

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/18/01973	Your Ref:	APP/18/00478
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6666	Date:	02 October 2018
DC Case Officer:	Rachel Ballam		
DC Case Officer Extn:	6143		
Application Number:			
Site Address:	Street Record, Fulflood Road, Havant		
Proposed Development:	Application for variation of Condition 15 of Planning Permission APP/15/01233 relating to internal layout, fenestration layout and main entrance (approved 16.8.18). Request to discharge condition No. 6 (3.09.18). Request to discharge condition No's 3, 4, 9, 11 and 14 (10.09.18).		

A request has been made to discharge the following condition(s) on the above application:

Condition 6 [Contamination].
Condition 9:[SuDS]
Condition 14:[Lighting]

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documents submitted in support of this application. Comments here relate to conditions no's 6 & 9 only - I understand that an approval notice has already been issued in respect of condition no. 14 following comments from Mark Moss.

Condition 6, Contamination

It is noted that the documents submitted are the same as those submitted in support of an application to discharge condition no. 5 of APP/15/01233, and that the applicant has requested that c.5 (15/01233) application be considered as a request to discharge c.6 of APP/18/00478.

Environmental Health considered the documents in detail as part of the 15/01233 application. In the absence of any new information, the same conclusion should be reached, and therefore the consultation response dated 14th May 2018 for c.5 remain wholly valid.

On that basis, I recommend that the request to discharge c.6 of APP/18/00478 is either refused pending the undertaking of a limited phase of additional site investigation in line with submitted proposals, or that an extension of time be agreed and any other available material information (e.g. the 2015 Structural Soils Ltd. report referenced within the Soiltechnics report) be submitted for review within the decision period of the current application (with a view to determining whether sufficient information is available to conclude that the source is likely to exist solely off-site, or to have been already mitigated).

Condition 9, SuDS (Pollution)

The SuDS layout relies upon permeable paving to achieve the principle retention of pollutants (LNAPL's and total solids) at the surface, and upon a Class 1 full retention separator as proprietary secondary retention. Details of the separator have not been provided, but on the assumption that it is suitably sized, the proposed layout is considered to be robust in pollution control terms; and certainly adequate for the consented development.

I note that all yard areas drain to the interceptor unit, and that roofwater is sent to a parallel system to discharge 'downstream' of the chamber. This is good practice, and helps to ensure that the interceptor size can be minimised, while ensuring it is not overwhelmed during period of heavy rainfall.

I also note (however) that the Southern Water Services (SWS) consultation response recommended refusal of c.9 on the grounds that SuDS elements (the tanked permeable paving) are proposed to be built over a public foul sewer, and within its 5m easement. All surface water discharges via a hydrobrake, to an existing headwall. No calculations have been submitted - I would expect the LLFA to raise an objection on this basis. This is purely a flooding issue, and is not relevant to pollution considerations - I will leave it to the LLFA to make appropriate representation as regards runoff flow rate.

The SWS objection does not seem likely to be an insurmountable. The area in question comprises just 2 no. parking spaces; there may be scope to 'lose' those spaces to avoid the need to drain the area (recognising that this may not be desirable from MIPA's perspective), or it may be possible to curtail the extent of the tanked system, and to surface (or tank) those spaces with an impermeable surface (or membrane) laid to fall to the permeable system. This would represent a minor amendment to an otherwise strong scheme.

Notwithstanding the objection from SWS, or any subsequent comments from the LLFA - I would be happy to recommend approval of c.9 on the grounds that it satisfies the pollution control requirements.

Mr. Jonathan Driver

Environmental Control Officer