

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/18/01587	Your Ref:	APP/18/00481
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	14 August 2018
DC Case Officer:	Mrs Emma Chisnall		
DC Case Officer Extn:	6523		
Application Number:	APP/18/00481		
Site Address:	61 Hollybank Lane, Emsworth, PO10 7UE		
Proposed Development:	Erection of 1No. 3 bed dwelling		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documents submitted in support of the current application. I am unclear on the reason that consultation of Environmental Health was triggered for this application where 09/72129/002 or APP/16/00516 (or 00916) is unclear.

Contamination

The single dwelling consented on land South of #2 Aubin Wood, and the plots of dwellings numbered 1-6 Brunswick Place coincide with an area previously used for a 'kitchen' or 'market' garden, probably formerly associated with Oak Lodge. This feature is represented by some 8 glasshouses (measuring upto 16 x 24m as max dimensions), and a walled garden / allotment area measuring some 30 x 45m, also a former orchard site. Other areas of the Aubin Wood development coincide with brownfield land, having the appearance of commercial or agricultural uses.

Orchard uses carry a low but not negligible risk of contamination - with soil improvers and traditional pest control treatments often containing environmentally persistent substances of significant human toxicity (e.g. arsenic, and solid-phase aromatic hydrocarbons, such as Benzo(k)Fluoranthene). Glass houses also carry a risk of combustion products being present from space heating, and use of potash, and perhaps most significantly carry a risk of elevated lead as a result of weathering of finished surfaces and from maintenance activities.

It was a missed opportunity not to investigate the land upon development of Brunswick Place, and as a result, it is not clear that those consents are compliant with the national policy. Fortunately, the greatest density of brownfield features coincides with low risk areas associated with access roads and parking areas, reducing the likelihood of any one of the consented dwellings being subject to average concentrations above relevant health criteria - though this remains a realistic possibility for some plots.

With specific reference to #61; some of the glasshouse features mentioned above exist at the boundaries of the subject site, and potentially just within the curtilage of the rear garden area. The risks are however more applicable to the properties already built out &/or consented, than

they would be to #61, with a relatively low probability of an exceedance of a health screening value over a relevant averaging area at #61, when compared with the highest risk consented / built plots.

Therefore, In the interests of consistency, and being mindful of proportionality of requirements relative to the scale of development and risk - it is not considered reasonable to require a proactive investigation of the plot of #61.

I have not other environmental concerns, and I understand that Mark Moss has already responded on subjects relevant to noise & nuisance.

Mark's comments notwithstanding - I have no adverse comments to make.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer