

From: Driver, Jonathan

Sent: 11 April 2023 19:04

To: Eaves, David

Subject: Planning Application APP/18/00244 - Block A soil verification report attached plots 14 to 25. For condition 9 Colt

Hi David,

Without a bit of creative inference, the short answer is not really – the report provides support to the February decision notice in relation to plots 76-95, and doesn't explicitly address plots 14-25 or the public open space (subjects of the balance of outstanding part-discharge). The text of informative 1 still applies insofar as the applicant has not sought to verify the placement depth in areas of public open space (different risk mitigation standard to 'communal garden areas'), or the post-placement soil quality in this area.

Whist this is the case, I do note that (unlike the earlier reports GWPR4409/VLR/April 2022 & .../August 2022-,) both the GWPR4409/VLR/March 2023 reports (23rd & 31st, respectively – assumed same ref) clarify that source of imported material is from the same location. If we are feeling generous, we could accept;

- i) That all imported topsoils are likely to have come from the same source site, despite this not being explicitly confirmed, and that a specific address for the source site is not given-
- ii) That given assumption at i), the applicant has provided 19 samples analysed for a full suite of contaminants, plus 8 additional samples screened for asbestos and an additional 16 samples analysed for Arsenic, and that all samples provide information on the general quality of a homogenous stock/source of topsoil,
- iii) That given the assumptions at i) & ii), that the quality of topsoil imported to areas of public open space is likely to be substantially similar to the topsoil subject to post-placement validation, and;
- iv) That as a lower standard of protection is required for a public open space exposure scenario, it would be reasonable not to insist upon specific verification of the play area in lieu of detailed Materials Management records.

I would have preferred that the verification documents closely related to the approved RMS, but the above interpretation would represent a reasonably defensible basis for a positive determination of this application (i.e. part discharge for whole residential development phase). Informative 2 would continue to apply, and both GWPR4409/VLR/March 2023 (23rd & 31st) reports should be listed on the decision notice.

Given how much effort has gone in to getting us over the line on this one, I think I'm inclined to take the pragmatic approach so's we can all move forward. If we are not comfortable with the level of assumption required, perhaps seeking confirmation of the source site address and (by way of declaration) that this is the only source site utilised for supply of this development. This would avoid the need for the applicant to produce an additional VLR documenting either or both MMP documentation/certification and post-placement verification of cover in area's of open amenity space (play area).

Happy enough for you to take a view on approach based upon the above.

Best Regards,

Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer

Havant Borough Council Environmental Health
Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant, Hants PO9 2AX

Tel (Direct Dial): 023 9244 6677
Tel (Mobile) : 07887 951 106
Tel (Team Admin): 023 9244 6670

Email: jonathan.driver@havant.gov.uk

www.havant.gov.uk
www.facebook.com/havantboroughcouncil
www.twitter.com/havantborough

of our privacy policy: <https://www.vistrygroup.co.uk/site-services/privacy/> .