

Memo

To:	James Brewer / Portsmouth City Council		
From:	Sarah Wallis	Email:	Sarah.wallis@atkinsglobal.com
Phone:	07834 506735	Date:	16 Feb 2018
Ref:	5164490	cc:	
Subject:	Review of comments regarding Noise and Air Quality assessment for Dunsbury Hill Farm (DHF) Application Reference: APP/17/01324		

Proposed Development

"Variation of Condition B6 of Planning Permission APP/15/00732 to remove restriction on proportion of B8 floorspace allowed within the Dunsbury Park development, and thus provide for a maximum mixed-use floor space of 61,779sqm within Classes B1, B2 and/or B8 of the Use Classes Order 1987 as amended".

It is considered that 2015 assessment, which was submitted as part of the current S73 application, tested the scenario of 100% B8 allocation at the site and therefore it is considered suitable to support the change to condition no B6. However, several comments have been raised by Havant Borough Council (HBC) Environmental Health (EH) Department relating to air quality and traffic data. We have reviewed these comments and our responses are set out below.

Air Quality Review

Following the review of the document from Havant Borough Council dated 3rd January 2018, there appears to be three points relating to air quality:

- 1) Air quality background concentrations being lower than in the 2015 ES Addendum, and hence the likely greater impact of the development on air quality.
- 2) Revisions to screening criteria for assessment and inclusion of an additional receptor within the air quality assessment.
- 3) The assessment should be concerned with the magnitude of change associated with the development.

Air Quality Background Concentrations

The comment has been made that air quality background concentration estimates appear to have been revised downward since the 2015 assessment, which would reduce overall pollutant concentrations at receptors, but would elevate the proportional impact of the traffic.

Atkins Response:

We would agree that it is likely that background concentrations are currently lower than those reported in the 2015 assessment, as this would be in line with government policies aimed at reducing pollutant emissions at a national level. However, the background concentrations used in the 2015 assessment were considered appropriate at the time of undertaking the assessment. Even if the background concentrations are now lower, the contribution from the development traffic is still likely to form the smallest proportion of the total concentration at the receptor. In all cases, total concentrations at all receptors were all expected to be below the air quality criteria.

Revisions to Screening Criteria and Inclusion of an Additional Receptor on Kandala Gardens

The comment has been made that using the screening criteria within the IAQM/EPUK guidance which was issued in 2015 would lead to an additional road (Purbrook Way) to be included in the air quality assessment as it would have a change of more than 100 HDV flows per day with the development in 2019. A receptor on Kandala Gardens should have been included, as it is located close to Purbrook Way.

Response:

We would agree that there would be an increase of more than 100 HDVs per day along the Purbrook Way between College Road and the A3(M) according to the changes in traffic data, however there were not

Memo

thought to be any receptors affected near this section of road. Whether the same changes in traffic would occur along the Purbrook Way west of College Road would need to be determined by the traffic modellers, as traffic could conceivably also travel along College Road. The traffic model at the time did not provide data west of College Road. We would be happy to include a receptor on Kandala Gardens if sufficient traffic data is available to undertake an assessment.

Magnitude of Change associated with the development

A comment has been made that the assessment should be concerned with the magnitude of change associated with the development, and not the overall concentration per se.

Response:

The magnitude of change with the development is provided in the ES Addendum in Tables 9.5 and 9.6 for annual mean concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter (PM₁₀) respectively. We have commented on both the change and the absolute concentration at each receptor within the Addendum. This is in line with both the EPUK 2010 guidance and the updated IAQM/EPUK 2015 guidance. The effect of the development was shown to be **not significant**.

Noise Review

Following the review of the document from Havant Borough Council dated 3rd January 2018, it was determined that there weren't any comments specific to noise, but there are some concerns regarding the validity and robustness of the traffic assessment, which underpins the noise assessment.

A review of the document from Havant Borough Council will be carried out by the traffic team. Following this, if it is considered necessary to revise the traffic data, the noise assessment can be revisited. However, it is expected that the effect of the development would remain **not significant**.

Recommendations

It is considered that the main points raised by HBC relate to traffic data and traffic modelling. Therefore, it there is a need to revise the traffic model then we would recommend revising the noise and air quality assessments. However, in all cases we would still expect the effect of the development to be **not significant**.

If the traffic assessment is being revised then we recommend that the study area is extended to the Purbrook Way west of College Road in order to assess the effects on Kandala Gardens, as requested by HBC.