

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/22/00978	Your Ref:	APP/21/01267
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	22 November 2022
DC Case Officer:	Jeff Sadler		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 ----		
Application Number:	APP/21/01267		
Site Address:	Proposed Unit 5, Dunsbury Park, Fitzwygram Way, Havant		
Proposed Development:	Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Phase 1 Plot 5 of APP/17/01324 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of 3no. B8 storage and distribution units totalling 6,877sqm for Condition B3(i) - (v) plot access, layout, scale, appearance & landscaping; Condition B5 Other Matters criteria (a) - (i) inclusive; and Discharge of Conditions A3, A5, A10, A17, A18, B9 & B10; incorporating revisions to previously approved Parameter Plans forming part of the Environmental Statement dated March 2012 for APP/12/00338, as amended by APP/17/01324. RECONSULTATION REQUEST for revised plans and/or documents received		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the application alongside relevant consultation responses and subsequent amendments. No comment will be made here where the provisions are acceptable, or where other consultees have raised concerns, or sought information/amendments and these have been either resolved, received, or secured.

These comments do not supersede any other comments that may have been made by Environmental Health under separate cover in respect of nuisance, amenity, lighting, or the control of construction phase impacts.

Offsetting of development emissions (Sustainability/Air Quality)

It is noted that the BREEAM assessment for each of the units achieves Excellent standard, and that the units targeted have resulted in a number of features being specified that are capable of reducing combustion-related emissions from both buildings and transport, relative to conventional technologies. These features are supported as making a valuable contribution to mitigating the concentration of local air pollutants.

In particular, I note that a reasonable quantum of EV charging spaces is proposed within the overall parking quantum, with all proposed spaces to be minimally-prepared for future expansion of the EV charging provision at each unit.

This iterative approach is a pragmatic strategy and is supported. I have however noted the specification for the electricity supplies, which might be insufficient to support concurrent use of EV charging points at more than about 50% (of the total quantum of-) parking spaces

(notwithstanding that the ratio is more favourable for unit 502). This means that it might not be possible to expand the quantum of EQ charging-equipped parking spaces beyond this level (>~50% available spaces) without first upgrading the primary building supply.

What is not clear is whether the limiting factor is the local switchgear on the incoming supply, the grade of supply cable, or the substation itself. Given the intent to future-proof the development against a strong shift toward electrically powered motor vehicles, it may be helpful if the applicant could provide a comment on the feasibility of commissioning the minimally prepared spaces with EV charging facilities and whether the specification of infrastructure for which approval is being sought under this application might represent a material barrier to future expansion of facilities (e.g. by the occupant, at a later date)

Ground Contamination

Two ground contamination reports have been submitted in support of this application. I have further sought & obtained one omitted report. All of these reports contribute to the requirements of APP/17/01324 condition A14, but I note that A14 is not expressly within scope of this application. It is anticipated however that the applicant would wish these to be considered at this stage, and not to be deferred to a future condition discharge application, post-dating the determination of this application (APP/21/01267).

Reports Reviewed:

- Hydrock Ground Investigation Report Ref: 19453-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1004 (9/12/2021)
- Hydrock Controlled Waters and Ground Gas Risk Assessment Ref: 19453-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-1006 (01/03/2022)
- Hydrock Remediation Strategy & Verification Report Ref: 19453-HYD-XX-XX-RP-GE-3001 (14/04/2022)

The principle issues raised within the ground investigation are that groundwater concentrations of phenols, ammoniacal Nitrogen, and some light fraction hydrocarbons are significantly elevated at one location, and that ground gas results (principally from the same location) return concentrations of Methane (CH₄) that are sufficiently as to exceed the lower explosive limit.

The GE-1004 report has not identified any specific source of putrescible materials that might be expected to lead to these concentrations. Source characterisation is poor, and it is therefore difficult to confidently draw any inferences as to the likely nature, extent or volume of source material. In dismissing the likelihood of significant risk, the report highlights within-site heterogeneity in test results, and in particular, that downgradient groundwater samples do not reflect the groundwater quality at the most significantly affected location (WS5.02).

The GE-1006 report aims to address some of this uncertainty these risks through additional monitoring. Three additional grounds of ground gas monitoring was undertaken, alongside some contextual sampling within the surfacewater receptor. Further within-plot (5) groundwater sampling was not undertaken.

The GE-1006 report finds no evidence of contamination within the down-gradient surface water, that could be attributable to the development land. I acknowledge that the EQS-AA is exceeded for copper, but I note that the maximum recorded concentration was recorded in the upstream sample (SW1), so I would agree that this is not attributable to the site. Total phenol concentrations are compliant with the EQS-AA, though I do note that the concentration in the upstream sample is around 2/3rds of concentrations in the downstream samples. This may be random chance, there is insufficient data to demonstrate a material contribution from the site, but it certainly does not preclude it. Sulphate at the mid-stream sample is also substantially elevated relative to upstream, and it is considered possible that this could be related to noted natural sources & earthworks disturbance within the Dunsbury Park site (suggesting the possibility of an active migration pathway).

Notwithstanding these points, I would broadly concur with the conclusions of the report in that the source (of substantially elevated phenols in groundwater) does not appear to be materially mobile.

I would also broadly agree with the gas risk assessment, primarily on the basis that there is no association between the high concentrations of CH₄ and significant positive flow rates. I would agree with the authors that there is little evidence of significant generation-driven flows, with flow rates displaying the characteristics of being driven by the groundwater surface (and probably the local influence of changes in well pressures during sampling).

It is notable however that the available trail hole logs do not identify an obvious source of the persistent significant concentrations of methane (at WS5.02 and to a lesser extent, WS5.04). This raises a question as to the likely efficacy of the remedial measures described within the GE-3001 report (which assumes that the source material will be removed during the tertiary terracing works under the earthworks strategy). I am confident that the site-wide worst case is overly conservative, but I am unclear on whether any material risk to buildings might remain following completion of works (the principle risk in this case being fire). This is an area of residual uncertainty, but I think on balance, probably within acceptable limits.

Necessarily, a good deal of reliance is placed upon the reactive provisions of the GE-3001 report, the diligence exercised in their undertaking (and essentially, the effect of provisions of condition A15). As above, on balance, this probably provides sufficient protection.

Given this, I would recommend;

- that all three above-listed reports be listed on the decision notice as approved documents, and that on the basis of these approved reports;
- the decision notice include an informative stating that Grampian clause of condition A14 should not be taken to apply (under the provision '*unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority*'), and
- upon application, condition A14 parts i)-iii) should be discharged insofar as they relate to plot 5. The condition wording necessitates that part iv) be retained, as (contrary to the implication of the title-) the GE-3001 represents a verification *plan*, rather than a verification report. The submission of a stand-alone verification report is envisaged by the authors at a future date, upon completion of the earthworks.
- Condition A15 should be retained in relation to this consent / development phase.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer