

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/18/02279	Your Ref:	APP/18/01072
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	21 December 2018
DC Case Officer:	Lewis Oliver		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6263		
Application Number:	APP/18/01072		
Site Address:	Waterloo Park, Elettra Avenue, Waterlooville		
Proposed Development:	Outline planning application with all matters apart from access reserved for subsequent approval for the erection of Class B1(c) / B2 / B8 development and Class B8 Trade Counter use, Class A1 Retail, Class C1 Hotel, Class D2 Leisure and Classes A3 and A5 Drink / Food Establishments		

Observations / Comments:

I have now found opportunity to review the application supporting environmental assessments. I will keep comments as brief as possible, but will aim to cover the full range of matters addressed within the application documents.

EIA Screening

With reference to the guidance given at paragraph 33 of circular 2/99 (2006), and the Indicative EIA threshold criteria table (2015 version), it is apparent that the EU criteria are set at a level around 10%-15% the level which the UK government considers to be 'significant', citing 20Ha for industrial estate developments, or >5Ha (or 10K sq.m floorspace) for schedule 2 a) & b) projects.

The other indicative criteria are not considered to apply to this site, and as a result it would appear to me that the screening report conclusion is reasonable, and that the development should not be regarded to be EIA development under the canon of UK legislation and regulatory guidance.

Contamination

The preliminary risk assessment presented is broadly agreed. I note however that of the prior site investigation & assessment documents listed, only the 2008 & 2012 documents have been reviewed by HBC, and that it has been noted that the coverage of those works was relatively 'light touch', leaving scope for undiscovered contamination to be present at the site. It is agreed that any contamination present is unlikely to represent a significant proportion of the site area, however, it must be recognised that there is a controlled waters receptor present within the curtilage, and that SuDS are proposed.

I note that the EA has proposed a condition formalising the developers duty to report and appropriately mitigate the risks associated with any contamination encountered which has not been identified by any of the prior reports. I have previously recommended a condition to achieve the same aim, albeit differently worded.

I concur with the Agency's view that a condition is appropriate - it is not necessary to impose separate conditions to cover the wording previously recommended by EH and by the EA under the latest consultation. I am comfortable with the wording from either the EA's or EH's proposed being applied.

SuDS

General design constraints and 'in principle' design solutions referred to are agreed (see 7.1-7.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment). It is assumed that drainage remains a reserved matter to be resolved with a detailed scheme to be approved for each development phase at the time of being presented as a details scheme reserved matters application. If this assumption is unsafe, it would be prudent for completeness to apply a suitable condition requiring the approval of drainage schemes prior to commencement of each development phase.

Traffic & Framework Travel Plan

I note that the traffic assessment identifies an unmitigated adverse impact on the Northern arm of the Hambledon Road, North of Elettra Ave, where the 'with development' RFC is 0.89, up from a do minimum scenario value of 0.81, against an 'operating comfortably within capacity' benchmark value of <0.75.

In Air Quality terms, this is not likely to be significant unless this consumption of residual practical capacity is likely to interfere disproportionately with other turning movements. As the calculated RFC is < 1 (i.e. < max. theoretical capacity), it would appear unlikely that the impact on this arm under peak flow conditions is likely to impede other turning movements within the junction - it is more likely to marginally increase average peak period queue lengths and junction delays for southbound traffic approaching the junction on the Hambledon Road.

This otherwise unmitigated adverse impact may serve to strengthen the case for off-site measures aiming to mitigate the impact of travel in accordance with policy DM12.

I note that the framework travel plan is very much a loose framework - as the applicant wishes to keep the outline consent as flexible as possible, the plan can only address the issue of modal share, and modal shift in very general terms; no targets are set. The proposals are very generic, and are in almost all cases deferred to either the individual plot applicant / tenant, or to the Travel Plan Coordinator.

I would expect the travel plan to be refined for each phase put forward as a detailed scheme, and to form an approved document on subsequent reserved matters consents.

Air Quality Assessment

The Air Quality Assessment indicates a possible baseline year exceedance at Homewater House, adjacent to the A3 Maurepas Way / London Road / B2150 Hulbert Road junction. Model verification presented at Appendix B indicates that the model is under-predicting the road- NOx contribution. Whilst this is noted to be a common feature of such models, it is not clear whether the presented results have been corrected to local modelling (using the factor presented) or not - this is simply not stated.

If the results have not been corrected, it would be reasonable to expect a non-negligible increase in all concentrations presented, for the baseline year & all future year scenarios.

This is important, as the significance screening results presented are dependent upon the baseline predicted environmental concentration (PEC) before development traffic is considered (i.e. baseline, and future years). Applying a correction factor which elevates model concentration estimates would serve to increase both the baseline PEC, and the 'do something' scenario 'PEC', and by extension the proportional magnitude of increase against the air quality objective. In this way, the application of any correction factor would elevate the assessed level of significance, such that the maximum impact would likely be considered at least 'Moderate' instead of 'Minor'.

It is unclear whether this applies, as the report is not explicit on the subject of model adjustment. As the impact is not likely to be 'Major', it is not likely to be material to the principle of consenting an outline development. However, it would be material to the level of mitigation (of emissions, and the impacts of travel) that may be appropriate to detailed phases of development. In this sense, it will be necessary to clarify this point in support of subsequent detailed development plans.

Irrespective of the issue of model bias correction, the output is nevertheless dependent upon an assumed reduction in baseline PEC between 2017 & 2020 - in the event that this does not in fact occur, the assessment of impact would increase from 'Minor' to 'Moderate', albeit at the lower end of the numerical scale when compared with scenario where the model correction proves necessary. The report notes that there is no identifiable trend in concentrations, which suggests that it may not be reasonable to rely upon this baseline assumption.

It is acknowledged that the assessment includes elements which are rather conservative - notably in the number of trips accounted for as 'new' to the road network, and the ignoring of the level of trips that the existing landuse class (i.e. prior use) would have represented. Similarly, the verification point chosen was a kerbside site reporting at last period of monitoring at close to the objective value - this point was decommissioned as it's position was too close to the road junction to be considered sufficiently representative of general ambient levels. This may skew the magnitude of the model correction factor calculated.

Equally, if it proves that the presented results are not corrected, the influence runs counter to conservative assumptions, and would result in slightly over-optimistic output.

Mitigation - Impacts of Travel, Emissions, and Air Quality

I note that the Highways authority has Identified some possible highway enhancements, relating to new crossing facilities, additional bus stops, and improved Cycle links to residential areas to the North of the site.

I have looked at the quality of the local infrastructure for active modes of travel, and note that with the exception of the desire line to which highways consultees refer to as lacking a suitable crossing point; pedestrians are well served but Cyclists are not.

The local roads are busy, and I would imagine sufficiently intimidating as to discourage all but the most confident cyclists. I would thoroughly support any scheme which improves off-road cycle links to the extensive residential areas north of the site - specifically represented by Charlesworth Drive (and connected roads), Darnel Road, and Sickel Way. Such schemes would be regarded as mitigating transport emissions and air pollution impacts, and contributing towards public health goals, as it would facilitate travel mode shift. The same would be true of a well designed crossing point - but care will need to be taken in design so as to avoid offsetting any air quality benefits with increased congestion at this busy junction.

It is also worth noting that emerging policy recognises the need to address the upward pressure of local emissions that new development represents, and is seeking the mitigation of new emissions irrespective of whether significance criteria are exceeded at specific locations. The air quality assessment may lend weight to the impetus to derive a suitable strategy for meeting the desire of the Highways Authority to improve the local public realm for pedestrians and cyclists. I would expect future detailed applications coming forward to have regard to the latest draft of the emerging local plan, and would highlight that this may require a greater focus on precautionary / good practice mitigation through high-quality design.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer