

From: Waite, Oxana
Sent: 19 September 2025 12:10
To: Harrison, Liz
Subject: Planning Application O/25/99506 (Process No: PR202507-110070) for Navigator Quarter, land adjacent to Southampton airport Eastleigh, SO18 2NL

Hi Liz

I have reviewed the Air Quality Assessment, chapter 7 and Annex B of Planning Application O/25/99506 (Process No: PR202507-110070) for Navigator Quarter, land adjacent to Southampton airport Eastleigh, SO18 2NL

Proposal: Hybrid Planning Application - Outline application for development of the land adjacent to Southampton Airport to provide employment floorspace of up to 92,000 sqm (GIA) within Use Classes E(g) (ii & iii), B2 and B8 with ancillary offices and areas for service yards, car parking, landscaping, ancillary buildings and associated activities, and access from Wide Lane (all matters reserved except for access). Full planning application for initial infrastructure works and construction of new access road including site levelling and other engineering works (EIA development).

The Air Quality section provides a detailed and largely comprehensive assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development during both construction and operational phases. It is broadly equivalent to a full planning stage air quality assessment, although certain site specific assumptions remain. The assessment considers both human and ecological receptors and aligns with IAQM and DMRB best practice. It references relevant national guidance and uses the latest version of dispersion modelling (ADMS Roads).

It appears that the assessment used v8.1 of the NO_x to NO₂ calculator. The most recent v9.1 (available Aug 2024), however, in this case, we would not require revision, assuming the use of the previous version would provide more conservative calculations.

All baseline conditions are aligned and appropriately refer to year 2023, and verified with 2023 monitoring for NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, as well as traffic and meteorological data.

Clear measures are proposed to mitigate the impact, including dust suppression, EV infrastructure, sustainable travel promotion, and monitoring protocols as per the IAQM guidance, listed in Table 7.24 (but wrongly referenced in the text as 7.25, para 7.180, 7.185 & 7.187).

Findings of the report suggest that residual impacts will be negligible and not significant, supported by modelling outputs.

Please see areas for improvement and technical observations that need to be addressed following the review. The assessment to be updated accordingly before it can be taken to the next stage.

1. It is not clear what nearby developments are included in the assessment to conclude on cumulative impacts.
2. The report notes potential use of ADMS Extra for energy plant assessment but lacks such results. Confirmation is needed.
3. It appears some tables contain duplicate rows (e.g. same receptor/habitat with identical values). Consolidation to avoid confusion is advisable.
4. Table 7.2.2 omits speed for Wide Lane, despite its link to AQMA 1, without providing a rationale for such a decision.

Considering the public-facing nature of the document, the following should be addressed:

5. In the Cumulative Effects paragraph, the report incorrectly refers to Chapter 9 Ecology and the HRA, this should be Chapter 10.

6. Paragraphs 7.48 and 7.93 could benefit from additional review.
7. Table 2.2 refers to “Oana White,” whereas paragraph 7.5 refers to “Oana Waite.” Please use the correct name.
8. Several links in the main body of the statement could be improved, as there are discrepancies between the text and the corresponding footnotes. For example, the body references TG22 while the footnotes cite London Local Air Quality Management (LLAQM) Technical Guidance 2019 (LLAQM.TG(2019), GLA 2019, p. 34, refs 4 & 5).

At the same time, Ecological Impact assessment demonstrated that

- Nitrogen deposition modelling suggests negligible effects at more distant sites, however,
- For some receptors, “in-combination” effects exceed the 1% AQAL threshold, requiring ecological advice and potentially additional mitigation.
- Dust risks to River Itchen SAC are assessed as high for construction earthworks (within 20 m).

Predicted changes in NO_x and NH₃ concentrations are generally minor when assessed "alone," but cumulative "in-combination" effects could pose risks to sensitive habitats.

For **human receptors**, predicted changes in NO₂, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} concentrations are negligible, with no significant impact on air quality objectives. However, Figure 7.3.2 refers to human health receptors but **overlooks residential receptors** on Campbell Road, which are within 100 m of the boundary. These should be included, especially to understand the construction dust impact.

R2, R3 and R4 receptors located along Southampton Road for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀, appear to have been assessed only for the operational phase rather than for construction. In my view, these receptors, together with those on Campbell Road, are likely to experience the greatest dust impacts during construction and cause concern from the public.

Planning Conditions could apply once the amendments are made and the assessment/modelling is updated accordingly.

Kind regards.

Oxana

Oxana Waite

Pollution Control Specialist

Planning & Environment - Pollution

Ext.: 3353

Mobile: 07393761951