

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/17/00111	Your Ref:	APP/17/00049
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	03 March 2017
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/17/00049		
Site Address:	Trosnant Infant School, Stockheath Lane, Havant, PO9 3BD		
Proposed Development:	Consultation by Hampshire County Council for one classroom teaching block to the north east of existing schools, a four classroom teaching block to south west of the existing schools, some internal refurbishment, the adaptation and improvement of the existing external play areas, the creation of a new MUGA and the expansion of the existing car park.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the combined geotechnical assessment & Phase 1 site investigation (TerraFirma(South) Report Ref 5715, Jul 2016), submitted in support of this application.

I note that the report references a Structural Soils Ltd. (SSL) report dated 1994, but does not make comment in respect to findings relating to chemical analysis of soils. Havant Borough Council does not hold a copy of that report, the 1995 consent (in connection with which the report was likely commissioned), is not present within the development control application archive.

The TerraFirma report does not acknowledge the presence of the former school buildings (replaced in 1995), but does reference an SSL trail hole terminating at 3.5m below ground at a slab of concrete - indicating prior structures. It is unclear where this feature was location, or whether the intrusive works were undertaken pre- or post- demolition of the former school buildings (i.e. whether the buried slab was associated with the known buildings, or a previously unrecorded structure. 1946 Aerial photography does not extend this far north, so I am unable to determine whether any defensive structures are likely to have been located at the site.

Report Conclusions - Screening Values

It is noted that the screening levels applied to the chemical samples are both out of date (have since been effectively superseded by the CIEH/LQM suitable for use (S4UL) values), and refer to a commercial landuse. As regards the latter, commercial screening values are not considered to be appropriate to this site.

The receptor class associated with an educational establishment (especially an infants

school) is entirely different to that which would apply to a commercial use class, comprising young children at a key developmental stage, with low body mass & average height, and an entirely different behaviour-related exposure profile.

It is considered that screening values derived for a 'residential without plant uptake' exposure scenario would be appropriate as a conservative screen. Values derived for a 'residential area public open (play) space' scenario would be broadly appropriate, but I would caution that these values are likely to have been derived assuming a lower exposure duration / frequency than might reasonably apply to a junior school soft-play area.

Contaminants of Concern

Applying currently accepted screening values, screening values are exceeded significantly for the following contaminants:

- Benzo(a)pyrene
- Benzo(a)anthracene
- Benzo(b)fluoranthene
- Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene

Results obtained are upto 800% relevant screening values, and therefore warrant further consideration.

Several TPH results have also been returned that could be of potential concern - it is acknowledged that some fractions are essentially non-toxic, however others exhibit a high degree of toxicity. The lack of a speciated sample makes these results difficult to interpret - however it is noted that 3 of 8 samples returned values that exceed the waste criteria.

In terms of locations, WS2 represents the maximum concentrations of the majority of the contaminants described above. This location is coincident with a former school building (may be representative of construction & demolition related made ground), and with reference to the present layout, is located within a soft play area adjacent to the proposed classrooms (and therefore is relevant in terms of exposures).

Both WS1 & TP1 returned elevated TPH. TP1 does not appear to be coincident with any former structure or feature on the site - again, located within a soft play area. WS1 is located in the vicinity of the proposed classrooms, and is likely to be representative of soils to be excavated / disturbed during construction.

Conclusions

On the basis of the submitted report, I would conclude that there is insufficient information to dismiss the potential contamination risk at this site (as being acceptable / negligible). On the contrary, the presented data highlight reasons for concern, and the explanation posited in the report is not supported by either the TPH results (elevated where no asphalt associated), nor the asphalt PAH spray testing (returning values significantly less than the maximum concentrations obtained from soil samples). I do not discount the possibility that asphalt fractions could explain the elevated results in WS 2, however this is insufficiently supported by the data.

I would recommend that further investigation be undertaken to characterise the made ground associated with soft play areas where elevated PAH & TPH has been identified, and I would recommend that speciated TPH CWG tests are undertaken to characterise the identified hydrocarbon contaminations.

I would also highlight that whilst the asbestos screening results presented were based upon appropriately robust sampling methods, it is believed that the former school buildings were of early-mid 1950's construction, and it is not unlikely that made ground could include asbestos containing materials. The DETS report makes clear that negative results should be regarded as 'no asbestos *in sample*'. Any further investigations should include further ACM screening.

I have no objections to the granting of consent for this scheme, subject to suitable conditions being applied in respect of the appropriate investigation (and if necessary, execution of remediation / risk mitigation works, and verification of same). I would also recommend an informative be included in respect of a contamination watching brief. Suggested wording below.

Contamination [1]

Prior to the commencement of any specific phase of development approved by this planning permission (other than demolition, site clearance, or any other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site, whether originating from within or outside the curtilage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but shall be undertaken by competent persons and unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

- 1) An intrusive site investigation informed by the results of the TerraFirma (South) Ground Investigation Report (Ref 5715, Jul 2016), to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise the nature & extent of physical contamination on or the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to all identified receptors.*
- 2) The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes;*
 - appropriately considered remedial objectives,*
 - an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to sustainability, and;*
 - clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.*
- 3) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the Remediation Strategy (2) are complete, identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance of engineered mitigation measures, and arrangements for contingency action.*

All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: *Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy [2011] and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], Contamination may be present within made Ground at the site as a result of previous land uses (structures, &/or activities) on the site, that could pose a risk to future occupiers of the site.*

Verification (Standard) [2]

*Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, any verification report required in accordance with **condition [1]** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the

approved verification plan, and must demonstrate that site remediation criteria have been met. Where longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages is identified as being necessary, the report shall clearly set out plans for monitoring, provision for maintenance, relevant triggers and contingency actions (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan").

The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy [2011] and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], Contamination may be present at the site as a result of both previous & current land uses (&/or activities) that could pose a risk to future site occupiers.

Informative (Unexpected Contamination)

"It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure development, upon completion, is safe & suitable for its consented future use. Notwithstanding any site investigation or assessment report submitted with the planning application hereby approved, or submitted in accordance with any condition of this decision notice; contamination may be present at the site within un-investigated areas of the site associated with sources that were either unanticipated, not previously identified, or anticipated but not located. Such contamination may be identified during the course of development. In the event that any discoloured soils or groundwater, oily sheens, foul or solvent odours, or deposits / inclusions comprising obvious waste materials be encountered during groundwork, or if groundwork staff report acute symptoms (skin, eye or respiratory); works in that area of the site should cease until an appropriate assessment of the nature and extent of the suspected contamination has been undertaken. The local planning authority should be notified of the nature of the contamination, and how that contamination is to be dealt with"

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer