

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/17/00530

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/17/00530

Address: Land to the rear of 78-80 Silvester Road, Waterloooville, PO8 8TS

Proposal: Erection of 2No. 3bed detached bungalows with a detached garage for each property (Approved 08/09/2017). Request to Discharge Conditions 3, 4, 6, 9, 10 and 11 (03/04/2017).

Case Officer: Rachel Ballam

Consultee Details

Name: Consultee Environmental Health (Environment Team)

Address: Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant PO9 2AX

Email: EHEnvironment@havant.gov.uk

On Behalf Of: Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Comments

The surface water drainage proposal is not supported by favourable soakage tests, construction details, or required storage volume (soakaway sizing) calculations. The foul sewerage submission is not supported by information from Southern Water confirming that both the principal and means of connection is suitable

Drawing no. A114 V7.3 shows surface water disposal by means of a shared soakaway, located adjacent to the driveway of the 'type B' property. It is not clear whether the soakaway shown serving the garage to the 'type A' property is located on the land associated with the type A or B plot. If on land associated with the 'type A' plot, it is unclear why the drainage for the main house has not been directed to the soakaway present on the plot - presumably to avoid the public sewer 'exclusion zone'. I have been unable to determine from Southern Water whether shallow conveyance of surface water within the exclusion zone is prohibited, but note that a) the existing properties lie within the exclusion zone, and b) that ground level / invert information from Southern Water suggest that the public sewer is in excess of 10m below existing ground level. If b) is accurate, it seems plausible to me that installation of services within the exclusion zone might be permissible. The absence of any evidence of engagement with Southern Water makes it very difficult to gauge whether the somewhat awkward drainage layout is necessary, or whether an objection to it would be reasonable in planning terms.

Shared soakaway drainage is not recommended, as owner of one plot necessarily adopts responsibility for the drainage of the other. This could unnecessarily result in the Council needing to invoke drainage enforcement powers, or could place the occupants at greater risk of civil dispute over the efficacy of drainage systems, or the impact of disposal (e.g. waterlogging of ground).

If the proposed scheme is accepted (as being necessary to accommodate site constraints), the applicant would need to ensure that rights and responsibilities in respect of maintenance of-, and access to- private drainage are properly addressed within the titles to the properties. However, this seems a somewhat odd approach where it appears that the existing properties are already served by public surface water system (chamber in road opposite #78, with communication in a northerly direction), providing an alternative means of disposal.

In line with CS15, use of SuDS is supported where appropriate. However, it is not clear from the submission that the proposal demonstrates that function is likely to be satisfactory, or that arrangements are adequate to ensure "whole life management and maintenance". In this sense, it could be argued that the submission fails to meet CS15. It is not considered appropriate to rely upon building control to address a material planning matter.

I would ordinarily expect the LLFA to address these concerns, but I am aware that the scale of this development is insufficient to trigger a consultation with the LLFA.

Should discharge of c.3 be refused, and the applicant consider alternative disposal via the public surface water system, drainage design should consider attenuation and controlled release to maintain greenfield runoff rates in order to comply with CS15.