

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/17/02174	Your Ref:	APP/17/01036
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	17 November 2017
DC Case Officer:	Tina Pickup		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6461		
Application Number:	APP/17/01036		
Site Address:	60 Fir Copse Road, Waterloo, PO7 5HZ		
Proposed Development:	Erection of 1No. 2 bed bungalow to land rear of 60 Fir Copse Road.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documentation submitted, alongside our own spatial records, and consultee comments. I've also picked up a couple of issues that might have been missed by other consultees, so will touch on those areas briefly. I'll keep it as brief as possible.

Controlled Waters, Flooding & Drainage

Both the EA and HBC Engineers have flagged the presence of a culverted river channel on the Eastern Boundary. Steve Mountain has flagged the propensity of the area to flooding (as have some of the residential consultees), and the Agency has stressed the need to maintain runoff rates to greenfield levels.

In this latter regard, I note that no calculations have been submitted, and similarly that the Environment Agency has stopped short of requesting a condition or taking ownership of this issue in order to secure a condition of no net increase (or even a net decrease) in runoff from the site, post development.

I also note that while the Agency are correct in their assessment that the dwelling falls outside the 8m easement within which a permit would be required for works, the Electricity Sub-Station is within 2m of the mapped river line.

I note that Building Control has raised the potential need to consult that Statutory Undertaker on the position of the proposed dwelling relative to the existing public foul sewer. The plans indicated that the building is to be positioned a minimum of 3m from the confirmed position of the sewer line. The proposed position for the re-located substation is however within 0.5m of the mapped position of the main sewer, and may even (given mapping errors) underlie it. I would strongly recommend that the views of Southern Water are sought in this regard.

Emails attached to the case refer to SuDS - there does not appear to be any firm proposals

in this respect. It suffices from my side to conclude that the building is a low-risk use class, and of conventional construction, being of low pollution concern. SuDS are likely to be far more relevant in respect of their impact on the flood risk (positive or negative), and in terms of the sustainability credentials of the scheme. I trust that the applicant will work with HBC's engineers in formulating an acceptable scheme. If you are minded to grant consent, I would recommend that detailed drainage arrangements are secured by condition for both foul and surface water / SuDS, given the proximity to a controlled waters receptor.

Transport / Air Quality

No concerns, single dwelling trips are negligible with respect to traffic growth, and there is no concern with ambient levels of air pollution in the vicinity.

Contamination

There are no specific potentially contaminating former landuses at the site, other than the Electricity Sub Station, which has been present since at least 1974, and possibly as early as 1961.

Sub stations, especially small stations, do not represent a particularly high risk of release, but if releases occur the transformer oils can be particularly harmful due to PCB formation in the oils during normal use.

The site is particularly sensitive, being within 10m of a main river line, and adjacent to a residential garden. The presence of an SPZ1c is not relevant to these proposals.

In this way, the substation represents a low probability / high impact contamination risk, that fortunately would likely be readily apparent during groundworks in the event that a historic (catastrophic, or chronic) release had occurred.

It is considered to be a prudent and proportional response to this risk, to formalise the Applicants duty to ensure that a site is safe & suitable for use, and not capable of meeting the definition of contaminated land given in Part 2A of the EPA 1990. If you are minded to grant consent for this scheme, I would request that you include the condition below:

[Condition [1] - Formalised Contamination Watching Brief]

"In the event that suspected contamination (soil, groundwater or buried waste materials) is encountered during groundwork; works in affected areas of the site shall cease until a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the suspected contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme may comprise separate reports/statements as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

- 1) Investigation in the vicinity of suspected contamination, sufficient to characterise it's nature, likely extent & mobility,*
- 2) An appropriate assessment of the risks to all receptors that may be affected, based upon 1), and;*
- 3) Where potentially unacceptable risks are identified by 2), a Remediation Strategy that includes appropriately considered remedial objectives and clearly defined proposals for achieving these, having due regard to sustainability*

All assessments, works, monitoring & other actions required by 1)-3) above (and B, below) shall be undertaken by competent persons, and the scheme shall be implemented as

approved.

Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, EITHER of the following shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority;

- A. *A statement confirming that no suspected contamination was identified during development, OR;*
- B. *Documentation in accordance with 1)-3) above; together with a Verification Report (where appropriate) demonstrating that remediation objectives have been met.*

Reason: *Having due regard to policies DM10 & DM18 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework, there is a potential for contamination to exist at the site within made ground which could pose a risk to occupants & adjacent Controlled Waters"*

Pollution

As is noted above, the existing substation represents a store of a potentially polluting / contaminating material. In the (likely) event that no significant historic releases have occurred, the proposed replacement of the substation risks releases within 10m of a main river line.

It is strongly recommended that the Environment Agency's advice is sought as to their requirements for the physical works, and the siting of a new station within the 8m easement. It should be noted that a material objection in this regard may render the scheme undeliverable, even if it gains consent from Havant Borough Council as the LPA.

Electricity Substation, Proximity to Dwelling

Electricity substations do carry risks, and do emit noise. It is a legitimate concern that the station compound, though risks of transformer oil release are relatively low, and noise complaints are few for well maintained equipment.

Examples can be found within the borough of stations within open enclosures being located within 1.5m of residential property, though typically the boundary treatment is a solid brick wall where proximity to the operational unit is this close. Chain-link or galvanized enclosures are not uncommonly found within 5m of a dwelling, and fully enclosed stations may be found with party walls to dwellings. Concerns regarding exposure to Electro-magnetic fields associated with such equipment have waned in recent years, with the body of available scientific evidence having failed to identify a strong link with any specific health effects.

In consideration of the above, it would appear that there would not be strong grounds to seek to refuse the scheme citing proximity of the dwelling to a substation (and it's health impact upon- , or the health & safety risk it poses to- future occupants) as principal grounds. The relationship between the substation and the proposed dwelling are obviously planning matters, where proximity may well represent a material issue.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer