

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/16/00730	Your Ref:	APP/16/00464
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	27 May 2016
DC Case Officer:	Heather Lealan		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6523		
Application Number:	APP/16/00464		
Site Address:	Land at the rear of 2-56, Blendworth Crescent, Havant, PO9		
Proposed Development:	Construction of 51 dwellings comprising 20 houses and 31 flats with associated landscaping, car parking, bin and cycle storage.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documentation submitted in support of this application, and have identified few concerns with respect of pollution / site drainage, air quality or contamination. Brief summary below for completeness.

Contamination

The site has been essentially greenfield from <1867 to present. A network of field drainage has previously existed across the site, and some isolated small structures have also previously existed at the site. There is no known filled land / made ground / other potentially polluting or contaminating activities or incidents though some limited made ground might be expected on site (from previous minor land-raising to negate need for drainage ditches; and certainly in the backfilling of former ditches which no longer evident). Marginally elevated soil gas might also be expected as a result of natural organic material associated with former ephemeral watercourses (field drains). Site is considered to represent a low risk of contamination risk from fly-tipped, domestic or other putrescible / hazardous waste within backfilled drains.

An intrusive contamination assessment was submitted with this application - reviewed by Environmental Health prior to this application being made, alongside those for several other sites in PCC ownership. The Design & Access statement notes the comments made by Environmental Health at the time (i.e. *"...a robust watching brief be put in place to cover groundwork on that site; to include provisions for picking/local removal of suspicious materials, tool-box talks to flag the H&S issues, and enhanced stockpile management/dust controls..."*), which were made in recognition of an Asbestos find at a different site.

The provisions referenced within the Design & Access Statement and quoted in italics above do represent good practice, but there is no indication from the site investigation that the same level of diligence is necessary for the subject plot.

Ground gas results presented could however represent a potential concern; these include depleted O2 (<16%) , elevated CO2 (>4%), and CH4 & CO detected at above detection limits

(both 0.1% v/v). No flow was recorded, but groundwater was noted to be saturating most of the response zone (a factor that limits confidence in concluding that the presented results are representative), only one round of results available, and the atmospheric conditions were represented by moderate static pressures on test day. Whilst these results are not sufficient to raise a significant concern, a single round of gas monitoring can only be regarded as representing an indicative 'snapshot', and both flow rates and concentrations may fluctuate significantly around the values presented.

The indicative values presented do indicate that some biological degradation is occurring. The conceptual model does not support a case for specific gas protection measures (e.g. no bulk source of putrescible material has been identified, limiting flow rates), however the results do place the gas regime on site as "Characteristic Situation 2" (with reference to Wilson & Card), representing a non "de-minimis" risk. It is recommended that inherently safe construction methods are adopted - for example, a suspended floor system & ventilated sub-floor void in preference to a ground bearing raft foundation or cast slab flooring.

Drainage Strategy (Pollution Risk)

I agree that site warrants consideration under the 'simple index approach' (CIRIA 753 SUDS Manual; control of pollution inputs). The surface water drainage strategy presented proposed discharge to the Hermitage Stream via pollution control features. The Hazard Level of the site is Low (0.5 / 0.4 / 0.4), and the Permeable Paving proposed has index values of 0.7 / 0.6 / 0.6 - adequate to address the index risk values whether or not this feature is regarded as operating in isolation, or to include the fin drain as a separate control feature. No adverse comment.

Air Quality & Traffic Generation

In consideration of the location of the site in relation to the local road network, and the flows of traffic currently accommodated; I can confirm that I have no concerns with respect to the exposure of future residents to air pollution.

I agree with the conclusions of the Connect Consultants Transport Assessment, that new vehicle trips generated by the site are likely to be low-negligible, and consider that the impact in respect of their related road traffic pollution impact is similarly likely to be negligible.

I note that the parking provision exceeds minimum policy levels, but that a the provision is minimised by virtue of the proportion of unallocated spaces. In this way, the level of provision is not considered contrary to policies to encourage modal shift - the site is reasonably accessible with respect to public transportation, and provision has been made for an appropriate level of secure cycle storage. No Adverse comment.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer