

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/22/00194	Your Ref:	APP/21/00200
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	15 March 2022
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/21/00200		
Site Address:	32 New Lane, Havant, PO9 2NG		
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site comprising erection of distribution warehouse (class B8) with ancillary offices and related facilities, vehicle storage deck, new access, landscaping and associated infrastructure (approved 22.10.21). Request to discharge conditions 11 and 19 (received 27.10.21). Request to discharge conditions 14, 15, 16, and 27 (received 10/12/2021). Request to discharge condition 17 (received 16.12.21).		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the supporting information to the application to discharge condition 17. I note that the condition wording is explicit in its intent to protect the principle aquifer & public potable supply (only). No risk assessment or pollution prevention measures are required under the condition where piles are to terminate within the London Clay.

I would concur with the assessment of others that the piles are extremely unlikely to penetrate the full depth of clay – the details provided indicate a maximum working pile depth of 20m, compared with a likely depth to the surface of the upper chalk of around 70m (according to BGS records).

It is possible that the piling works proposed could mobilise contaminants more broadly within the secondary aquifer where an (as yet undiscovered) source of chlorinated solvent exists within the curtilage of the development land as free-product (as might be possible given the available vapour & groundwater results). The presence of such a source is not certain, but is equally difficult to rule out based upon the previously submitted reports.

Given that condition 17 does not require a piling risk assessment where piles are confined to the London Clay unit, it is considered that contamination risks to the secondary aquifer fall under the provisions of condition 11. I would highlight the caveats given within my consultation response to the application to discharge condition 11, and the rationale for recommending discharge of that condition.

On this basis, I am able to support the discharge of condition 17.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer