

SP MANWEB

Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network



Document Reference: 6.12
Environmental Statement Chapter 12
Cumulative Effects

PINS Reference: EN020021
Regulation Reference: 5(2)(a)
November 2018

SP MANWEB

**Reinforcement to the North Shropshire
Electricity Distribution Network**

**CHAPTER 12
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

Environmental Statement

**DCO Document 6.12
November 2018
PINS Reference EN020021**

This page is intentionally blank

The Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009**

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Reinforcement to the North Shropshire Electricity Distribution Network

Environmental Statement: Chapter 12 – Cumulative Effects

Document Reference No.	6.12
Regulation No.	Regulation (5)(2)(a)
Author	Gillespies
Date	09 November 2018
Version	V1
Planning Inspectorate Reference No.	EN020021

SP Manweb plc, Registered Office: 3 Prenton Way, Prenton, CH43 3ET. Registered in England No. 02366937

This page is intentionally blank

CONTENTS

12.1 INTRODUCTION	1
12.2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY BACKGROUND	1
National Policy Statements (NPS)	2
Local Planning Policy.....	2
12.3 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	4
Intra-project Effects.....	4
12.4 CONSULTATION	5
12.5 INTRA-PROJECT EFFECTS	6
12.6 SUMMARY	11

This page is intentionally blank

CHAPTER 12: CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

12.1 INTRODUCTION

- 12.1.1 This chapter presents the intra-project cumulative effects assessment (CEA) for the Proposed Development.
- 12.1.2 Details of the inter-project CEA are presented in the relevant assessment chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapters 6 – 11 (**DCO Documents 6.6 – 6.11**) and their associated appendices.
- 12.1.3 Further information relating to this chapter is presented in Appendix 12.1: Intra-Project Cumulative Effects (**DCO Document 6.12.1**).

12.2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY BACKGROUND

- 12.2.1 A range of public sector and industry-led guidance is available on CEA but at present there is no single, agreed industry standard method.
- 12.2.2 In Part 1 of Schedule 4 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (SI 2009/2263) as amended (the 'EIA Regulations') explain that an ES should include:
- 'A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment, which should cover the direct effects and any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of the development.'*
- 12.2.3 PINS Advice Note 17: Cumulative Effects Assessment¹ (December 2015) is relevant to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and sets out a staged process for assessing the cumulative effects with 'other development'. It complements guidance provided in the PINS Advice Note 9: Rochdale Envelope².

¹ The Planning Inspectorate (2015), Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative Effects Assessment

² The Planning Inspectorate (2015), Advice Note Nine: Rochdale Envelope

National Policy Statements (NPS)

12.2.4 The need to consider cumulative effects in planning and decision making is set out in planning policy³, in particular the National Policy Statements (NPS).

12.2.5 Part 4 of NPS EN-1 sets out general policies in accordance with which applications relating to energy infrastructure are to be decided. In paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.1.4 it states that:

'In considering any proposed development, and in particular when weighing its adverse impacts against its benefits, the IPC should take into account:

- Its potential benefits including its contribution to meeting the need for energy infrastructure, job creation and any long term or wider benefits; and

- Its potential adverse impacts, including any long-term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any adverse impacts.

In this context, the IPC should take into account environmental, social and economic benefits and adverse impacts at national, regional and local levels.'

12.2.6 Paragraph 2.8.2 of EN-5⁴ states that:

'Cumulative landscape and visual impacts can arise where new overhead lines are required along with other related developments such as substations, wind farms and/or other new sources of power generation.'

Local Planning Policy

12.2.7 The Local Plan for Shropshire comprises several planning documents, known

³ For example: The relevant National Policy Statements and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

⁴ Department for Energy and Climate Change (July 2011), National Policy Statement for Electricity Energy Infrastructure (EN-5)

as Local Development Documents (LDDs).

12.2.8 Two of the key documents which make up the Shropshire Local Plan are:

- The Core Strategy DPD (adopted 24 February 2011); and
- The Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (adopted 17 December 2015).

12.2.9 Since the adoption of the SAMDev Plan, any saved planning policies from the district councils are considered to be out of date and have been replaced by the Local Plan.

12.2.10 Policy MD8: 'Infrastructure Provision' of the SAMDev provides policy guidance for New Strategic Infrastructure:

'3. Applications for new strategic energy, transport, water management and telecommunications infrastructure will be supported in order to help deliver national priorities and locally identified requirements, where its contribution to agreed objectives outweighs the potential for adverse impacts. Particular consideration will be given to the potential for adverse impacts on: ...

ix. cumulative impacts.

12.2.11 Policy MD12: 'The Natural Environment' states that:

'...the avoidance of harm to Shropshire's natural assets and their conservation, enhancement and restoration will be achieved by:

2 Ensuring that proposals which are likely to have a significant adverse effect, directly, indirectly or cumulatively, on any of the following:

- i. the special qualities of the Shropshire Hills AONB;*
- ii. locally designated biodiversity and geological sites;*
- iii. priority species;*
- iv. priority habitats;*

- v. *important woodlands, trees and hedges;*
- vi. *ecological networks;*
- vii. *geological assets;*
- viii. *visual amenity; and*
- ix. *landscape character and local distinctiveness.*

will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that:

- a) there is no satisfactory alternative means of avoiding such impacts through re-design or by re-locating on an alternative site and;*
- b) the social or economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm to the asset.'*

12.3 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

12.3.1 This chapter focuses on what the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 'State of Environmental Impact Assessment Practice in the UK' Report⁵ (Ref 17.5) recognises as intra-project effects:

- Intra-project effects – These effects occur where a single receptor is affected by more than one source of effect arising from different aspects of the project. An example of an intra-project effect would be where a local resident is affected by dust, noise and traffic disruption during the construction of a scheme, with the result being a greater nuisance than each individual effect alone.

Intra-project Effects

12.3.2 The assessment of intra-project effects has identified the shared receptors which could be affected by various environmental effects identified in the ES. Then, if required, a qualitative assessment of the potential significance of the cumulative effect has then been undertaken.

⁵ <https://www.iema.net/assets/uploads/Special%20Reports/iema20special20report20web.pdf>

- 12.3.3 Where only one effect has been identified for a particular receptor or only one topic has identified effects on that receptor there is no potential for an intra-project effect to occur. Intra-project cumulative effects can therefore only be identified where more than one ES topic has identified a residual effect on an individual or group of receptors.
- 12.3.4 For a residual intra-project effect to be considered it must have been assessed as minor adverse (slight adverse for historic environment) or greater for an individual topic i.e. a receptor that is considered to potentially experience several negligible effects would not be assessed as experiencing significant overall effects. Furthermore the receptors considered must be the same e.g. for a listed building the receptor considered for visual amenity is the resident of the building, whereas for historic environment the receptor considered is the actual building and not the resident.
- 12.3.5 It follows that receptors considered in only one topic cannot be considered to experience an intra-project effect.
- 12.3.6 The potential for whether a receptor could experience intra-project effects is presented in Appendix 12.1 (**DCO Document 6.12.1**). Those receptors identified in Appendix 12.1 (**DCO Document 6.12.1**) as potentially meeting the criteria for experiencing intra-project effects have been detailed below in Section 12.5 of this chapter.

12.4 CONSULTATION

- 12.4.1 Consultations regarding the CEA are detailed in the Table 12.1 below:

Table 12.1 – CEA Consultation	
Issues raised by SoS within the Scoping Opinion	
Para. 2.30: The SoS notes that paragraph 3.3.3 of the Scoping Report states that the two underground lines at either end of the overhead line that connect to the	All works are now included within the Proposed Development and therefore have been assessed within the assessment of the Proposed Development as a whole.

