

ARV/2045

11 November 2018

Havant Borough Council
Planning Department
Public Service Plaza
Civic Centre Road
Havant
Hants PO9 2AX

Dear Sirs,

**Re: Interbridges Site, Emsworth - Planning Permission APP/16/00295
Application for approval of conditions dated 21/06/2017**

Further to the submission of details in compliance with Conditions 4,5,6,7 and 8 of the above permission, we comment further, given the responses last year.

Condition 4 - Road Sections

We note that County Highways have responded that these internal details are the remit of HBC and the Local Agent.

Condition 5 - Road Layout

We believe, quite deliberately, this condition was written (at our request) to exclude the requirement for the S278 Agreement to actually be in place before commencement as that seemed improbable and there was particular concern that the traffic signal system should not be present during construction as it would constrict free access and inevitably be damaged by large construction loads.

There was some implication in the response from County Highways that this might be the case as there was no application for a temporary access. We did last year meet on site with Steven Townsend, the Local Highways Engineer to discuss a temporary access and it was agreed a S171 Notice was the right procedure, provided we limit the width to 10 metres.

Cont/....

This is a licence to work in the highway at a particular time, which also needs a permit for the crossing itself (normally expected to be a permanent dropped kerb rather than temporary as intended); the contractor undertaking the work has to do this with a timescale, thus we need to clear 'pre-commencement' first.

The S278 adoption will now involve a significantly smaller part of the access, as such any temporary access within that area will be removed for the S278 construction.

Condition 6 – Proposed Floor levels

You have approved

Condition 7 – Proposed Services in relation to trees

The response from Harry Mitchell was seeking a revised Landscaping Scheme, because of the Gas Pipeline planting Strip.

We rejected the need for this on the basis that it was not part of the condition and we had successfully included the previous permission planting scheme in with the now retired Landscape Architects Report and Management Plan and had agreed with Daphney Haywood to apply it to that additional area on the same basis, with the exception that it would not include trees as they could damage the Pipeline. A copy of the Report and Plan were included in our response.

Condition 8 – Proposed Drainage

The responses from both Southern Water and Hampshire Lead Flood Team required us to re-address the surface water drainage of the site. Our original Engineers scheme was we thought extreme and still depended upon a capacity check. We engaged another Engineer whilst attempting to get a capacity check approval; two attempts were rejected at the rate given and Chris Manhire did eventually get a verbal figure of 1.5 litres/second; this is abnormally small, any flow control system at that rate would likely be blocked at critical times, and such a small discharge would have little benefit for the site.

In eight-months our Engineer failed to produce a scheme, thus we now have RGP involved, who are also dealing with S278.

We did have further full percolation tests undertaken; this was in winter, which was not ideal, but produced slightly better results.

Proposed Drainage Scheme

RGP have produced a soakaway-based scheme which is included herewith, the content of which is scheduled in their letter and technical details.

Cont/....

In our view in simple terms this scheme is as follows:

The existing site is grass and scrub with natural attenuation, whilst the front two-thirds is to all intents and purposes impermeable, the rear has some degree of percolation; when this exceeds capacity the site run-off flows into Seagull lane. The natural flow East from Seagull Lane to the River Ems was blocked in 1987 by the A27 over-ground outfall and now runs South under the railway bridge and into the River via Brook Meadows. The new scheme needs to be shown not to exacerbate and ideally improve upon that.

The additional run off from the proposed hard surfaces is collected, passed where appropriate through oil separators and ultimately discharged to soakaways in the more permeable parts of the site; these soakaways are more efficient than the natural percolation into the sub-soil.

Whilst the scheme does not include a balancing pond per se, in an extreme event, the lower car park levels are such that it can be allowed to flood providing storage capacity for the additional water (both now and allowing for climate change) until such time as the soakaways can discharge into the subsoil.

We acknowledge the comments regarding maintenance; Interbridges Estate Management Ltd was incorporated in January 2018 to have control of the common areas including drainage, landscaping, trees, fences, surfaces and parking.

Condition 3 - Construction Traffic Management Plan

We have yet to submit this last outstanding pre-commencement condition; the main contractor will provide the information for this in the light of the current S278 progress; the latter has made a leap forward in the last week in that The HCC Engineering Consultancy have accepted that they have all the necessary information for the Design Audit Review to proceed; their default programme before 3 months notification of road closure can be given includes four months of queries and responses, but in theory this has been processed in advance.

We hope that the above address the response issue raised, but if you have any query or require more information, please contact the writer or Chris Manhire or for technical drainage issues, please contact Mark Akmenkalns of RGP direct.

Yours faithfully

ANDREW VANAGS

on behalf of Manhire LLP