

Havant Borough Council
Development Control
Civic Offices Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hampshire
PO9 2AX

Our ref:HA/2024/125893/01-L01

Your ref: APP/20/00990

Date: 01 July 2024

Dear Sir/Madam

**REQUEST TO DISCHARGE CONDITIONS 5 AND 36
HAVANT THICKET, ADJACENT TO SIR GEORGE STAUNTON COUNTRY PARK, MIDDLE PARK WAY,
HAVANT**

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the discharge of condition 5 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) and partial discharge of condition 36 (Ecology). We have the following comments to make regarding these.

Condition 5 (document reference HTR-RHD-P2-RE-PL-Z-0018) Phases 2-8

Page 5: Intro & Background. Point 3 – Jones Bros EMS. What has been provided is not in our opinion an EMS, just an ISO 14001 certificate and a generic company statement. An EMS needs to be site specific and contain a lot more detail. The applicant should refer to: [Develop a management system: environmental permits - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/develop-a-management-system-for-environmental-permits) for guidance of what we would expect, especially for a major construction site. A lot of what would be expected in an EMS is however included in the Water Quality Management Plan.

Page 9: Point 31. The discharge permit once determined and issued will cover elements of this.

Page 26: 7. Consents & Permissions. Point 147. These state that Future Water will ensure all permits, consents and licences are in place prior to commencement of construction and Future Water will manage submissions and approval of all the required consents, permits and licences prior to commencement of the relevant site works. Please note that discharge permits are still being determined.

Page 67: W1 CH 9, CH15. Procedures should be in place to cover the safe storage of the material removed from the settlement lagoons and the silt buster type devices. The material from these silt buster type devices should be tested before deciding on the materials re use or appropriate disposal.

Please also note that the The Document Titled Pollution Control Plan HTR-FUW-ZZ-ZZ-PL-0530 does not seem to be available to view through the public access portal.

Environment Agency
Canal Walk, ROMSEY, Hampshire, SO51 7LP.
Customer services line: 03708 506 506
www.gov.uk/environment-agency

Cont/d..

Condition 36 partial discharge for phase 2 (Wetlands) and phase 3 (Embankment)

We have reviewed documents HTR-RHD-P3-XX-RP-Z-0003 and HTR-RHD-P2-XX-RP-Z-0002 in relation to the partial discharge of condition 36. Both documents are generic, albeit some of the detail that may be missing, is likely to be contained in other documents. We have the following comments to make.

Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Measures Phase 2 Wetlands Reserved Matters - Discharge of Planning Condition 36 Document Reference: HTR-RHD-P2-XX-RP-Z-0002.

Section 1, the description of the ecological mitigation undertaken to date covers the whole site, as opposed to specifically the wetland area, which is ultimately the focus of this document.

Section 3, reserved matters Wetland Design. This section describes the design of the wetland which we provided comment on. However, we do not believe the matters that arose from that consultation have been addressed.

Section 6/7 describes the timescale for construction and the lag time to the wetland becoming functional. The document refers to the management in-between, but it is unclear what this will consist of.

Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Measures Phase 3 Reserved Matters - Discharge of Planning Condition 36. Document Reference: HTR-RHD-P3-XX-RP-Z-0003.

Section 2.7 describes the management of the new retained grassland on the downward slope of the main reservoir embankment. Reference is made to the desired habitat structure/condition. It is stated that grazing will be used as far as possible. The document lacks robust detail with regards to future management. This may be contained elsewhere, i.e., LEMP (Atkins, 2024) however the document does not signpost or reference to where the information can be found. Failure to manage the new/retained grassland will undermine the ecological objectives for this area of the site, yet no explanation is provided as to how this will be mitigated i.e., what happens if the embankment cannot be grazed?

Section 4. table 1, describes how the enhancement measure should benefit species/specie groups, again the lack of information with regards to target condition and how the result will be achieved brings into doubt how successful the measures will be and benefit for those species/group referred to in the table.

Section 8. table 3, the CEMP is referred to as a live document. Table 3 is an insert of the CEMP, which includes Ref B15, which refers to the protection of watercourse and measures required. The proposed actions reflect the current state of play on site or the measures that are required/agreed. This brings into question if the CEMP is being updated? Based on recent pollution incidents, the achievement criteria are not being met. There is no detail to explain what happens when this is the case? The LPA ecologist must be satisfied that the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (doc no. HTR-RHD-P2-RE-PL-Z-0018) is fit for purpose and being updated as required.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Laura Lax
Senior Planning Advisor

Direct dial 0208 4745902
Direct e-mail laura.lax@environment-agency.gov.uk

End