

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/19/02106	Your Ref:	APP/19/00324
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	14 October 2019
DC Case Officer:	Steve Weaver		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6512		
Application Number:	APP/19/00324		
Site Address:	5-7 Station Road, Hayling Island		
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing dwelling and business units and construction of a 2/3 storey building to provide 19 flats and 2 commercial units with vehicle and bicycle parking and a bin store.		
	RECONSULTATION REQUEST for revised plans and/or documents received		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the revised documents submitted, alongside the responses from key consultees (for context, and to avoid unnecessary duplication). Comments here are limited to those submissions relating to transport, parking & sustainability (from an air quality perspective), drainage provision (from an 'adequacy', and pollution perspective), and contamination / contaminated land assessment.

I am aware that Environmental Health has previously provided substantive comments in respect of noise, nuisance and amenity. Mark Moss has been allocated this case for comment in respect of these subject areas, and I expect material comments to follow under separate cover in due course.

Contaminated Land Assessment

I note that the applicant has re-submitted the GCC Ground Condition Desk Top Study Ref J19-005-R01 (v1) dated 28/01/2019.

This document was reviewed at initial consultation. As no new Land Contamination information has been included, or incorporated into a revised study; comments & recommendations made previously remain valid. Please see CONS-19-00716 02/05/2019.

Drainage / SuDS

I note that a surfacewater drainage assessment has been submitted which concludes that the proposed scheme will result in a net reduction in runoff rate without any additional specific attenuation features.

From this I interpret the permeable surfacing indicated on the submitted drainage layout plan to represent a conventional system (i.e. rainfall transparent surfacing, without systems for collection, conveyance and storage).

This will increase the natural percolation rates at the site relative to existing (cover latter notes that the site is almost entirely covered in hard-standing). My only comment is to make the

observation that this may be material to the site conceptual model against which the contamination risk assessment should be considered.

As regards the submitted drainage layout, I note that drawing 414406-100P1 Aug 19 contains the text 'Assumed combined drain in road'. Please note that no combined systems are noted to be present in this area, and that the public systems are separated. The nearest public surface water sewer inspection chamber is located 27m East, with available public maps showing a 'stub' connection (i.e. indicating that a public sewer pipe is known to exist, but it's pipe location / orientation is unknown). This mapped 'stub' (in reality, a sewer) is shown to run in the direction of development.

For the benefit of the applicant, the closest public surface water chamber is SWS asset no. 692636, noted to be present "IN FOOTPATH OPPOSITE THE BARLEY", with an shallow invert level of <1.0m below existing ground levels.

It is not appropriate to dispose of surface water to the foul sewer as indicated, this would contribute to capacity issues at local network pumping stations and Budds Farm, and so to the frequency and volume of discharges of wastewater to the Harbour during periods of heavy rainfall. If the existing site is so connected, the applicant should make separate (new) connections to the public foul and surfacewater sewers, and appropriately decommission / seal any incorrectly connected drains serving surfacewater collection systems at the site.

For the avoidance of doubt, I would advise against approving the above referenced drawing in it's current form. It may be expedient to simply condition the detailed scheme for foul & surfacewater drainage.

Air Quality (Parking, Addendum Transport Assessment, Revised Scheme)

I note the revised accommodation schedule & parking provision, providing SPD compliant allocation to residential units and a <SPD (nil) commercial provision. In line with previous comments, I would raise no objection to the under-provision.

I also note that the Transport assessment is predicated on the commercial units representing A2 Office or B1 use, and not retail / customer-facing business. This is not explicit in the application documents, referring only to 'commercial unit'(s). I note the reiteration of concerns about capacity in the adjacent public car park, and that weekend survey data is not presented.

It may be material to the assessment of parking / conflict with existing traffic flows (or pedestrians / cyclists) whether or not a consent is granted with a specific use class restriction on the commercial units, or an open (unspecified) 'commercial use' consent is awarded.

The submitted traffic count data for Station Road places the 2-way AADT estimate at around 4950 vehicles, where significant direct air quality impacts are unlikely. Indirect impacts (e.g. discouraging travel by sustainable travel modes through inappropriate parking) are likely to be more significant from a general air quality perspective. In this way, this issue is more likely to be of material significance in general planning terms (as a local amenity issue)

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer