

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

1. CASE DETAILS			
Case Reference	N/A	Brief description of the project / development	Variation of conditions 1, 2, 19 and 20 of planning application P17P0247 to enable amendments to the permitted scheme (proposed development of land for employment uses (use classes B1 / B2 / B8), access and car parking, landscaping and associated works), land east of Parsonage Way/Trotshill Way, Worcester
Applicant	Warndon Six Ltd		
LPA	Worcester City 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)			Click here to enter text.
Is the project Schedule 2 development under the EIA Regulations?			Yes
If YES, under which description of development in Column 1 and Column 2?			10 (B)
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?			Click here to enter text.
Are the applicable thresholds/criteria in Column 2 exceeded/met?			Yes
If yes, which applicable threshold/criteria?			10 (B) (iii) the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.
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)			A Screening Opinion was issued on 21 March 2017 in relation to the host application P17P0247.
If yes, is a copy of the SO/SD on the file?			A copy is on the EIA Register
If yes, is the SO/SD positive?			No
4. ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT			
Has the appellant supplied an ES for the current or previous (if reserved matters or conditions) application?			A request for a Screening Opinion was requested by the applicants in respect of the host application P17P0247.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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 (If answer in Part 2a / 2b is 'No', the answer to Part 3a / 3b is '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) 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.	
1. NATURAL RESOURCES				
1.1 Will construction, operation or decommissioning of the project involve actions which will cause physical changes in the topography of the area?	Yes	Given the existing topography and size of the site it is considered that re-grading works will be required to accommodate the proposed development.	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24 th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF. Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
				<p>provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The onset of the impact on the topography of the site will commence as soon as construction starts. It will remain and is likely to increase as the development is completed. The impact is unlikely to be reversible with some limited mitigation possible. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
<p>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?</p>	Yes	<p>The proposal will use natural resources, including the use of land, water, materials and energy in the construction phase and water and energy will be used during the operational phase. The former can be reduced through the use of sustainable construction methods.</p>	No	<p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
				<p>make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The scale and characteristics of the proposed development will not be likely to result in any significant loss of natural resources. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
<p>1.3 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>	No	<p>The site is a greenfield parcel of land. The loss of this land would be irreversible; however, it is designated within the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) for employment uses. This allocation was carried forward from the designation in the previous City of Worcester Local Plan.</p>	No	<p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The proposed development will not result in any significant loss of high quality or scarce</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
				resources. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.
2. WASTE				
<p>2.1 Will the project produce solid wastes during construction or operation or decommissioning?</p>	Yes	<p>Waste will be generated during the construction phase but this will not be significant as no structures need to be demolished. However, the anticipated re-grading works would produce significant waste soil materials that would need to be transported for disposal to a nominated site.</p> <p>The proposal will also be expected to generate waste when the proposed development is complete. However, it is expected that any wastes generated from the operation of the proposed development will utilise waste disposal services.</p>	No	<p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>No significant effects are anticipated as a result of this proposal. The operation of the development is unlikely to produce unexpected amounts of solid waste during operation and it is expected that any wastes generated from the</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
				construction of the proposed development will be transported off-site.
3. POLLUTION AND NUISANCES				
3.1 Will the project release pollutants or any hazardous, toxic or noxious substances to air?	Yes	NO ₂ emissions from vehicular traffic associated with the construction and operational phases of the development	No	<p>These issues were assessed in consultation with WRS in respect of planning application P17P0247.</p> <p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of this aspect of the proposals.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
3.2 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	It is likely that the impacts from the proposed development, both during the construction and operational phases, will result in increased dust, noise and vibration levels in addition to an increase in levels of lighting and heating.	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24 th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF. Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.
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	Any land contamination issues are mitigated as part of planning application P17P0247.	No	No significant risk to human health during the construction and operational phases are anticipated as a result of this proposal. Whilst there is always the risk of pollution being generated on the site due to the proposed development, there is no evidence to suggest that this will be likely to lead to any significant risk of contamination. It is also expected that

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
				<p>the site operators will ensure that all vehicles carrying any substances or materials considered harmful to human health and/or the environment will be strictly controlled by Health and Safety Legislation.</p> <p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
3.4 Are there any areas on or around the location which are already subject to pollution or environmental damage, e.g.	?	A city-wide AQMA is proposed but has not been confirmed to date.	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
where existing legal environmental standards are exceeded, which could be affected by the project?				<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. There would be an increase in the total number of car parking spaces and a corresponding increase in NO₂ emissions from vehicular traffic associated with the construction and operational phases of the development. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of this aspect of the proposals.</p>
4. POPULATION AND HUMAN HEALTH				
4.1 Will there be any risk of major accidents (including those caused by climate change, in accordance with	No	Subject to compliance with relevant construction standards and working practices it is considered that the risk of major accidents (including those	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
scientific knowledge) during construction, operation or decommissioning?		caused by climate change, in accordance with scientific knowledge) during construction and operation would be unlikely.		<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>Whilst there is always the possibility of accidents during the construction and operational phase of any development which might affect human health or the environment, there is no evidence to suggest that accidents are likely or that the impacts are likely to be significant.</p>
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	No	A city-wide AQMA is proposed but has not been confirmed to date.	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
water contamination or air pollution)				<p>Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. There would be an increase in the total number of car parking spaces and a corresponding increase in NO₂ emissions from vehicular traffic associated with the construction and operational phases of the development. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of this aspect of the proposal.</p>
5. WATER RESOURCES				
5.1 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,	No		No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?				<p>Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. Climate change could increase heat stress and possibly flooding due to the risk of surface water flooding throughout the site. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
6. BIODIVERSITY (SPECIES AND HABITATS)				
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	Yes	The site is within 1 km of Lyppard Grange SAC, Lyppard Grange Ponds (SAC), Lyppard Grange Ponds SSSI and Hornhill Meadow LNR and Worcester Woods LNR.	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24 th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances,

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)
<p>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>nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through its layout, including landscape buffers, and relevant planning conditions, including lighting. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
<p>6.2 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>Vegetated habitats, including grassland habitats and established hedgerows with mature trees within the site and adjacent Worcester Woods LNR provide habitat suitable for nesting and foraging for birds and bats. The site is generally considered unsuitable for reptiles and Great Crested Newts, as there is no permanent still water or other wetland features, very limited foraging opportunities and basking areas and no suitable habitat. There are damp areas in the northeast and southwestern corners, although</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from,</p>

(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)
<p>these are only present after periods of prolonged heavy rain during the winter.</p>	<p>the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through relevant planning conditions, including compliance with all recommendations within the ecological appraisal submitted as part of planning application P17P0247 and conditions regarding site lighting.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through its layout, including landscape buffers, and relevant planning conditions, including measures to minimise light spillage beyond the boundaries of the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
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).		running east to west. The site boundaries generally consist of semi-mature hedges with sporadic trees. Several mature trees are found within the site. There are some trees and landscape features (non-designated) on the site and the site lies within an area designated as being Green Space (formerly Green Network) and Significant Gap (formerly M5 protection Corridor).		updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24 th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF. Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through relevant planning conditions, including provision of 40% on site green infrastructure and additional landscaping, within and to the boundary of the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.
7.2 Is the project in a location where it is likely to be highly visible to many people? (If so, from where, what	Yes	The site is located in a highly prominent position that would be visible in short and long range views from various directions on approach and	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

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

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
direction, and what distance?)		on leaving the city on the local road network. There are a number of public rights of way within the site. PRoW 562(C) is to the eastern boundary and runs in a north to south orientation. PRoW 563(C), ProW 557(C) and PRoW 564(C) converge along the northern boundary.		<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>PRoW 564(C) will be diverted to accommodate the approved development.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
8. CULTURAL HERITAGE/ARCHAEOLOGY				
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	Yes	There are no designated heritage assets within the application site. The nearest Listed Building is some 120m away with the nearest Conservation Area being some 35m away. In terms of the effect on below ground deposits, the development could have a minimal impact on buried archaeological remains.	No	All designated assets lie at distance from the proposed development. Both are on the other side of A4440 and are screened from the application site by existing landscaping. There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
<p>the project (including potential impacts on setting, and views to, from and within)? Where designated indicate level of designation (international, national, regional or local).</p>			<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through relevant planning conditions, including a programme of archaeological works to guide appropriate mitigation measures to minimise impacts to below-ground archaeological features. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>	
9. TRANSPORT AND ACCESS				
<p>9.1 Are there any routes on or around the location which are used by the public</p>	Yes	PROW 564(C) runs through the site.	No	Authority was granted by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 23 November

