

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/18/01080	Your Ref:	APP/18/00501
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	26 June 2018
DC Case Officer:	Karen Wooden		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6514		
Application Number:	APP/18/00501		
Site Address:	92 Elm Grove, Hayling Island, PO11 9EH		
Proposed Development:	Prior notification for change of use from class B1(a) office use to C3 residential use subject to prior approval covering flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the application documents, alongside relevant files from the planning archive and available spatial records. It may be helpful in the interests of transparent decision-making, to address some considerations relating to contamination.

Sensitivity of the site (the form of development) to contamination

I note that the existing building is already mixed use, with the ground floor at the rear of the building already comprising residential accommodation, converted 2007 along with the top floor space. In this sense, the proposed change of use does not materially alter the conceptual risk profile of the site.

I note that there is no specific proposal to remove vehicle parking hard-standing, or to create any private garden or soft landscaping areas. Three of the five extant parking spaces are already allocated to existing flats. It is assumed the remaining 2 spaces are to be allocated to the 2-bed flat. In this way, it is not considered to be realistic to expect that creation of green space (where increased exposure might occur) is either feasible or desirable.

It is reasonable to conclude that exterior changes which might elevate that sensitivity of the site to contamination, are therefore not likely to occur as a result of the proposal (or indeed without requiring further consent to re-organise the accommodation at the site).

History

The site was originally developed between 1881 & 1898. The adjacent buildings (now known as 94 & 96 Elm Grove) were likely developed under consent number HWU 1680 (1951; "...two shops with living accommodation at rear and above, 4 & 5 Elm Grove, South Hayling" "... to business use with domestic accommodation over"). Both This, and the preceding applications (HWU 28 & HWU 166) for that site refer to the "repair of buildings destroyed by enemy action", or "rebuilding of totally destroyed properties...".

Despite the usual marginally elevated risk of encountering unexploded ordnance (UXO/UXB) in this area, the apparent confirmation that ordnance detonated at this site (likely a 50kg+ item, based upon the description of damage) would indicate that the UXO risk is negligible, as it is extremely unlikely that a live strike from ordnance of this size would have been followed by a second item of ordnance, as might be the case with smaller (e.g. 1 - 4kg) ordnance more typically dropped en-masse. The 'post strike ' redevelopment of the site dramatically reduces the chances of unexploded items remaining on undiscovered at the site.

Consent No. 17377/1 [1965] and 17377/2 [1966] both refer to land now known #92 Elm Grove; the former referring to "*shops*", the latter "*shops with flat over*" - i.e. use class as for adjacent buildings, having low risk mixed use from initial construction.

Site development succession is taken to be pre-1900 mixed use residential / retail on greenfield land, redeveloped post-war to same use class.

Qualitative Assessment of Contamination Risk

UXO risk is considered to be negligible. Previous landuses are not considered to represent high risk as a contamination source. The closest potential source of contamination which could in principle affect the site, relates to possible fuel storage at the Fire Station on the East side of Elm Grove (~40m), considered to be low risk in the context of the proposed development (a dwelling type with inherently limited exposure pathways)

I have no adverse comment as regards this PN application, and do not consider it necessary to impose any conditions on any positive determination.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer