

Morris, Rachael

From: Morris, Rachael
Sent: 13 February 2024 08:33
To: Morris, Rachael
Subject: FW: Pollution Comment: O/23/96467 for Land adjoining Chalcroft Business Park, Burnetts Lane, West End, SO30 2HH - Air Quality

From: Waite, Oxana <oxana.waite@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 12:25 PM
To: Morris, Rachael <Rachael.Morris@eastleigh.gov.uk>; Scott, Neil <Neil.Scott@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Pollution Comment: O/23/96467 for Land adjoining Chalcroft Business Park, Burnetts Lane, West End, SO30 2HH - Air Quality

Dear Rachael,

Thank you for consulting with us regarding the Air Quality Assessment submitted by Phlorium, contracted by FIP (West End) Limited for the planning application No O/23/96467 (Process No PR202312-102236), concerning the land adjoining Chalcroft Business Park, Burnetts Lane, West End, SO30 2HH.

Upon reviewing the document, we would like to address several concerns and seek clarification on certain aspects of the assessment.

Firstly, while we generally agree with the proposed structure and methodology, there are some observational comments and areas requiring clarification.

We can't agree or support the suggestion that "the proposed development should not result in the exposure of new receptors to levels of air pollution at risk of exceeding the UK Air Quality Standards (AQs)". Our concerns primarily stem from potential inaccuracies within the assessment, such as discrepancies in Table C.1 (Monitored and Modelled Concentrations of NO₂ at Local Monitoring Sites (2019)) of Appendix C, Model Verification Study, which contains three monitoring locations instead of referenced in the text four. Additionally, the modeled NO₂ concentrations depicted in Figure C.1 on a scale of 6 to 12 µg/m³ seem to differ significantly from the values reported in the table for chosen DT locations e.g. 18.2 to 19.9 µg/m³, raising questions about the accuracy and authenticity of the applied adjustments. Additionally, the next table "Monitored and Adjusted Modelled Concentrations of NO₂ at Local Monitoring Sites (2019)" labeled as Table C.1, which should be C.2 as per reference in the text and the fact that there shouldn't be two tables with the same number Capture.

Secondly, could we please request the data capture for Meteorological data to justify it is sufficient for this specific modeling?

Thirdly, clarification is needed regarding the use of the 2021 vehicle emission factor when the 2019 background and meteorological data were utilised in the model. It would be beneficial to understand the rationale behind this discrepancy to ensure the consistency and reliability of the assessment.

Furthermore, regarding the construction phase, while the assessment identified medium risk for nuisance dust soiling effects and low risk for PM₁₀ health effects and ecological impacts, the duration of described activities remains unclear. It is imperative to adequately assess and discuss the potential impact of such nuisance over time.

Additionally, clarification is needed regarding the proposed site-specific mitigation measures, as para 5.23 – 5.34 of the Assessment list GLA mitigation measures with a reference to Appendix D containing IAQM Recommended Construction Mitigation Measures. Although some of them overlap, transparency and clarity regarding the exact and

site-specific measures to mitigate the residual significance of impact during the construction phase rather than the citing of Guidance would be highly beneficial.

Lastly, it remains unclear if the referenced Defra's COVID-19 Supplementary Guidance is relevant to this assessment.

In conclusion, addressing these concerns and providing the necessary clarifications will help enhance the accuracy and integrity of the Air Quality Assessment to ensure appropriate steps are taken before the next stage. I look forward to receiving the response and discussing these matters further if needed.

Kind regards,

Oxana Waite

Pollution Control Specialist

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 3353