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
for access to recreation or other facilities, which could be affected by the project?				<p>2017 to proceed with the diversion of this footpath under Section 257 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (as amended). There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
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	There are several roads in the locality with access to the site via the A4440, which is part of the Worcester outer ring road, and local estate roads within Warndon Villages on the opposite side of the A4440. The M5 runs to the east of	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the Planning Committee on 23 rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
		the site with access to the local road network via junctions 6 and 7.		<p>Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Planning application P17P0247 was accompanied by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The proposal would increase the number of trips by all modes of transport to the site. No objection to this aspect of the proposal was raised by the Highway Authority or Highways England.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site. However, no significant effects are anticipated as a result of this aspect of the proposal.</p>
10. LAND USE				
10.1 Are there existing land uses or community facilities on or around the location which could be affected by the	Yes	Sensitive land uses comprise mainly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing development at Warndon Villages • Worcester Woods LNR 	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
<p>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.</p>				<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>Assessment of the impact on adjacent land uses was undertaken for the original proposals. The planning permission for P17P0247 includes appropriate mitigation to counter impacts through relevant planning conditions regarding ecology, landscaping and the operation of the development. No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the amended proposals.</p>
<p>10.2 Are there any plans for future land uses on or around the location which could be affected by the project?</p>	Yes	The site is allocated within the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) for employment uses. In addition, the site benefits	No	There has been no change in site circumstances following the approval of planning application P17P0247. Following the meeting of the

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
		from full planning permission for employment uses (use classes B1 / B2 / B8), access and car parking, landscaping and associated works pursuant to Planning Permission: P17P0247. The permission currently remains extant until 7 March 20219.		<p>Planning Committee on 23rd November 2017 the updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published and came into effect on 24th July 2018. Whilst this represents a material change in policy circumstances, nevertheless the provisions of the recently published revised NPPF version are largely consistent with, and transferred directly from, the original 2012 version of the NPPF. The terminology and paragraph numbers may differ somewhat but the broad objectives of the revised NPPF is consistent with that of the previous original NPPF.</p> <p>Non-material amendments to the scheme are proposed by the current Section 73 application to reposition the ancillary office space for Building B so it becomes a pod attached to the front of the unit, reposition some car parking provision so it would sit between Building A and Building B, reducing the size of Building A and make provision for 29 additional car parking spaces across the site.</p> <p>No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.</p>
11. LAND STABILITY AND CLIMATE				
11.1 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	No	No significant effects are anticipated as a result of the proposals.

Question	(Part 2a) / (Part 2b) – Answer to the question and 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)	
12. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS				
12.1 Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulation of impacts together during the construction/operation phase?	No	Planning permission was granted on 22 December 2016 to application P15P0013 for employment development comprising offices, research and development facilities with access from Berkeley Way, car parking, landscaping and associated works on land at the junction of Berkeley Way and Parsonage Way. The permission remains extant until 22 December 2019.	No	No additional major development in the vicinity of the site has been approved in the meantime following the grant of planning permission for applications P15P0013 and P17P0247. The key issue relating to the potential impact of the proposal, both on-site and in the vicinity, relates to its potential for cumulative impact particularly with the approved scheme listed. There will be some interaction of impact between the proposed site and this approved scheme if implemented. However, both sites are reasonably self-contained and stand-alone in nature. The cumulative effects from the proposals would be unlikely to be significant, particularly in terms of traffic generation, impact on the local highway network and ecology.
13. TRANSBOUNDARY EFFECTS				
13.1 Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects? ²	No		No	No significant effects are anticipated as a result of this proposal.

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.

5. CONCLUSIONS – ACCORDING TO EIA REGULATIONS SCHEDULE 3

The impacts of the proposed development would be localised and are likely to be reduced through the layout and design of the scheme and by implementation of mitigation measures imposed through planning conditions of the extant permission granted under planning application P17P0247. With such mitigation no significant effects are anticipated as a result of the current proposals to vary conditions 1, 2, 19 and 20 of planning application P17P0247 to enable the proposed amendments to the permitted scheme.

An Environmental Impact Assessment would not be required for the development proposed under planning application P18P0485.

6. 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

7. ASSESSMENT (EIA REGS SCHEDULE 2 DEVELOPMENT)

OUTCOME

Is likely to have significant effects on the environment

No

Not likely to have significant effects on the environment

Yes

More information is required to inform direction

No