

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/21/00203	Your Ref:	APP/20/01055
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	17 March 2021
DC Case Officer:	Jane Burton		
DC Case Officer Extn:	[Not Available]		
Application Number:	APP/20/01055		
Site Address:	Town Park at the MDA Berewood Development Site, London Road, Waterloooville		
Proposed Development:	Reserved Matters Application for Town Park Phase B, under 6 (i) a), b), c) & (d) conditions 3, 4, 6 (ii) a) b) e) f) i) o), 7, 10 and 11 of planning consents APP/10/00828 (and WCC 10/02862/OUT) and in accordance with section 9 (Open Space) of the S106.		

Observations / Comments:

Comments here relate to reserved matters under c.7 of APP/10/00828 and are informed by the T & P Regeneration Ltd. Phase 2 intrusive Site Investigation Report Ref: CS-J-0161 iss.3 (31/10/2019 [Berewood Newlands development Phase 2] Town Park Phase B).

The report identifies some relatively minor contamination in association with a former, informally constructed farm track, including asbestos as free fibres, and elevated concentrations of fuel range hydrocarbons (~0.5g/kg TPH). PAH sampling was not undertaken at the location where elevated hydrocarbons were identified, which hampers attribution to any particular source. It is possible that the TPH value is associated with an oil or liquid fuel, or potentially with a wood treatment or leached component of macadam. The Aliphatic/Aromatic split does not correspond to either a weathered petroleum spirit, nor a diesel fuel.

I note that the investigation did not identify any visual / olfactory evidence of contamination, and I would agree from the photographs provided, that natural soils would appear to be clean / unimpacted.

In the context of public open space, the concentrations of contaminants identified are not considered to be significant. It is considered likely that soils underlying the track could potentially be consistent with the made soils characterised at location TP03 (i.e. to be impacted by contamination) but it should be noted that made soils collected from a short distance away at TP04 essentially tested 'clean'.

I do not consider that any specific precautions are required to manage the contamination risk or other ground hazards, other than the general caution given within the report for groundworks personnel to 'remain vigilant' for visual or olfactory indications of contamination (including materials likely to contain asbestos) and for suspicious objects (clasts) that might represent unexploded ordnance (UXO or UXB).

These proposals require substantial groundworks, and as a result, if contaminated material is present it is likely to be observed / identified.

It should be noted that the exposure scenario for this development involves a large averaging area, which substantially limits the possibility of harm occurring in the event that the developer fails to identify a deposit of contaminated material.

In consideration of the above, I do not consider that any planning controls are required to formally manage contamination risks. There are no objections to the development, and no conditions are proposed.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer