

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/16/00990	Your Ref:	APP/16/00624
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	19 July 2016
DC Case Officer:	Harriet Pitney		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6144		
Application Number:	APP/16/00624		
Site Address:	13B St Georges Walk, Waterlooville, PO7 7TU		
Proposed Development:	Prior Notification for change of use of ground floor office from class B1(a) to C3 residential use.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the particulars of the application, the development history of the site, and consultation responses for applications relating to nearby land (plots at 7-11 St Georges Walk).

Overview of Site History & Relevant Features

The site was operated as a Brick Yard from before 1867; the term "Yard" would normally refer to a retail operation, not a production operation, less risk of fuel, combustion residues & metallic contaminants being associated with a Brick Yard as compared with a Brick Field.

Whilst the land use is not specifically identified on a number of subsequent map issues, it would appear likely that the site remained in use for retail of Building Materials between this earliest mapping and at least 1966, where it is identified as a Builders Yard.

Several changes in structures & boundaries present at the site, and in accesses to the site are noted across the available map issues. Several significant additions, alterations & demolitions appear to have occurred between around 1950 & 1966; a period when asbestos would have been in widespread use.

An embankment is shown 1961 beneath no. 13, sloping from the boundary of the plot of no. 11 to the North / Northwest. This gradient was not marked on previous map issues, but is likely to represent extant topography (i.e to have been present previously). This feature appears likely to have been levelled prior to 1966, at around the date that the original (main frontage portion of the-) building at no. 13 was constructed. Given the proximity to the boundary, it is considered more likely that ground levelling would have been achieved through use of imported fill, rather than a cut & fill utilising natural strata & overburden. A Site Investigation from no. 11 confirms a reasonable depth (>1m) of made ground at the boundary with no. 13, probably (given the slope indicated) deepening toward (and on-to) the plot of no. 13.

Use as a Builders Yard (or similar) appears to have continued until at least 1999, i.e. until immediately prior to redevelopment as 'Golden Court'.

I have reviewed the relevant planning casefiles, and no site investigation reports or geotechnical data have been found in respect of the Golden Court development (99/63651/000).

Environmental Risks

It is considered probable that made ground exists on/under the plot occupied by no. 13, and within its immediate vicinity. In consideration of the marked embankment, this Made Ground may exceed 2m in depth.

Given the number of buildings and storage areas associated with the Builders Yard, and the dates over which these changes occurred, it is considered possible that asbestos containing materials may be present (investigation of adjacent site identified bonded asbestos materials within made ground, alongside metallic contaminants).

Fuel storage and dispensing is often associated with Builders Yards, and consequently localised fuel impacts may also be associated with the wider site (i.e. not necessarily coincident with no. 13). 1974 mapping does show 3 no. small linked rectangular features to the rear of no. 13, their purpose / use is unclear, but these could represent a feature of interest (e.g. fuel storage)

As noted above, it is possible that contaminants may be present on site, and it is further possible that the site might be capable of being considered to be contaminated under a 'residential landuse with private gardens' exposure scenario. However, it would appear unlikely that any soft landscaping is associated with this development, nor any private yard or garden.

Over 90% exposure relevant to the 'residential exposure' scenario relates to direct exposures to soils, and screening values are normally weighted to the elevated exposure / reduced bodyweight of juveniles. If this pathway is-, or juvenile receptors are- excluded, the residential screening values (e.g. for metallic contaminants) increase dramatically.

The proposed form of residential development (and its likely occupant profile), are considered low risk in terms of contaminant exposure - not likely to be of particular concern in consideration of the proposed scheme & potential / likely soil contaminants (e.g. asbestos, arsenic, lead - as identified on the adjacent site, possibly representative of contiguous/contemporaneous made ground).

No significant concentrations of volatiles were associated with the adjacent site (and so are not necessarily likely to be associated with made Ground at the application site), and any on-site fuel storage (e.g. associated with the builders yard) is likely to have been diesel fuel - low risk in terms of vapour ingress to indoor air.

It is also recognised that the proposed permitted development rights conversion does not involve any significant groundworks - limiting the possibility that contaminants (in particular, asbestos) will be disturbed / become mobilised (and therefore be made 'available' to human receptors). Similarly, there is limited opportunity to inspect soils during the course of development, or to remove / remediate any contamination impacted material from beneath structures to be retained. Given the scope & scale of proposals, alongside the relatively low risks (associated with the assumed character of made ground); a requirement to formally assess the risks posed by contaminants in soils is not considered to be either reasonable or justified.

I would highlight however that it would be appropriate to require an intrusive site investigation in future if proposals were brought forward for a comprehensive redevelopment of the site to a more sensitive landuse class.

Conclusions

The proposed change of use is considered to represent a low risk in accordance with the rationale discussed above. As such, I have no adverse comments or specific recommendations to make.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer