

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/19/02537	Your Ref:	APP/18/00453
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	18 December 2019
DC Case Officer:	Miss S Haigh		
DC Case Officer Extn:			
Application Number:	APP/18/00453		
Site Address:	Land South of Eastleigh House & Helmsley House, Bartons Road, Havant		
Proposed Development:	Reserved matters application following outline permission APP/15/01435 to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for 175 No. dwellings (including 53 affordable homes) comprising 5 x 1 bed flats, 18 x 2 bed flats, 28 x 2 bed houses, 84 x 3 bed houses and 40 x 4 bed houses; play area and public spaces, roads, footways, cycleway, and drainage features.(14.12.18). Request to discharge condition No.2 (05.02.19).Request to discharge condition No.3 (30.07.19). Request to discharge Conditions 11 and 12 (26.09.19) A request has been made to discharge the following condition 3 (Piling)		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the relatively limited information submitted in relation to this application. I would take a fairly neutral stance on this application, but would nevertheless draw your attention to the specific requirements of condition 3, namely;

- (i) the type of piling proposed
- (ii) the design depth for piles
- (iii) the design rationale for the selected foundation solution
- (iv) the density of piling proposed, and
- (v) a materials management plan for anticipated imports and exports to & from the site, respectively

Much of the information submitted to date is reasonably generic, and has a focus on above ground operations (e.g. plant use and pile handling etc.), and health and safety. This does not in & of itself address points (ii)-(v), and only partially addresses point (i).

With respect to the recent submission, the text of the cover letter only refers to the piles already installed. Whilst it may be implied, it does not follow that the deepest planned pile has already installed (this is not stated to the best of my knowledge), and so the Council cannot take the submission as being sufficient to in & of itself to satisfy requirement (ii) above. The submission does not confirm the maximum target depth, nor the location of the deepest planned pile.

I am similarly not aware that any design rationale has been submitted (requirement (iii) from above), and I have not managed to locate a piling layout plan which identifies the planned positions & density (requirement (iv) from above) which identifies the type of pile to be used at each location

(requirement (i) from above). To the best of my knowledge the information submitted to date does not include a materials management plan - notwithstanding that it is accepted that there will be no import / export from the site in relation to the planned displacement piling (other than pre-cast piles & plant - requirement (iv) from above) .

To be clear, I don't dispute the borehole logs submitted, or the negligible risk to the aquifer associated with the installation of the piles constructed to date.

From a technical compliance perspective however, the applicant doesn't appear to have met the strict requirements of the condition.

In line with comments previously submitted, I would only have concerns about piles anticipated to be driven to depths exceeding 24m BEGL (the approximate limit of available BGS boreholes), and it is acknowledged that engineering requirements are unlikely to necessitate exceedance of this depth.

In this respect, I would raise no objection if you were minded to discharge condition 3 on the basis of the submitted information (without prejudice to comments made by my colleagues under separate cover, on other aspects of the piling method). I regard it as a technical planning matter as to whether the applicant should be required to submit documentation specifically addressing the condition requirements.

In the absence of any material objections from Environmental Health on risks to the aquifer, I would recommend that significant weight be given to the comments of the Portsmouth Water Company as regards the appropriate level of concern. I do not anticipate any substantial objection - which would mean that the planning determination would 'turn' on the judgement in relation to the technical requirements to demonstrate condition compliance.

Other matters;

Please note, I am aware of the application to discharge c.18 (external lighting) under the outline consent. Comments are likely to be submitted by my colleagues with a 'nuisance and amenity' focus, however there is no need for me to make a response to that consultation.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer