

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/15/00471	Your Ref:	APP/15/00303
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	01 May 2015
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/15/00303		
Site Address:	Former Oak Park School, Leigh Road, Havant		
Proposed Development:	Havant Health and Well-Being Campus, comprising an 80-bed nursing home, 51 affordable extra care flats, 48 affordable and market supported living flats, community hub facilities, landscaped amenity gardens, car parking, with vehicular access from River Way and Leigh Road and pedestrian access from Lavant Drive and Crossland Drive with associated infrastructure.		

Observations / Comments:

Alongside the supporting documents submitted with this applications, I have also reviewed the planning history for this site (relating to the previously consented community hospital scheme), and the previous site investigations & consultation responses. I note that application red-line boundaries differ between schemes, and site investigations & previously agreed remedial strategies / risk mitigation refer to features falling outside the red-line for this specific application.

Other elements of previous reporting, and previous assessments of environmental risk remain valid - in particular in relation to measures for mitigating potential for pollution of the Lavant surface-water stream from surface water run-off & drainage infrastructure.

Comments here will focus upon soil quality, contamination risk, pollution prevention & air quality. There will be some overlap with the remit of the Environment Agency & Hampshire Highways - where comments are received by a more appropriate authority (for example Environment Agency recommendation in relation to potential pollution of the main river/controlled surface water), those comments should take precedence.

Previous Consents

Consent No. 08/68066/002 included several relevant conditions in relation to pollution prevention & mitigation of risks both to & from controlled waters, other flooding & risks associated with other geo-environmental factors.

- **Condition 8** required the investigation & assessment of ground contamination, alongside a remediation & verification plan (if required)
- **Condition 9** required submission in relation to any verification plan submitted pursuant to condition no. 8.

- **Condition 10** related to unexpected contamination
- **Condition 32** restricted use of infiltration drainage without prior approval of the LPA (would be permitted where demonstrated that no risk to controlled waters exists)
- **Condition 33** required prior approval of piling or other penetrative foundations, which must demonstrate acceptable risks to controlled waters
- **Condition 34** required a buffer zone, riparian planting scheme & details of the means to protect the stream buffer zone during construction.
- **Condition 35** required approval of a specific surface water drainage scheme for the site (based upon SUDS principles) prior to commencement.
- **Condition 36** Required approval of a scheme to remove suspended solids from surface water runoff during construction.
- **Condition 37** Required approval of a specific surface water drainage scheme in relation to parking areas prior to commencement, which must incorporate oil interceptors.

Consent No. 09/68066/003 approved details in relation to conditions 33-37, and condition 8 (remedial strategy & verification plan).

Not all previously approved details will apply to the revised scheme, and the current application has not necessarily specifically addressed all of these issues.

Planning Statement

The principle of maintaining a suitable buffer zone (previous c.34) is maintained within the current application. The landscaping plan provides general planting strategy details - I expect others to comment on the appropriateness of the planting scheme for control of runoff & attenuation of suspended solids and wildlife value.

Flood Risk Assessment - Enzygo Flood Risk Assessment & Abley Lechford Drainage Strategy

It is considered that the Flood Risk Assessment Section 5.0 (Site Drainage) contains sufficient detail in relation to SUDS (previous c.35), establishing attenuation capacities & the feasibility of limited infiltration drainage. Discharge rates are calculated and control infrastructure identified - forming the basis for the overall drainage strategy. No consideration of additional (non-flow / flooding) risk to the controlled water is provided within the report.

The Drainage Strategy presents an overall site layout - confirming the location of infiltration drainage (formerly c.32), and apparently making no distinction between road gully drainage, parking areas, or roof-water drainage. Road gullies on Lavant Drive & Lakeside are thought to already drain to the existing attenuation basin (and subsequently the Lavant), and arguably the public road network is more likely to result in acute accidental spillage / release inputs (e.g. from road traffic accidents & breakdown) than site access roads likely to have far lower average speeds); so site access road gully drainage inputs are unlikely to represent an increased pollution risk.

Concerns were however previously raised in relation to the potential for release from stationary (parked) vehicles. It is appreciated that the parking provision represents a substantial reduction on that previously consented, but the risk of release remains. The drainage strategy does not propose the issue of oil interceptors for parking areas nor specify any measures to mitigate / prevent siltation.

The reason for application of for previous condition 37 is considered to remain valid. In the absence of any specific advice to the contrary, *I would recommend that the condition be re-applied* to any consent granted for the scheme currently under application.* (*with appropriate text amendments to relate to the separate parking areas, and number of proposed spaces etc.)

Piling/Penetrative Foundations

The Enzygo Geo-Environmental Assessment report recommends the use of piled foundations, due to the variable characteristics of made ground at the site, and the possibility that existing foundations (from demolished buildings) will need to be grubbed up & backfilled. Some generic calculations are presented from assumed building loadings, but detailed design is deferred to others. No recommended methods are identified, and piling diameters, depths, and layouts are not presented.

The reason for imposition of the original condition was the risk of mobilisation of contamination, or the possibility of creating preferential migration pathways to the secondary aquifer - and subsequently impacting water quality within the Lavant. The contamination assessment has not identified the presence of any gross contamination, and has in addition confirmed local geology to be clay to 15m depth below ground level (the conservatively assumed penetration depth).

A piling risk assessment was previously agreed for vibro-stone columns - not considered to represent a minimal risk technique with respect to pathway creation or contaminant mobilisation. Given the lack of evidence for site-wide elevated concentrations of contaminants, or gross contamination associated with a point source, it is *not considered necessary for the LPA to pre-approve piling or other penetrative installation methods*.

Contamination / Remediation Method / Discovery Strategy & Verification

I have reviewed the Enzygo Geo-Environmental Assessment alongside the previous Gifford Reports. Previous reporting identified possible environmental risks that have either not been identified within the latest assessments, or have otherwise been dismissed.

It is agreed that there is a general lack of contamination sources external to the site, and that the greatest risk of contamination is associated with made-ground and construction & demolition wastes (potentially containing asbestos) associated with the demolition of former structures. Previous reports also identified possible contamination associated with the obsolete electricity substation (not associated with this application red-line area), and suspected oil storage tanks associated with boiler house serving the former school. Neither the presence or location of fuel tanks has been confirmed, though some site survey annotation refers to 'fuel line' located in the east of the site.

Whilst the site is fairly large, several phases of investigation have now been completed, with fairly extensive trial pitting, and monitoring of local groundwater quality (2003/2008 - no new data within the Enzygo Report) has not previously identified any significantly elevated hydrocarbons (PAH, TPH/Speciated), only trace concentrations (<0.5 ug/l) of aromatic compounds. The balance of evidence is against any residual source of contamination being present on site that could be considered significant in terms of controlled water receptors.

Some contamination has been identified in association with made ground that exceeds generic exposure criteria for human health. Exceedances are associated with the previously infilled gravel pit (TP1), and PAH's are interpreted to be associated with coal ash, though neither the hydrocarbon profile (characterisation of coal ash) used for comparison, nor are the calculations referred to presented.

Detectable heavy fraction PAH has been identified within all soil samples analysed from the latest round of investigation - this is not consistent with a point source liquid release, and chronic surface spillage is not consistent with previous landuse history. An ash component in soils would be consistent with the results.

Exceedances of generic soils criteria are restricted to the gravel pit area, underlying a communal garden area (allocated for car parking area under the Community Hospital scheme). No detailed consideration is presented with respect to site specific conceptual exposure to this specific identified source - instead treatment has been relatively conservative, assuming residents could be exposed under an equivalent scenario to a residential private garden. It is considered that this is a reasonable approach as there are site specific factors affecting exposure risk levels in both directions - i.e. age of residents and frequency of likely gardening activity limiting exposures, but age of residents, and conversely the likelihood of existing health conditions or use of medication that might increase sensitivity of a person to PAH contaminants in particular, especially in respect of acute effects. In addition, the two available environmental samples that confirmed this feature (2008 & 2014) both returned consistent results - it can be assumed therefore that the exceedances are characteristic of the fill within this feature.

Previous reports identified 'suspected asbestos containing material' (ACM) associated with the former gravel pit (assumed based upon contextual information contained within the report to refer to fragments of cement bonded asbestos sheeting or other bonded fibrous material). The Enzygo report does not specifically identify any suspected ACM, and samples submitted for a visual asbestos screen were reported as being free of identifiable free fibres, though it should be noted that the level of sampling & tests employed are regarded as indicative only. Presence of asbestos is therefore unconfirmed, but remains possible.

References to clean cover in this area are considered appropriate as a precautionary measure, but I note that proposals omit the anti-dig / warning layer previously approved within the Gifford remedial strategy & verification plan, and in addition, presents a less specific contamination discovery strategy than that previously approved.

I would recommend that the applicant follow the more robust & detailed remedial strategy & verification plan presented in the Gifford Report Reference 14169-GE-R03 (dated April 2009)

Both Environmental Health & the Environment Agency have previously accepted that no additional investigation or risk assessment is required, but there is outstanding general risk mitigation work to be undertaken, alongside adherence to a watching brief, and verification of imported clean (or site translocated) topsoils used within garden areas.

If development control are minded to grant consent for this scheme, I would recommend the following conditions:

Condition 1

"A verification report that demonstrates the completion and effectiveness of all remedial & risk mitigation measures set out in the previously approved remediation strategy & verification plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include results of any additional sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved plan, to demonstrate that remediation criteria have been met".

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory remediation of the site, if deemed necessary and having due regard to Policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy (2011), and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) (2014).

Condition 2

"If, during development, soil or groundwater that appears to be impacted by contamination is found to be present, no further development shall be undertaken until an appropriate assessment has been undertaken, and a report detailing how that contamination is to be dealt with, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, all works outlined in the submitted report shall be adhered to."

Reason: *Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy (2011), and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) (2014); there is a low risk of Contamination at the site that could, if present, pose a risk to future site occupiers, resulting from historic uses of land or buildings"*

Attenuation of suspended solids in runoff during construction

I have not found reference to any specific construction site management plan within the supporting documentation. It is understood that a suitable submission was previously made & approved in respect of the previous scheme, but that this document has not been re-submitted with this application. It is considered that the reason for the application of condition no. 36 on the previous consent remains valid, therefore in the absence of any specific advice to the contrary (for example, from the Environment Agency), *I would recommend that the condition be re-applied to any consent granted for the scheme currently under application.*

Traffic & Transportation Assessment - Air Quality

I have reviewed the Abley Lechford Partnership traffic & transportation assessment, and would broadly agree its conclusions. The site is located within an inherently sustainable location, and consequently travel plan measures to promote sustainable travel measures are likely to have a reasonable chance of success.

The scheme concept is one that should reduce the need for individual / multiple single occupancy vehicle trips, and I accept that the current scheme is likely to have a reduced impact (generate / attract a reduced number of vehicle trips) in comparison to the previously consented scheme. Shift patterns common to this type of facility tend not to coincide with a heavily tidal traffic flows that characterise road network 'rush hour', and the site is located within an area with efficient access to the local network.

Junction capacities are good in the locality, Air quality is not thought to be inherently poor, and sensitive receptors (including the development itself) are well set back from road-traffic related sources of pollution.

I have no concerns relating to air quality in respect of this development.



Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer