

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/18/01281

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/18/01281

Address: Hermitage Park, Harts Farm Way, Havant, PO9 1FA

Proposal: Variation of conditions 2 (approved plans) and 3 (sewer diversion details) of Planning Permission APP/17/00511 (Proposed Gas fuelled Capacity Mechanism embedded generation plant to support the National Grid) in order to retain the existing sewer, change type of containerised generator, remove transformers and replace with a single 33kv transformer, amend size of proposed substation, reconfigure layout accordingly, replace proposed acoustic fence by a timber fence, and slightly amend fence line around the access to compound.

Case Officer: Emma Chisnall

Consultee Details

Name: Consultee Environmental Health (Environment Team)

Address: Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant PO9 2AX

Email: EHEnvironment@havant.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Comments

Comments here relate to Air Quality only. Comments may be received from Environmental Health under separate cover with respect to the proposed changes to the acoustic barrier, and the increase in elevation for plant.

I have reviewed the particulars of the application, and note that the emission release height is to be more than doubled, from 3.97m to 8.55m. This could in principle materially alter the emissions dispersion calculations presented in the 2017 Air Quality Assessment (Ref: I&BPB5588-111R001F01).

As a sense check, I have consulted the DEFRA model dispersion factors for landfill gas engines, and (whilst the proposals fall slightly outside the parameters for which these values are applicable); I note that the predicted emissions plume contribution at ground level and at 350m distance (closest residence), would be expected to be -12.5% (all other factors being equal).

The emission rate of the generator set is governed by the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016, to a scalable ceiling rate and cannot (therefore) exceed the emissions rate modelled in the 2017 assessment, but could in principle exceed the absolute mass emission. The output capacity of the set is identical, and I have not identified any reference to an increase in anticipated operational hours. In this way, any difference would be in engine efficiency (or operational hours) only, and is unlikely to be material to local air quality, especially given the anticipated net positive

impact resulting from the increased flue height (increased dispersion).

The proposals are anticipated to be neutral to marginally beneficial, and for this reason, I raise no objection to the proposals on air quality grounds, and do not require the air quality assessment to be revisited.

(JD)