

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/19/02068	Your Ref:	APP/18/01107
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	15 October 2019
DC Case Officer:	Miss S Haigh		
DC Case Officer Extn:	6530		
Application Number:	APP/18/01107		
Site Address:	Out Buildings, 97 Lovedean Lane, Waterlooville, PO8 9RN		
Proposed Development:	Erection of 3No. 4 bed dwellings including parking and landscaping (approved 22.3.19). Request to Discharge Condition No. 6 (recd 9.7.19).		
	Request to Discharge Condition 3 [Materials], 15 [Site Management] and 18 [Piling / Controlled Waters Risk] (26.09.19)		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the text of condition no's 15 & 18, and the documents submitted in support of the application to discharge those conditions. I have spoken with the noise & amenity officer, and do not expect separate comments to be made by this office.

c.15 - Environmental Management during construction, iii) Details of pollution mitigation measures

The R & R Design Studio Ltd. Construction Management Plan (CMP) has a focus which is clearly guided by the specific condition wording, omitting (for example) the typical aspects such as site working hours, prohibition of burning on site, and mitigation of noise for amenity of neighbours. The Condition does not specifically require these things, so their omission cannot be regarded as grounds to refuse.

I note the provisions for staggering deliveries, and having an unloading area at the site entrance for final transfer by hand or by light site plant to the storage compound; which is otherwise vehicle restricted. The site is notably tight, and this arrangement probably makes the material storage compound one of the 'best protected' areas from damage by collision (through restriction of reversing HGV / LGV, access by small plant only), though it is recognised that use of site plant in this area means that some risk remains.

Given the reasons for the imposition of condition 15, protection of fuel stores (and other potentially contaminating liquid products) and prevention of spillage is likely to be the most critical element of the CMP.

The CMP provides for any fuel oil or diesel brought on to site being held in bunded tanks or in small containers on bunded pallets. It does not (however) indicate;

- where these are to be stored,
- whether any provision will be made for the storage of other construction solvents / liquids (additives etc.),
- whether any additional protection from accidental collision will be provided, or
- (in the case of use of bunded pallets) whether the bund will be sheltered so as to prevent the bund from filling with rainwater, or be otherwise secured from damage or theft.
- Similarly, the CMP does not cover refuelling of plant and portable equipment e.g., restriction to specific area, routine use of drip trays etc. in order control small spills, and to ensure that fuelling occurs close to the location of spill kits & away from drainage systems.

The general provisions of the CMP in respect of dust, access and plant and site traffic are generally good. If any amendment or expansion is required to ensure that water resources are best protected, it is likely in these areas. I would recommend a revision to account for these factors, for the avoidance of doubt.

As regards drainage, I am satisfied that water resources will be sufficiently protected during the period where natural percolation is to be relied upon to control site surface water. There is no indication of impermeable strata underlying the site, so significant local pluvial flow is considered unlikely to occur, and local sandy / gravelly clays generally being at least 500mm thick will provide sufficient short-term interception of pollutants that may be mobilised by rainfall. The risk posed by soakaways will be dependent on their construction, and the measures to prevent mobile contaminants / pollutants entering the soakaway system. If discharging direct & unfiltered into the chalk, direct turbidity risks may arise - but I would view this as a design deficiency as much as a construction management issue.

Suitable spill management equipment (e.g. drain seals / booms, as proposed), should suffice for the purpose of addressing acute risks from pollutant releases. Assuming that soakaways are compatible with the contamination risks at the site (and that their design is appropriate), I don't see their proposed use for managing construction phase runoff as representing a significant additional risk.

c.18 - Piling

I am mindful that Environmental Health has not been asked to comment on the discharge of c.18. This being the case, I will keep it brief, but it may be helpful to make some observations as this condition is related to the contamination assessment and mitigation conditions.

The contamination conditions remain outstanding. An additional phase of investigation is either planned or in progress, which will include some groundwater or leachate testing alongside general characterisation of made soils - in particular in the region of the former chalk pit underlying plot 3.

In this way, it is not yet known whether there is a particular need for the piling method to minimise the risk of creating new pathways to the chalk (or not), as it is not known whether or not vertical migration is likely to represent a material and significant risk (requiring mitigation).

It is clear from the notes accompanying the design / layout documents provided that

- detailed design has not yet been undertaken (submissions for approval are deferred to contractor)
- (this notwithstanding,-) the chalk underlying the site is to provide the structural support
- penetration depths (into chalk) are likely to exceed 5m in places if all indicated design assumptions are applied universally across the site, and that,
- no piling method has been ruled out, so percussive / vibro- methods may be specified.

Portsmouth Water will be best equipped to advise on the appropriate level of risk as regards short term turbidity issues at abstraction points that might be associated with pile installation. Until I have the results of the additional phase of site investigation, I will be unable to advise on suitable piling methods that are compatible with soil conditions, the local use of soakaways, and the local depth to the strata representing the principal aquifer.

My expectation would be that Portsmouth Water will object to the discharge of c.18 at this stage, as neither the depth, diameter or method of piling appears to have been specified to date (i.e. not meeting the requirements of c.18 a) or b)).

If the recommendation from Portsmouth Water is to approve discharge against the above observation, then I would highlight that the approved details may need to be amended following- (depending upon- / in response to-) the results of the additional site investigation. If it is impractical to revisit the piling method, then any Site Conceptual Model for Contamination purposes will simply need to account for the proposed / approved method, and (under this scenario - i.e. where a risk is shown to exist-) this would likely result in a need for an enhanced standard of remediation.

The implication is for the applicant as it is procedurally for the Council, and it does not 'in & of itself' necessarily amount to a reason to refuse the current application.

As regards the determination of c.18, I would defer to the expertise of Portsmouth Water as regards the perception of risk associated with piling. I am comfortable to account for the decision as appropriate when considering the discharge of c.6.

Comments here are for the avoidance of doubt as to how the interaction between c.18 & c.6 will be viewed in the event that an 'unfavourable ground-conditions' scenario emerges.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer