

General Environmental Health Planning Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref: P2026/0342

Address: Unit D North Bank Rd Port Talbot SA13 1RE

Description of Development: Details to be agreed in association with planning conditions 03 (Construction Method Statement), 04 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), 06 (Contamination Assessment), 08 (Landscaping and Planting Works), 11 (Cycle Storage and Parking), 12 (EV Charging), 13 (Refuse and Recycling Strategy) and 14 (Ecological Walkover Survey) of planning permission P2024/0212 granted on 01.05.2025.

Planning Case Officer: Chantalle Lamnea

Comments provided by: Leah Morgan

Our Ref: PLN43452 and PLC43453

Date: 21/08/2026

The General Environmental Health Planning Consultation response to the above application has considered the following relevant areas:

Noise	☒	Air Quality	☒	Contaminated Land	☒
Odour	☐	Housing	☐	Other (please specify)	☐

The Environmental Health Team, in responding to the above application, provides the following substantive response:

No Objection	☐
No Objection subject to conditions (see the specified conditions below)	☐
Requires further information (see details below)	☐
Objection (on the grounds set out below)	☐
Discharge of planning conditions	☐
Discharge of planning conditions not recommended	☒

Overall Recommendation

We do not recommend discharge of conditions 4 and 6 at this time.

Observations and Comments

Condition 6 – Land Contamination

We have reviewed the Terra Firma, Tier 2 Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Report, dated May 2026, Reference 18045 and on the basis of the report we are unable to recommend the discharge of condition 6 at this time.

The report recommends more detailed site investigation to refine the conceptual site model and as such the condition has not been completely complied with.

We recommend that the following comments are passed onto the consultant in regard to the additional investigation;

The site is immediately adjacent to the Calders site which was a former timber yard and railway sidings. During construction of the PDR road creosote contamination was encountered and site investigation was carried out. You are advised to contact Environmental Health for information that they hold regarding the site prior to any further investigation because it may be necessary to add additional contaminants to the analytical suite.

The gas risk assessment needs to be reviewed in light of the presence of hydrocarbons in the groundwater and the evidence of contamination previously found on the adjacent site. It should be considered whether or not this could be the cause of the significantly depleted oxygen on site.

There is also no mention of possible tidal influence on the gas regime and all monitoring was conducted during relatively high barometric pressure. We are of the opinion that the risk assessment needs revisiting and the lines of evidence followed up to demonstrate that the proposed CS 1 is suitable.

Pathways for the hydrocarbon Inapl to ingress into the building also needs to be considered, along with tainting of water supply and services.

Condition 4 – Construction Environmental Management Plan

We have reviewed the GJP Construction Environmental Management Plan that has been submitted with the application, and are of the opinion that the document lacks some detail for this site where there are some specific sensitivities that need to be addressed. We therefore do not recommend discharge of this condition.

Firstly, with regard to noise, the document is very generic and does not provide any information about the construction methods that will be used on site, the timings of them and specific controls.

The contaminated land report makes reference to piling but the management plan only briefly mentions piling with no suggested controls other than hours of construction.

In regard to dust there is no acknowledgement that the site is in close proximity to an AQMA and therefore dust should be well controlled. Section 8.2 identifies some “good working practices” yet the document doesn’t go on to address these things, again pointing

to it being a generic document and not site specific. Some phases of construction are likely to be more high risk than others for dust and these should be identified with specific controls.

There need to be clear mechanisms for implementing more frequent road sweeping, and in prolonged dry periods this needs to be proactively increased rather than waiting for build up of material on roads. There is also mention of a jet wash if necessary, this needs to be manned or systems need to be in place to makes sure they are used because often when they are not manned they do not get used and serve no purpose.

The section on contamination needs a plan for how unexpected contamination will be dealt with. Sites in the area have commonly found contamination when construction starts and this site is adjacent to one where we know contamination exists, along with evidence of hydrocarbons on the site during the first phase of site investigation. If at any point there is visual or olfactory evidence of contamination all work must stop in that area immediately and the environmental consultant should be contacted for advice, the Local Authority should also be immediately informed.

Condition 3, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 14

We do not have any comments regarding these conditions.

Recommended Conditions

N/A
