

Matt Lindon
Savills
Mountbatten House
1 Grosvenor Square
Southampton
SO15 2BZ

Our Ref: GEN/22/00213
Direct Line: (023) 02392 446263
Ask For: Mr L Oliver
Email: planning.development@havant.gov.uk

30 March 2022

Site Location: Unit 100 Dunsbury Park, Fitzwygram Way, Havant, PO9 4EE
Re: Request for an EIA Screening Opinion for Unit 100, Dunsbury Park, Havant.

Dear Mr Lindon,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017 (SI571/2017) ('THE EIA REGULATIONS') SCREENING OPINION IN RESPECT OF UNIT 100, DUNSBURY PARK, HAVANT

This screening opinion is with regard to the request for a screening opinion submitted to the Local Planning Authority under the Town and Country planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 - Regulation 6 (1).

Background to the Proposed Development

Planning permission was originally granted for Dunsbury Park in 2014 with a hybrid application (ref: APP/12/00338), providing full permission for the access link road (now constructed - Fitzwygram Way) and outline permission for the development plots totalling 61,779sqm of B1/B2/B8 floorspace, with a maximum of 20% to be B8, and up to 5,574sqm of hotel and conference facilities.

The original outline application was subject to EIA and an Environmental Statement was prepared in 2012 (2012 outline ES). This assessed outline parameters in relation to the following environmental topics.

- Land use
- Socio-Economic
- Transport and Access
- Air Quality
- Noise and Vibration
- Cultural Heritage
- Ground Condition and Land Contamination
- Water Resources and Flood Risk
- Landscape and Visual Assessment³
- Ecology
- Waste

The 2012 outline ES found that, whilst some adverse environmental effects were identified, these were generally minor with many residual benefits being identified including a major beneficial socio-economic effect. It was concluded that adverse effects are minimised through sensitive and sustainable design and the adoption of best practice in the

management and control of construction.

Detailed planning consent has since been granted for 34,377sqm of industrial floorspace (Units 2, 3a, 3b and 4a), leaving a balance of 27,402sqm of floorspace to be delivered under the outline consent.

Plot 100 (hereafter referred to as 'the Site') forms part of the extant consent but was designated as a Hotel and Conferencing facility (Use Class C1). However, the applicant has outlined that it is an intention is to deliver this unit as employment and industrial floorspace (Use Class E(g), B2 and B8), and as such representing a change from the outline permission. To achieve this, an additional planning application will be submitted that will replace the consented Hotel and Conferencing use with industrial floorspace. This screening request relates to the proposed change of use for Plot 100 in the context of the wider development at Dunsbury Park.

The Site and Surroundings

The site is located off Fitzwygram Way, Havant, east of the A3(M) Junction 3, approximately 3.2km north west of Havant town centre. It is situated at the south of the wider Dunsbury Park development and is approximately 1.2 hectares (ha) in size. Given the consented and developed uses on and around the site (associated with the wider Dunsbury Park Development), the site comprises part of an industrial estate.

The site will be accessed from the southern arm of the Fitzwygram Way roundabout. This has already been constructed. Pedestrian/cycle access will be provided via a connection from the existing shared use footway/cycleway on the southern arm of the Fitzwygram Way roundabout.

Following the granting of the extant consent for development, the site has been cleared to facilitate the creation of a suitable development platform. The site is therefore currently vacant land which has been fenced off from access. Immediately adjacent to the western boundary between the site and Fitzwygram Way is a small area of grassland which contains a drainage pond. Beyond this, a strip of woodland provides a buffer between the A3 and the site. The site is bound to the north and west by Fitzwygram Way and to the east and west by vegetation and trees. Waterlooville is located west beyond the A3.

The surrounding land uses are predominantly industrial and commercial associated with the existing and approved wider Dunsbury Park Development (part of which has been constructed already). Residential uses associated with the aforementioned settlements are located in the wider surroundings. Woodland (which contains some areas of Ancient Woodland) is situated to the south. This includes some public footpaths and areas of recreational uses associated with Neville's Park.

The site is not located within or adjacent to any Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) or Ramsar sites. However, the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA)/Ramsar and the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are 3.7km downstream of the site.

There are no local or statutory listed buildings within the site and it is not located within a Conservation Area.

Within the wider area there are a few heritage assets which include:

- Grade II listed – Springwood Junior School, approx. 1km west
- Grade II listed – Stakeshill Cottage approx. 1.1km west

Additional listed buildings are situated within the settlements of Rowlands Castle, Havant and Waterlooville, however these are a considerable distance from the site.

The Environment Agency (EA) Flood Map for Planning shows the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding)

Proposed Development

The proposed development will consist of up to 3,251sqm of employment and industrial floorspace (Use Class E(g), B2 and B8). Current indicative designs (See Figure 2) propose that this will be delivered within a warehouse unit of 14.6m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in height located approximately in the middle of the site. The proposed height represents a decrease in of 1.9m from the maximum parameters approved under the outline consent.

