

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/16/00143	Your Ref:	APP/16/00042
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	05 February 2016
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/16/00042		
Site Address:	Northwood Farm, Northwood Lane, Hayling Island, PO110LR		
Proposed Development:	Prior notification for change of use from agricultural building to C3 residential use subject to prior approval covering flooding, highways and transport issues, noise and contamination.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the application docs & available spatial resources. I have confirmed that the proposals are (GPDO '15 schedule 2 Pt.3) Class Q compliant (i.e. not w/i AONB, Conservation Area, or SSSI - The building is not listed, and the footprint comprises around 135 sq.m of a permitted 450m). The photo record shows that prior exercise of agricultural permitted development (extensions) is very unlikely.

I agree that the transport impact is likely to be negligible.

With regards Contamination, it is noted that the subject building was constructed sometime prior to 1879, forming at that time part of East Stoke Farm (becoming Northwood Farm some time prior to 1909).

Farm complexes generally regarded as representing a potentially contaminating landuse, typically due to local informal waste disposal (liquid, solid and ash - to land), but also due to the use of agricultural pesticides, herbicides & fungicides (which may include metals & hydrocarbon compounds), or to the storage, fuelling, maintenance & repair of self-powered agricultural machinery.

I appreciated that the applicant is not aware of any landfill around the Northwood Farm yard area. However, given that this could have occurred at any time from before 1879 to the date that the applicant purchased the property; it is considered that there is insufficient knowledge of the site history for a confident conclusion to be made with respect to the presence of buried wastes. Similarly, the historic use of the farm is unclear - e.g. whether sheep grazing was undertaken for any period, where dip may have been stored or used on site (formerly containing high concentrations of arsenic)

The application documents confirm that the subject building is currently (and in recent history has been-) used for the storage of agricultural materials & equipment - a landuse typically associated with hydrocarbon contamination. The exterior hardstand is shown to be in poor

condition, and as a result, any surface spillages occurring at the yards are likely to reach the soil.

The planning statement suggests that an amount of land is to be allocated as amenity space, presumably comprising either the yard, access road, adjacent barn, or some of all of these previous uses. Farm yards & tracks / access roads are often associated with wastes / made ground due to informal stabilising using construction & demolition wastes (often including asbestos). Barn areas are often used for various storage purposes through the course of their useful life, and similar contaminants could be associated as with the subject building itself.

It is accepted that the proposal / intention is to use the property for holiday rental, which does carry reduced occupant risk profile when compared with a full-time occupancy residential use - however it is recognised that once converted, the property carries a use class that would permit full-time / family occupancy. For this reason it is appropriate to consider the residential use conservatively, i.e. as residential (with home-grown produce, where private garden space is to be provided), as this is within the scope of the change of use.

Class Q is an odd provision, as agricultural buildings are generally regarded as representing a potentially contaminating landuse, and as a result, no residential conversion should be undertaken at any agricultural storage building (or within any agricultural operational complex / yard) without prior consideration of contamination. Arsenic, Lead, Hydrocarbons (inc. poly-aromatics), asbestos, and pesticides should be considered.

I have no in-principal objection to the conversion of these agricultural buildings to residential use - and in the event that contamination were found to be present, it is unlikely to be uneconomic to mitigate the associated risks.

However, my understanding is that conditional approval is not an option in the case of prior notification applications, therefore in absence of appropriate empirical soil quality (or groundwater) data, I must recommend refusal.

An investigation of soil quality should cover the wider plot, as well as within the building footprint.

Best Regards,

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer