

Mrs Lynsey Palmer  
Strategic Property Unit  
Staffordshire County Council  
2 Staffordshire Place  
Tipping Street  
Stafford  
ST16 2DH

Postal Address: Planning, Policy & Development Control  
Staffordshire County Council  
2 Staffordshire Place  
Tipping Street  
Stafford  
ST16 2DH

Telephone: (01785) 277271  
Email: [planning@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planning@staffordshire.gov.uk)  
Web site: [www.staffordshire.gov.uk/planning](http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/planning)  
Please ask for: Alfia Cox

SENT BY EMAIL

Our Ref: [SCE.218/ES.16/07](#)

Date: 5 July 2016

Dear Mrs Palmer,

**DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING ON THE SITE AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING ACCOMMODATING 45 CARE BEDROOMS AND SUPPORTING FACILITIES TOGETHER WITH EXTERNAL LANDSCAPING AND PARKING AREAS AT FORMER MARGARET STANHOPE CENTRE, OUTWOODS CLOSE, BELVEDERE ROAD, BURTON ON TRENT**

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2011: REGULATION 7 - SCREENING OPINION**

I refer to your application ([ES.16/07](#)) in connection with the above proposals and the regulations referred to above.

The County Council has considered the information you supplied and is of the opinion that the proposed development falls within the description provided within Schedule 2 paragraph 10(b) to the above regulations, but in the opinion of the County Council, having taken into account the criteria in Schedule 3 to the above regulations and the '[Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects](#)' (version 6/3/14), the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. Further details are provided in the accompanying 'Screening Opinion Checklist'.

Therefore, in accordance with the powers contained in the 'Scheme of Delegation to Officers', this letter confirms that the County Council is of the opinion that the proposed development is **not EIA development** and need not be accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

Yours sincerely

**Alfia Cox**  
Senior Planning Officer

Accompanied by a Screening Opinion Checklist





**Screening Opinion Checklist** Case Officer: Alfia Cox

Date: 5 July 2016

F2

<p>PAIPAD No. <b>SCE.218/ES.16/07</b></p> <p>Site / Location: <b>Former Margaret Stanhope Centre, Outwoods Close, Belvedere Road, Burton on Trent</b></p>			
<p>Description of development: <b>Demolition of the existing building on the site and construction of a new building accommodating 45 care bedrooms and supporting facilities together with external landscaping and parking areas</b></p>			
<p><b>PART 1 - Is a Screening Opinion Required? (ref: EIA Regulations 2011, and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects)</b></p>			
	<p>Do you have enough information to define the size and type of development (a plan, description of type/nature/ purpose and possible effects)?**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes</b> (proceed to step 2) (Application ref. <b>ES.16/07</b>)</li> <li>• <b>No</b> - either take the precautionary principle and assume the worst case or, request more information confirming 3 week deadline not commence until received;</li> </ul> <p>**Note - <b>Changes or extensions may also need an EIA!</b> (Schedule 2, category 13)</p>	Yes	No
1	Development Description		✓
2	Is it a Schedule 1 development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes/No</b> (explain)</li> <li>• <b>YES</b> – The development is category..... and a <b>screening opinion is not required as an EIA mandatory!</b></li> <li>• <b>NO</b> – If the development is not listed in Schedule 1 it may be listed in Schedule 2 (proceed to step 3)</li> </ul>	✓
3	Is it a Schedule 2 development? (Schedule 2, Col 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes/No</b> (explain)</li> <li>• <b>YES</b> - The development falls/could fall within Schedule 2 category 10(b) – Urban Development Projects)</li> <li>• <b>NO</b> – If the development is not listed in Schedule 2 a screening opinion is not required and <b>EIA not required!</b></li> </ul>	✓
4(a)	Does the development fall within the absolute threshold/criteria? (Schedule 2, Col 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes/No</b> – (explain)</li> <li>• The threshold/criteria is 0.5 hectares..... and the proposal is 2.25 hectares..... (proceed to step 4b)</li> </ul>	✓
4(b)	Is the proposal within/near to a 'sensitive area'? (e.g. SSSI, NP, AONB, SAC, RAMSAR, Scheduled Monument)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes/No</b> – (explain)</li> <li>• <b>YES</b> – The development falls within/near to the following designated site(s) Within or ..... metres from ..... Within or ..... metres from..... (OR)</li> </ul>	✓
5	Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If you have answered 'Yes' to the threshold/criteria a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2</li> <li>• If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is required – proceed to Part 2</li> <li>• If you have answered 'No' to the threshold/criteria and the development is not within/near a sensitive area a screening opinion is not required.</li> </ul> <p>Screening opinion required?</p>	✓

**PART 2 – Is an EIA Required? (ref: Schedule 3 - EIA Regulations 2011 and Planning Practice Guidance – Screening Schedule 2 projects)**

EIA usually required for (i) major developments of more than local importance; (ii) development in particularly environmentally sensitive or vulnerable locations; (iii) developments with unusually complex and potentially hazardous environmental effects. This checklist should be used to determine whether significant effects are likely to arise from the development. **REMEMBER** – the Regs also apply to changes to EIA development and reserved matters / subsequent approvals

	<p>The threshold/criteria cited in the National Planning Practice Guidance (Considering and determining planning applications that have been subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment, <a href="#">Annex Indicative screening thresholds</a>) states that for:</p> <p><i>Indicative criteria and threshold for Urban Development Projects</i> states that EIA is unlikely to be required for the redevelopment of land unless the new development is on a significantly greater scale than the previous use or the types of impact are of a markedly different nature or there is a high level of contamination.</p> <p><i>Key issues to consider:</i> are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the site area of the scheme is more than 5 hectares; or</li> <li>(ii) it would provide a total of more than 10,000 m<sup>2</sup> of new commercial floorspace; or</li> <li>(iii) the development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non-urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1,000 dwellings).</li> </ul> <p>The site is part of the existing Outwoods Hospital and proposal affects previously developed land that would result in demolition of the existing building and associated structures and the new residential care facility would be constructed. The footprint of the existing building is about 2550m<sup>2</sup> and the footprint of the new building would be 2090m<sup>2</sup>, with total internal floorspace being 2648m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p><b>The site area is less 5ha than and the footprint of the new building is less than existing</b></p>
<p><b>1</b> Indicative thresholds/criteria</p>	<p>Does the development fall within the indicative thresholds/criteria? (see <a href="#">Indicative screening thresholds</a>)</p>
<p><b>2</b> Characteristic of the development:</p>	<p>Size of the development:</p>
	<p>The application site is about 1.1ha and the footprint of the new building would be less than the existing. The remainder of the site would be additional car parking spaces/cycle parking and external landscaped garden area</p>

<p>The site is within the Outwoods Hospital site so the nearest buildings and parking facilities are predominantly in hospital use. Also to the south of the site there is a Worcestershire University building in close proximity to the site</p>	<p>Cumulation with other developments</p>	
<p>Construction materials</p>	<p>Use of natural resources</p>	
<p>Demolition, construction and excavation</p>	<p>Production of waste</p>	
<p>Possible – during demolition and construction works. Potential traffic impact as existing. No significant emissions or noise is anticipated with proposed use</p>	<p>Pollution and nuisances</p>	
<p>Low risk if the site is operated properly in accordance with relevant health and safety legislation</p>	<p>Risk of accidents</p>	
<p>Present and future – residential care homes (C2 (Residential Institution)),</p>	<p>Existing land use (include past, present and future (allocated land))</p>	
<p>It is reasonable to assume that the land would continue to be used as residential care homes. It is not anticipated that there would be any additional implications from the proposed changes to the existing site.</p>	<p>Relative abundance, quality, regenerative capacity of natural resources</p>	<p>3 Location of the development (the environmental sensitivity of area likely to be affected):</p>
<p>The site is not within an environmentally sensitive area in EIA terms. It is reasonable to assume that any impacts of the development would be addressed as part of the detailed planning application.</p>	<p>Absorption capacity of natural environment (particularly wetlands, nature reserves/parks; SSSIs and international designations; areas where environmental quality standards have been exceeded; densely populated areas; landscapes of historical, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	
<p>Minimal impact. It is not anticipated that there would be any additional implications from the proposed changes to the site. The site is located on the previously developed land; and there would be potential impacts, e.g. visual and traffic. However, it is reasonable to assume that they would not be significant in EIA terms and can be addressed as part of the detailed consideration of the proposal.</p>	<p>Extent of the impact (area and size of affected population)</p>	<p>4 Characteristics of the potential impact</p>
<p>Due to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, the magnitude and complexity of the impacts is considered to be low.</p>	<p>The magnitude and complexity of the impact</p>	
<p>Likely impacts during demolition and construction, in particular construction vehicle movements and use of the new care facility but impacts are not considered to be significant.</p>	<p>The probability of the impact</p>	

	<p>The duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact</p>	<p>Demolition and construction works would have only temporary impact. The residential care facility is permanent.</p>
<p>5 Can the significant effects be addressed by proposed mitigation measures?</p>	<p>Are the mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modest in scope</li> <li>• Plainly and easily achievable</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. It is anticipated that the environmental effects and potential mitigation measures are modest and there is a reasonable expectation that they can be achieved through the imposition of planning conditions</p>
<p>6 Conclusion</p>	<p>ES required?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Signed and dated</p>	<p>Case Officer Alfia Cox 3 July 2016</p>	<p>Team Leader/Team Manager Mike Grundy 5 July 2016</p>