

Heather,

I assume that the roofing information relates to both APP/16/00812 & .../00813, and the drainage to 00813 only. Roofing info. is fine, the Galvalloy coating would be potential leaching risk for a sensitive site if applied raw, but I note that the panels specified will be pre-coated, dramatically reducing the leaching potential. I also note that coatings are free of phthalates and heavy metal based pigments. I've no issues with roofing materials, or indeed (given the material & finish) with a simple un-trapped connection direct to soakaway. I am not particularly concerned about the leaching of aluminium / iron from rainwater downpipes, my principal concern would be with metals with a higher environmental or human toxicity, such as Zinc, Copper or Lead. I note that the guttering is to be lined, and that downpipes can be coated in the same way as roofing – as I've no specific concerns with the proposed materials, I have no specific comments on the treatment of these elements. The above applies to all schemes / applications where these materials are specified, which I assume would include all options.

There remains a little ambiguity with regards the revised drainage system, and I am working on a couple of assumptions, namely that both the permeable paving and attenuation tank (neither with outward connection indicated) represent infiltration features.

The revised drainage layout reduces the soakaway volume in the north car park (beneath permeable paving), and diverts a number of roofwater downpipes in the SE corner of the unit to bypass the interceptor, and discharge direct to the attenuation tank (soakaway). The revised scheme retains some combined roofwater & surface water conduits (passing through the interceptor chamber); whilst this is not ideal, the diversion of approximately ½ of the roof area from the interceptor does represent a significant improvement over the previous scheme. This will improve capture of oils and fines before becoming overwhelmed (e.g. during storm events) and triggering the interceptor's bypass feature; thus representing scheme betterment. The condition technically requires complete separation of roofwater & surfacewater, however given that neither the risk status or sensitivity of the site is high, I consider the proposed scheme to be a reasonable compromise.

Whilst not strictly the subject of your email, I would reiterate comments made in relation to APP/16/00812 with regards c.14 (paving); where I noted:

"External Works Materials" (DWG No. 14021 / TP / 41 Rev B); [specifies] ...Marshalls Keyblok Pencil Edged Concrete Block Paviours in various colours for Parking Bays, Car Park Roads, Bay Marking & Pathways.

I note that the materials specified are not suitable for constructed permeable paving system, and that the appropriate (equivalent) product from Marshalls is the Piora paviour (e.g. code: PV380 22 50; Bracken).

Please confirm with the applicant that a permeable product is to be used in areas of proposed permeable paving. In the absence of this confirmation, I object to the discharge of c.14 on the basis that materials of inappropriate specification have been specified, and that this will impede surface water management, local surface water flooding risk, and pollution attenuation."

Whilst flooding is outside of the remit of EH, I'd note informally that this issue is particularly important from this perspective due to proximity of the rail line, and the risk that poor infiltration through paving could lead to local build-up of surface runoff.

Best Regards,

Jon

Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer

Environmental Health, Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant, Hants PO9 2AX
Tel (Direct Dial): 023 9244 6677
Tel (Team Admin): 023 9244 6670
Email: jonathan.driver@havant.gov.uk

www.havant.gov.uk
www.facebook.com/havantboroughcouncil
www.twitter.com/havantborough