

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From: Environmental Health **To:** Development Control

Our Ref: CONS/20/01830 **Your Ref:** APP/20/00455

EH Case Officer Extn: 44 6677 **Date:** 30 July 2020

DC Case Officer: Lewis Oliver

DC Case Officer Extn: 44 6263

Application Number: APP/20/00455

Site Address: Cottage Farm, 149 Lovedean Lane, Waterlooville

Proposed Development: Outline application (with all matters reserved except for access) for the construction of up to 56No dwellings, open space, landscaping, access, the demolition of 149 Lovedean Lane and associated works (part of application site within Havant Borough Council).

Observations / Comments:

It is acknowledged that the development land falls predominantly within the EHDC district, and that our policy colleagues have indicated that the development should be considered under EHDC policies.

The balance of areas may be materially relevant for issues like contaminated land risks, where the regulator is determined by the location of the source of contamination, but where one of the principal sensitive receptors is located within the HBC district (Portsmouth Water abstraction).

For other issues, such as those relevant to air quality-, are more directly relevant to the HBC area as the site access falls within the HBC district, and around 85% of traffic is to route via highways initially within the HBC district (Lovedean Lane South, and Yoells Lane).

For these reasons, I have reviewed the application supporting documents in detail, and would like to make some observations.

Design & Access and Planning Statement(s)

Several 'no build' zones are defined on scheme plans to provide surety in the stability of ground under built elements, and minimising ground dissolution risks.

The Planning Statement (at 5.24) suggests that *'further investigations [were] carried out to inform site constraints'*, but no geotechnical site investigation has been submitted with the application. The (Geo-Environmental) Desk Study Report J19042 (Dated as recently as February) makes a recommendation for extensive further ground investigation works to fully evaluate site conditions; recommending Geo-physics surveys, followed by geotechnical tests and a comprehensive range of trial holes to confirm results.

There were only 5 weeks between the date of the desk study & the formal government 'lock-down', so it is possible that the recommended works (at least the fieldwork element) could have been undertaken, but the timing is tight. The geotechnical work is material to the principle of

the layout (and ultimately to the quantum of development at the site), as well as to the drainage scheme. Unless these matters (i.e. quantum / layout / drainage scheme) are either deferred or controlled by a Grampian condition, I would suggest that the *Geotechnical site investigation report is an essential document to support determination of this outline application.*

Wilson Bailey Geotechnical & Environmental Desk Study - J19042 (Geotechnical & Ground Contamination Risk)

This report identifies no known potentially contaminating landuse at the site – having been used for ‘open agriculture’ throughout it’s history. Opportunistic deposit of waste materials within former mineral workings or natural dissolution features would represent the most tangible risk for the presence of contamination at the site.

The majority of risks identified are associated with the geotechnical side, and the geological setting of the site. The site is within an SPZ1, and is considered extremely sensitive to contaminants, to construction activity, and to changes in groundwater regimes as a result of development or drainage systems. The report confirms that preliminary discussions with Portsmouth Water Co. (PWC) confirm the risk perception, and the need for robust design and construction controls.

I note that the PWC Consultation response strongly reflects the perception that a precautionary-principal needs to be adopted at this site. PWC’s recommendations are addressed below.

I would broadly agree the conclusions of the report. Given comments regarding the ‘topsoil depleted’ state of the site, it is likely that extensive importation will be required to support fit-for-purpose private garden areas, and the proposed landscape scheme. This importation is arguably a principle risk – and a robust and enforceable system of verification of the quality & suitability of placed soils should be in place.

Surface Water Drainage, and CEP Flood Risk Assessment 23246 (Controlled Waters Pollution Risks)

The FRA confirms that the site is not expected to be at unacceptable risk of flooding from fluvial, pluvial or groundwater sources.

The report also confirms (at 1.4) the preliminary drainage strategy to comprise *“The proposed development will incorporate a sustainable drainage system which will discharge surface water at a restricted rate into the surrounding public surface water sewers and provide storage for all storm return periods up to and including the 1:100 year rainfall event with an allowance for climate change”*.

The design concept of this strategy is acceptable, and is compatible with conditions proposed by others largely as a result of comments at 6.3.5 which confirms that the ‘water quality swale[s]’ and ‘permeable paving [30% void storage volume]’ will be lined. It is implicit, but possibly worth highlighting here-, that the proprietary high-void ‘crate’ storage systems should also be lined in order to avoid unacceptable geological dissolution risks.

With respect to the drainage scheme, I note that there is a mismatch between the text at 6.2.13.2 and the ‘impermeable areas’ plan at Appendix 9, which shows the access road to be impermeable. I would highlight that an inadequate standard of pollution protection is likely to be achieved (in respect of access road runoff), if the access is constructed as a traditionally drained impermeable surface. *As above, if this element of the scheme is not a reserved matter, clarification should be sought.*

Appendix 10 provides an indicative drainage design – no specific issues have been identified, and I note that the principle (and target discharge rates) are acceptable to the LLFA. My only

comments on the scheme design are that the swales provide pollutant attenuation services downstream of the storage structures, risking high levels of siltation within the storage structures, or at least, placing significant reliance on the efficacy of both of the catch-pit structures and their preventative maintenance.

Appendix 11 provides an indicative maintenance schedule which includes important provisions for construction-phase drainage. It is recommended that i) the decision notice makes this schedule enforceable as a 'baseline minimum standard', and ii) that the long-term maintenance through formation- (or contracting & funding-) of a management company is appropriately secured (whether by condition, or through the s106 agreement).

i-Transport Transport Assessment Ref: SJ/BB/ITB11383-006C & Air Quality Relevant Scheme elements (Air Quality)

It should be noted that the SJ/BB/ITB11383-006C report did not include 7-day data from the automatic traffic counters (ATC) deployed on Lovedean Lane. This precludes calculation of a local & recent 'peak flow to AADT' expansion factor to consider how the peak flow impacts described translate into changes in road traffic flows on an AADT basis.

For review purposes I have used the nearest available ATC data for Lovedean lane yielding AADT traffic estimates from the applicants' peak flow data of:

- Lovedean - South of Yoells Ln. ~5900 to 8500
- Lovedean - North of Yoells Ln. ~6200 to 10100
- Yoells Ln. ~2000K to 3800

It is generally considered that air quality problems are unlikely to arise where the 'building line' for air quality sensitive property is >5m from the kerbside of roads carrying more than 10000 vehicles per day. With reference to the figures above, this is at the upper end of estimates for Lovedean Lane north of Yoells lane only. Routing estimates provides suggest that only around 15% development traffic will utilise the Lovedean Lane road link north of Yoells lane.

With reference to the total traffic generation estimates (Table 6.2) 12 hr traffic generation estimates approximate to around 300 vehicles on an AADT basis. Nationally accepted guidance dismisses the need for a scheme air quality assessment where expected new traffic generation is less than 500 vehicles on an AADT basis.

For these reasons, it is not expected that air quality is material to the principal of development, or it's layout, as a source of new emissions or as a receptor for existing emissions.

I have in addition reviewed the non-motorised highway user audit (Appendix F), and would comment as follows:

- 2.2.3 recommends the provision of tactile paving across the James Copse Road / Lovedean Lane junction bellmouth to improve the public realm for pedestrians, alongside a formal pedestrian crossing on Woodcroft Lane, to further improve pedestrian access to Woodcroft Primary School. Both measures are supported, but the latter is considered to be particularly relevant given the scale of the Linden's development on Woodcroft Ln (site entrance visible on Image 6), assuming that this improvement has not already been secured in connection with that development.
- 2.3.3 recommends some improvements to pedestrian route to Horndean Tech College, to include a formal dropped kerb and tactile paving crossing arrangement across Frogmore Lane; and formal pedestrian crossing points to be provided in the vicinity of the Lovedean Lane / Yoells Lane priority junction as part of the site access works. Both measures are

supported, but it is considered most important to secure the formal crossing arrangements to both the North & South of the site entrance.

Improvements to the pedestrian environment are supported on the basis of the related support for making zero-emission active-travel choices as convenient & appealing as possible to contribute to both air pollution and public health objectives.

Consultees (Stat/Non-Stat Organisational & Public)

- The LLFA consultee recommends that any subsequent Reserved Matters or Full Planning Application should be supported by agreement in principle from the asset owner (Southern Water) for the proposed discharge rates and connections, and in addition; proposes a Grampian Condition which overlaps significantly with that proposed by PWC (at c.1). PWC's & the LLFA's requirements do differ – the LLFA's wording is in general more comprehensive & detailed, but PWC introduce an additional and substantial requirement for a '*comprehensive assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development*'. In the interests of avoiding unnecessary duplication, a consolidated condition will need to be agreed.
- The Environmental Health (nuisance & amenity) consultee proposes a Grampian condition requiring submission of a CEMP. This requirement has significant overlap with PWC's wording (at c.4). Again, PWC's wording includes additional elements particularly relevant to pollution, so a consolidated condition will need to be agreed which accounts for all requirements.
- PWC's proposed c.3 is supported. No alternative / expanded wording is proposed. Similarly, proposed restrictive c.5 requiring a piling risk assessment is supported, principally to mitigate the risk of short-term physical contamination in the aquifer (turbidity)
- PWC's proposed c.6 aims to restrict infiltration drainage within a 10m buffer of any known dissolution feature, and it is requested that PWC is consulted on any future investigative works. I would highlight that no condition will require further investigative works, and the applicant will be under no obligation to submit such works as a reserved matter; a positive determination on this application will secure the quantum & layout. In line with the recommendation above, it is considered that *Geotechnical site investigation report is an essential document to support determination of this outline application* and if sufficient geotechnical information cannot be obtained prior to determination, ideally both the quantum and layout should be reserved until these matters can be shown to be effectively supported by the geotechnical & geological context.
- I have reviewed the available public comments. I would dismiss concerns about transport emissions and would consider traffic & access junction issues to be highway matters. Clarification is being sought in respect of access road drainage, and I note that several consultees are seeking to ensure that adequate drainage is achieved. It is perhaps relevant to consider the combined highway impact of all committed nearby local development in combination with the proposed scheme, however this is unlikely to be material in terms of air quality, but may be from a highway safety perspective given the 85th percentile speeds identified (exceed limit) as justification for improving the public realm for pedestrians.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer