy of this decision has been placed on the appropriate register.

Yours faithfully

For Associate Director - Planning

Tewkesbury Borough Council

ENC EIA Matrix

**TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017**  
**Screening Matrix**

<b>1. Case Details</b>	
a.	LPA Case Reference: 24/00001/SCR
b.	Site Address: Land At Parcel 7230 Postlip Winchcombe Cheltenham Gloucestershire
c.	Description of Development: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening opinion - Undergrounding of approximately 7km of Overhead Line and associated works.
d.	Key constraints: Cotswold National Landscape
<b>2. EIA Details</b>	
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 EIA Regulations?	No
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?	
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?	<b>Cotswold National Landscape</b>
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?	No
If YES, which applicable threshold/criteria?	
<b>3. LPA/SOS Screening</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)?	No
If YES, is a copy of the SO / SD on the file?	No
If YES, is the SO / SD positive?	
<b>4. Environmental Statement</b>	
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?	No

## SCREENING

	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & explanation of reasons (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 <b>(If answer in Part 2a / 2b is 'No', the answer to Part 3a/3b is N/A)</b>	(Part 3a) / (Part 3b) (only if Yes in part 2a) – Is a significant effect likely? (Yes/No or Not Known or 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 <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>
<b>1. NATURAL RESOURCES</b>		
1.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	No  The scheme will involve the undergrounding of powerlines, which will require some localized excavation. However, the ground levels will be restored and there will be no lasting effect or physical change to the topography of the area. This could be controlled by way of condition.	N/A
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  As above, there will be some excavation and then restoration to soil, which will not use natural resources.	N/A
1.3 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, <b>high quality or scarce</b>	No	N/A

<b>resources</b> which could be affected by the project, eg forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?				
--	--	--	--	--

Questions to be considered	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & 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)
<b>2. WASTE</b>		
2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?	<div>Not Known</div> <div>The undergrounding of the lines itself will displace a minimal amount of soil which will not result in waste spoil following back-filling. The defunct powerlines and associated pylons will either become recyclable assets or waste.</div>	<div>No</div> <div>The removed physical infrastructure will not be significant in quantum and can be managed as part of the applicant's usual processes depending on whether it considers the lines and pylon structures to be assets to be retained or waste. If waste, responsible removal from the land could be controlled by way of a condition and disposal is controlled by other regimes. There would not be a significant effect.</div>
<b>3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES</b>		
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 electro-magnetic radiation?	<div>Yes</div> <div>There will inevitably be some noise during the deconstruction, removal, excavation stages of the project.</div>	<div>No</div> <div>The scheme will emit some temporary and intermittent construction noise, however, this will not be significant in terms of levels or duration. There are limited sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the site and any impacts could be managed/ mitigated by way of an appropriate condition.</div>
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?	No	N/A
3.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage eg where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded,	No	N/A

which could be affected by the project?				
<b>4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH</b>				
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	Whilst the works will result in power outages and involve powerlines, pylons and excavation, the site area is remote and can be contained to prevent major accidents.	Yes No	
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)	Yes	As at 4.2. Power outage may have impacts across the population served by this infrastructure.	No	The outage would be pre-planned and managed to prevent or mitigate impacts on health or well-being, and is in any case localised.

Questions to be considered	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & 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)
<b>5. WATER RESOURCES</b> 5.1 Are there any water resources including surface waters, eg 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	N/A
<b>6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)</b> 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 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? (Eg 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))).	No	N/A
6.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, eg for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-wintering or migration, be affected by the project?	Yes  There is some habitat potential in the area affected.	No  The scheme proposes to avoid sensitive biodiversity sites /areas/ habitats. Any effects would be during the demolition and construction / undergrounding/ construction phase only and would be mitigated by way of method statement required by condition. There would be a biodiversity net gain in any case; which would also not result in a significant effect.





Questions to be considered	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & 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)
<b>7. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL</b>		
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 the location which could be affected by the project? (See question 8.1 for consideration of impacts on heritage designations and receptors, including on views to, within and from designated areas). Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes The site is within the Cotswold National Landscape (CNL); a national designation. The scheme would have a temporary adverse effect on the CNL during the demolition/ excavation phase in terms of physical groundworks and construction compounds. The scheme will also have a long-term positive effect in that it will remove 7 pylons and replace 2 terminus pylons to facilitate undergrounding of lines.	No There will be a long-term positive effect as a result of the removal of several pylons across approximately 7km of landscape. This would result in a betterment to the CNL, however, this would not amount to a significant effect because the scheme relies on installing/ retaining two terminus pylons and it would also have a temporary adverse effect arising from excavation and construction/ vehicle compounds in order to achieve the overall betterment.
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?)	No Along its route there are various points at which the project would be more visible than others, but once implemented, only a small proportion will be visible and not highly so/ visible to many people.	N/A
<b>8. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY</b>		
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, form and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).	Yes There are a limited number of listed buildings within the wider vicinity of the scheme; including Postlip Mills and Postlip Lodge. There is also potential for archaeological remains along the undergrounding route.	No The effect upon the listed buildings would arise from the works and compounds; thus it would be temporary in nature and could be mitigated by management and screening if necessary. There would be no discernable long term effect on these heritage assets. The effect of the scheme on potential archaeological remains could be adequately managed/ mitigated by application submissions and planning conditions. As such, the

					effect would not be significant.
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

Questions to be considered	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & 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)
<b>9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS</b>		
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?	No	N/A
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?	Yes The A40 and junction 10 of the M5 are subject to congestion.	No National Highways is satisfied that the effect on the road network could be effectively managed via transport statements/ mitigations and the effect would not be significant.
<b>10. LAND USE</b>		
10.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the project? Eg 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	N/A
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
<b>11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE</b>		
11.1 Is the location susceptible to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, or extreme / adverse climatic conditions, eg temperature inversions, fogs, severe winds, which could cause the project to present environmental problems?	No	N/A

Questions to be considered	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question & 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)
<b>12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b> 12.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No  The project does cover a wider area as part of a comprehensive project and environmental impacts have been screened by other planning authorities. However, its effects as set out above would mostly arise during its construction/ implementation which would be temporary and phased, avoiding cumulative effects.	N/A
<b>13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS</b> 13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? (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).	No	N/A

**5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3**

The proposed development is not of a type described in Schedule 1 of the 2017 Regulations and it is not of a type described in column one of Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The site is within a sensitive area, namely the Cotswolds National Landscape. Whilst it does meet the relevant thresholds and/or criteria in Schedule 2 column 2 of the Regulations, the proposal is unlikely to have significant effects on the environment.

**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?	No

**7. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)****OUTCOME**

Not likely to have significant effects on the environment	ES not required	
---	-----------------	--

<b>OFFICER</b>	Kim Langford-Tejrar Principal Planning Officer
<b>DATE</b>	04.03.2024