Table 12.1 – CEA Consultation	
<p>Wem and Oswestry substations, and the works required to the substations, would be permitted development and therefore would not be reported in the ES. The SoS advises that in order to address the consequential effects the ES should assess the underground lines and substation works in the cumulative effects assessment (CEA) for the Proposed Development.</p>	
<p>Para. 3.17: The SoS recommends that in order to assist the decision making process, the Applicant considers the use of tables:</p> <p>(a) to identify and collate the residual impacts after mitigation on the basis of specialist topics, inter-relationships and cumulative impacts;</p>	<p>Tables and cross referencing have been used where appropriate and in line with the SoS recommendations throughout the ES and its appendices.</p>
<p>Para. 3.20: The SoS notes that the Scoping Report contains a ‘Cumulative Effects’ chapter that sets out the methodology that will be applied to the cumulative effects assessment (CEA), but also that the topic chapters include information on the CEA methodology. The SoS suggests that the CEA methodology could be set out in a discrete chapter or included in the Methodology chapter of the ES, with no need to repeat it in the topic chapters.</p>	<p>Within the ES, inter-project cumulative effects have been assessed within individual topic chapters and the methodology has been described in Chapter 4 ‘Approach and General Methodology’ (DCO Document 6.4).</p> <p>This chapter deals with intra-project cumulative effects only.</p>

12.5 INTRA-PROJECT EFFECTS

12.5.1 This section presents potential intra-project effects for receptors which could be affected by more than one ES topic.

12.5.2 Appendix 12.1 (**DCO Document 6.12.1**) summarises those receptors where

more than one topic has identified a residual effect on that receptor. Those receptors where potential intra-project effects have been identified are described below in Table 12.3.

Table 12.3 – Receptors where potential Intra-project effects identified			
Receptor	Topics where effect identified	Summary of intra-project effects	Significant intra-cumulative effect
Old Oswestry Hill Fort	Historic Environment – Neutral/Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	The effects combined do not create an overall significant effect, due to the distance of the receptor from the Proposed Development and the overall low level of effects identified for individual topics.	No
Rednal Mill	Historic Environment – Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence. It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.	No
Lower Lees	Historic Environment – Slight Adverse LVIA – Moderate Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the	No

Table 12.3 – Receptors where potential Intra-project effects identified			
Receptor	Topics where effect identified	Summary of intra-project effects	Significant intra-cumulative effect
		historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence.	
Dandyford Farm	Historic Environment – Neutral / Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence. It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.	No
Stonehill	Historic Environment – Neutral / Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence. It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect	No

Table 12.3 – Receptors where potential Intra-project effects identified			
Receptor	Topics where effect identified	Summary of intra-project effects	Significant intra-cumulative effect
		identified is of a low level.	
Malt Kiln Farmhouse	Historic Environment – Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence. It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.	No
The Shayes	Historic Environment – Slight Adverse LVIA – Minor Adverse	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence. It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.	No
Pools Farm	Historic Environment	For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects	No

Table 12.3 – Receptors where potential Intra-project effects identified			
Receptor	Topics where effect identified	Summary of intra-project effects	Significant intra-cumulative effect
	<p>– Neutral / Slight Adverse</p> <p>LVIA – Minor Adverse</p>	<p>are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence.</p> <p>It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.</p>	
Stanwardine Hall	<p>Historic Environment – Slight Adverse</p> <p>LVIA – Minor Adverse</p>	<p>For LVIA and historic environment the likely effects are caused by the likely visual intrusion of the proposed overhead line into the setting of the building and the general visual amenity effects from the overhead line. However the historic environment receptor, i.e. the building and its setting is not the same as the LVIA receptor, i.e. the individual living at the residence.</p> <p>It is also noted that for both topics the level of effect identified is of a low level.</p>	No
Montgomery Canal	<p>Ecology (for habitat / species) Minor Adverse (but highly</p>	<p>The ecological, LVIA and historic environment receptors in respect of the Montgomery Canal are not the same, therefore there cannot be intra-project effects.</p>	No

Table 12.3 – Receptors where potential Intra-project effects identified			
Receptor	Topics where effect identified	Summary of intra-project effects	Significant intra-cumulative effect
	unlikely) LVIA – Negligible (but highly localised visual effects) Historic Environment – Slight Adverse	It is also noted that for all three topics the level of effect identified is localised and of a low level.	

12.6 SUMMARY

12.6.1 In summary, no likely significant intra-project cumulative effects have been identified.