Gated access will be provided to a large service yard in the southern part of the site. This will provide turning, parking and loading space for large articulated HGVs. Thirty-nine car parking spaces are proposed at the front of the unit and areas of landscaping will be provided around the site boundaries.

This is the maximum quantum of development as advised by the agent and has been used to inform the screening conclusions within this letter.

The indicative breakdown of the proposed 39 spaces is shown below:

- 33 standard parking spaces
- 2 accessible spaces (5%)
- 4 electric vehicle charging spaces (10%)
- Plus 10 cycle parking spaces

Relationship with Extant Consent

The proposal seeks to replace the permitted use of Unit 100 from a Hotel and Conferencing facility with industrial floorspace. With regard to the EIA Regulations, this is considered to represent a Change or Extension of a Schedule 2 development (the original outline consent). The proposed development therefore falls within category 13(b) in Schedule 2. On the basis that the relevant thresholds are met/exceeded (see below), EIA would be required if significant effects are likely to result from the proposed development.

EIA Screening Process

Development that falls within Schedule 1 of the EIA Regulations always requires EIA and is referred to as 'Schedule 1 development'. Development listed in Schedule 2 that is located in a 'sensitive area' (as set out in Regulation 2(1)), or exceeds one of the relevant criteria or thresholds given in Schedule 2 is referred to as 'Schedule 2 development'. Not all 'Schedule 2 development' will require an EIA, only the developments likely to have significant environmental effects due to its size, location or nature. Development that requires EIA is referred to as 'EIA development'.

The proposed scheme is not Schedule 1 development, but falls within the description in Schedule 2 Part 10(b) 'Urban Development Projects' and Part 13(b) 'Change or Extension to an Urban Development Project'. The proposed development is not located within a sensitive area but would exceed the relevant criteria in Schedule 2 of more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development, and, in relation to the outline consent, under Part 13(b) "The development as changed or extended may have significant adverse effects on the environment". Therefore, the proposed development would constitute EIA development if it is likely to result in significant environmental effects.

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides indicative thresholds to assist in the determination of whether a project is likely to have significant environmental effects. For urban developments such as this, these indicative thresholds state that "*Environmental Impact Assessment is unlikely to be required for the redevelopment of land unless the new development is on a significantly greater scale than the previous use, or the types of impact*

are of a markedly different nature or there is a high level of contamination”.

The Screening Opinion request is supported by a comprehensive and detailed information from Savills dated 2nd March 2022 considering the development against the criteria outlined in the EIA regulations.

The proposed development does not qualify as a Schedule 1 development and is not located wholly, or partly, within a ‘sensitive area’ as defined in Regulation 2(1). However, it does fall within the description of ‘Infrastructure Projects 10(b) Urban Development Projects’ and 13(b) Change or Extension to an Urban Development Project within the first column of Schedule 2 of the Regulations and exceeds the thresholds in the second column, as the proposal includes more than 1 hectare of non-dwellinghouse development.

To determine whether the proposed development comprises EIA development, it is necessary for the Local Planning Authority to consider whether it is likely to have significant effects on the environment, taking account of the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations.

It is considered that the characteristics and location of the development are unlikely to give rise to significant environmental effects, alone, or in accumulation with other developments. Given the location of the site on the edge of the urban areas of Havant and Waterlooville, its existing use and the extant consent for development, it is not considered to result in any significant urbanisation. The additional non-residential space is consistent with the surrounding area and will not introduce any different sensitive receptors into the area than are already present.

The potential environmental impacts from the development are considered to be of similar nature to those already present and experienced by the surrounding environment and would not result in a new or different effects that would warrant the need for EIA. Additionally, the implementation of suitable design alongside mitigation and avoidance measures, drainage design, landscaping and best practice construction methods, it is considered that significant environmental effects are unlikely to arise and therefore the proposal would not constitute EIA Development for the purposes of the EIA Regulations.

The site is not located within a sensitive area (as defined by the EIA regulations) and, for the reasons described in this response, significant effects are not considered likely, the proposed development is not considered to constitute EIA development. This is in line with relevant EIA guidance provided in the PPG which states that *“only a very small proportion of Schedule 2 development will require an Environmental Impact Assessment”* (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 4-018-20170728). This conclusion is in line with PPG guidance on Schedule 2 development which defines 10,000sqm of commercial floorspace as suitable thresholds above which significant effects may occur. This is substantially higher than the quantum of development proposed. It is considered that the assessment and consideration of environmental matters related to the proposed development can be appropriately addressed through the planning application process.

Conclusion

It is considered, having regard to the selection criteria in schedule 3 to the Regulations and the associated guidance including screening indicative criteria and thresholds, the development would not be likely to have significant effect on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. As a result, it can be confirmed that the development described in your associated plans and documents **is not EIA development**.

Finally, during the consideration of the pre-application Natural England and the Hampshire County Council Ecologist provided the following consultation responses which should inform and guide the form of any formal planning application, please see these consultation responses attached.

Yours sincerely

Mr L Oliver
Principal Planner
Our Ref: GEN/22/00213