

Subject: FW: PR202501-107511 Planning Application for Construction of a 70-bed care home F/24/98678

Sent: 31 January 2025 09:04

Subject: PR202501-107511 Planning Application for Construction of a 70-bed care home F/24/98678

Hi Rebecca

Re: Site Address: Land East of Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh, SO50 6AF

Proposal: Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures. Planning Application [F/24/98678](#)

I have reviewed the Air Quality Assessment (AQA) submitted in support of this application, and I would like to offer the following observations:

The assessment is focused on dust impact and considers its risk using

- The scale and nature of the works
- The sensitivity of the area to dust impacts

Among drawings of the assessment, I have not noticed any maps of the area to include receptors considered in the report, e.g. a nearby housing estate, that lays <250m that could be impacted by the construction phase. The map would also assist in identifying a large neighbouring industrial estate. There are a few operators within the area that hold an environmental permit issued by Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC) to regulate air emissions.

The decision not to conduct nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) dispersion modeling, based on non-exceedance at the nearest monitoring locations, is not valid. The site is located adjacent to AQMA 1 (Eastleigh), making it necessary to conduct modeling using appropriate tools such as ADMS-Roads or similar. This is essential to properly assess potential air quality impacts and identify the significance of the impact of proposed development to the area as this AQMA spread through all central Eastleigh.

Additionally, the reasoning in Section 5.3 & 3.3 of the report, which screens out the assessment based on a single traffic movement difference (99 vs. 100 AADT threshold), is not a cautious approach, therefore a more conservative evaluation is required.

The conclusion in the section on "Mitigation Measures" states that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) "may be" required is not acceptable. Given the site's location near sensitive ecological receptors and the magnitude of the development, a site-specific CEMP should be a condition of approval as listed in Table 17 of the report.

Additionally, the assessment accounting for dust sources from the adjacent industrial estate to the users of proposed development, where several operators hold environmental permits with EBC seems to be missing.

Also, given the proximity to industrial sources, the installation of a high-quality and appropriate ventilation system should be recommended to mitigate exposure of future users to pollutants.

Given the proximity of the development to town centre we would also like to see the implementation of Best Practice Design Measures, possibly through planning conditions to include (but not limited to):

- Provision of a Travel Plan to encourage sustainable travel options such as public transport, cycling and walking
- Adequate and secure cycle sheds should be provided.
- Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Points with the number confirmed with Sustainable Transport Planner or Climate Change Manager
- Access to cycle and walking routes connecting to Bishopstoke Road.

In summary, the current assessment appears inconclusive and requires further improvements, particularly in:

- Assessing road traffic impacts due to proximity to AQMA 1.
- Considering dust sources from the nearby industrial estate.
- Recommending an effective ventilation system for future residents.
- Addressing dust impact of the construction phase through addition site-specific air quality measures to CEMP.

I recommend that these points be addressed before determining the application.

Kind regards.

Oxana Waite

Pollution Control Specialist

Planning & Environment - Pollution