

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/20/02075	Your Ref:	APP/20/00533
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	27 August 2020
DC Case Officer:	Tina Pickup		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6461		
Application Number:	APP/20/00533		
Site Address:	B.M. Scaffolding, Brockhampton Road, Havant, PO9 1JU		
Proposed Development:	Proposed demolition of existing industrial unit in favour of a new replacement unit for B1, B2 and B8 use		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the application documents and would like to make some brief comments in respect of contamination risk, air quality and drainage / SuDS.

Noise / Light Nuisance

I can confirm that my colleague, Soffia Handley, has reviewed this application in respect of it's potential for amenity / nuisance issues and has logged a 'no adverse comments' outcome on our case. I am unclear whether these has been communicated to the planning service or not.

Contaminated Land

I note the application document states that Contamination issues are not anticipated at the site, and that the application did not include a phase 1 environmental desk study.

Given the industrial history of the site – particularly that associated with metal finishing / surface treatment, I have undertaken a brief review of the context of the site. This review has highlighted some features of concern. Notably, 89/54070 shows at least one soakaway which is shown as featuring an overflow pipe communicating directly with the culverted channel to the Brockhampton Stream. It not known what degree of connectivity there may be between site and the former watercress beds & the section of the Brockhampton channel to the west of the site; or between the culverted section of the Brockhampton, and the beds / channel to the west – however it is known from prior sampling that the Brockhampton channel to the west has exceeded EQS values for metals in individual sample results (which could in principle have been associated with this site, though were attributed to another source at the time).

It is understood the metal plating processes were not undertaken within the laboratory unit, but it is implicit that such activity was routinely undertaken within the workshop. I also note that prior consents included Grampian style condition relating to provisions for the safe refuelling of vehicles; this is an unusual provision, and it implies that local refuelling was a feature of the operation of the site.

Plans also indicate that buildings previously present on the site were clad & roofed almost exclusively with Asbestos containing materials – and most rainwater goods were specified as being constructed from asbestos cement. It would be prudent to regard all made soils at the site as potentially contaminated with asbestos. This could have implications for disposal, and if this risk is not dismissed through physical investigation the potential for presence may necessitate quantification and screening.

It is acknowledged that the proposed use is not contamination sensitive, however it remains appropriate in policy terms (para. 178 of the NPPF, and locally, DM17 & DM10) to seek confirmation that the site could not meet the definition of 'Contaminated Land' following development.

The potential risk to controlled waters is considered sufficient to justify requiring a proactive investigation of the site. Any investigation undertaken will need to respond to the utilities constraints.

There is no material objection to the proposed development, subject to the following conditions:

Contamination (Standard) [1]

Prior to the commencement of any specific phase of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site, whether originating from within or outside the curtilage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons, and the findings presented as a written report.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

- 1) *A site walk-over survey &/or sufficient desk-based research to identify;*
 - *All relevant previous uses of the site,*
 - *Potentially significant features and contaminants associated with those uses*
 - *Uncertainties relating to previous use or associated potential contaminants*
 - *A conceptual site model identifying all relevant sources, exposure pathways and receptors, and;*
 - *A summary of potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.*
- 2) *Site investigation based on (1), to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise any physical contamination on or affecting the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.*
- 3) *The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1) & (2), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes;*
 - *appropriately considered remedial objectives,*
 - *an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to sustainability, and;*
 - *clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.*
- 4) *A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out any Remediation Strategy required under (2) are complete, identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant*

linkages, maintenance of engineered mitigation measures, and arrangements for contingency action.

All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: Contamination may be present at the site as a result previous land uses, activities and/or demolitions that could pose a risk to controlled waters, groundworks personnel, or future occupants. This is in line with DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

Verification (Standard) [2]

*Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, any verification report required in accordance with **condition [1]** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan, and must demonstrate that site remediation criteria have been met. Where longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages is identified as being necessary, the report shall clearly set out plans for monitoring, provision for maintenance, relevant triggers and contingency actions (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan").

The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Contamination may be present at the site as a result previous land uses, activities and/or demolitions that could pose a risk to controlled waters, groundworks personnel, or future occupants. This is in line with DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], and paragraphs 178-180 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

Air Quality

The development is not 'major' development and so under emerging policy would not require either proposals to offset emissions to air, or an assessment of emissions from the operational fleet of vehicles. A significant air pollution impact would not be expected.

I note that the parking consultee has highlighted the parking shortfall. I would further point out that 4 of the proposed spaces could not be used concurrently with the loading bays.

Long stay cycle parking (by means of indoor wall mounted storage brackets) is indicated to be proposed, but is not shown on the plans. It is considered good practice to provide adequate cycle storage and changing / showering facilities to make sustainable travel choices as easy as possible for employees. Given the above comment, this is advised, but I could not justify an objection on this omission / inconsistency.

Drainage / SuDS

I note that the focus of the FRA report is upon justifying the principle of development within a flood risk zone. No drainage scheme proposal is given within the application documents, and I note that the report omits a site runoff estimate from the existing site for flood contribution purposes.

It is anticipated that the LLFA will require that a detailed drainage scheme be secured by means of a Grampian condition. If not, please contact me and I will suggest suitable wording.

Pollution issues can be dealt with under that condition – it suffices to state here that the same

reasons that make this site sensitive in respect of soil Contamination make the site similarly sensitive in pollution terms. A proprietary interceptor unit may be required in the yard area, and filter strips / attenuation planting might be prudent at the site boundaries.

I note the comments within the FRA on feasible runoff mitigation on a small site – a green roof solution is suggested alongside rainwater harvesting as potential features (it is recognised that these do not represent proposals).

Green rooves are regarded as providing an air quality benefit (providing an attenuation and absorption service), and would be welcomed at this location, considering nearby emissions sources.

Similarly, the scale of the site would lend itself to a modest rainwater harvesting system – representing a low-cost flood mitigation feature that would add to the sustainability credentials of the scheme.

Due to the proximity of nearby controlled waters, infiltration drainage may not be compatible with soil conditions – this might be dependent upon the results from the contamination assessment.

On the assumption that drainage details can be secured post-consent & prior to commencement, I have no objections on pollution grounds to the principle of development.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer