

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/17/01002	Your Ref:	APP/15/00420
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	28 April 2017
DC Case Officer:	Simon Kennedy		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6138		
Application Number:	APP/15/00420		
Site Address:	Proposed Development - Swiss House - 14 flats & 1 Office Unit, 9-11 St Georges Walk, Waterloooville		
Proposed Development:	Proposed construction of a building comprising 14 new apartments, 6 car parking spaces, a ground floor office, secure cycle store and secure accessible refuse stores following the demolition of No's 9 and 11 St Georges Walk, Waterloooville, PO7 7TU (approved 17/07/2015). Request to Discharge Conditions 5 and 6 (18.03.2016). Request to Discharge Condition No.4.4 (12.04.17).		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the Omnia Environmental Consultants Verification Report Referenced: A10635/200317/L1, which documents the installation of an anti-mix / dig deterrence membrane, and placement & verification of a minimum depth of 300m clean topsoil within soft landscaping areas.

I note that the verification process served to identify improper installation of the anti-mix membrane, which was subsequently replaced. In this way, the verification process has served to improve the quality of the completed works.

The verification report did not however respond to the recommendation that the handling of waste soils from the site should form part of the overall remedial strategy. It remains unclear (therefore) whether any contaminated soils were removed from the site, what description they were removed under, and what the consequent scope for re-use or disposal may have been. It remains possible that the soils removed from the site may be inappropriately incorporated with topsoils destined for re-sale as clean growing medium.

It is not critical in the context of this development for this information to be incorporated within the verification report - it remains the responsibility of the developer to ensure that waste is disposed of appropriately (i.e. is passed to a licensed carrier, with an appropriate description), and the waste carrier treats takes reasonable steps to verify the authenticity of the description given, and that waste is treated accordingly.

I acknowledge that on the face of it, the verification sampling has not positively identified an exceedance of a Generic Screening Value (GAC). However, the values returned for both samples of Arsenic (from the clean, imported topsoil) are close to the GAC given. A mean value

test estimates the 95th percentile of the sample population to be 43.99 mg/kg, exceeding the GAC for both residential with consumption of home produce (GAC given in the report), and residential without consumption of home grown produce (40 mg/kg).

The verification sample population is does not exceed the Public Open Space GAC for Arsenic (79 mg/kg) at the 95th percentile, but does exceed this value at the 99th percentile concentration (estimated at 88.64 mg/kg).

In this way, the imported topsoil is considered to be unsuitable (as a whole) for private residential garden areas. I acknowledge the limited number of samples, and that the public open space GAC is more appropriate for the current scheme.

Conclusions

It must be acknowledged that soils significantly contaminated with Lead, Arsenic and Asbestos Fibres have been retained on site. The built scheme and remedial strategy carried out are sufficient to prevent exposure, and the risk is therefore considered to have been appropriately managed.

The imported topsoils are on the margins of acceptability, but for the scheme specific risk factors previously highlighted, I am content that these soils do not pose an unacceptable risk to future occupants. They are however unsuitable for transfer to a private residential garden setting, and consequently should not be regarded as being without risk.

I would reiterate that further assessment, and remediation / risk mitigation is likely to be required upon future redevelopment to a more sensitive land use, and in this sense, the site should be considered to be 'suitable for it's consented use' (in line with policy DM17, and DM18), and not 'clean'.

With the above caveat as regards the residual risk - I can confirm that I regard the remedial objectives as having been met, and I can therefore recommend discharge of Condition no. 4, part 4.

Best Regards,

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer