

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/15/01412	Your Ref:	APP/15/00950
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	19 October 2015
DC Case Officer:	Sally Smith		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6522		
Application Number:	APP/15/00950		
Site Address:	108-110 Elm Grove, Hayling Island, PO11 9EN		
Proposed Development:	Demolition of retail unit and associated outbuildings and redevelopment to form 44 No. sheltered apartments for the elderly including communal facilities, access, car parking, landscaping and substation. In addition, provision of 1No retail unit with flat above with associated parking and landscaping.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documents submitted in support of this application, and would like to provide some general comments in respect of Drainage/SUDS (viability/pollution/contamination), Energy (Ground Source - Installation), Contamination, Transport (Air Quality), and Demolition (Asbestos surveys). I believe that Laurent has already raised some issues with respect to noise.

Drainage / SUDS

There appears to be some confusion within the Flood Risk Assessment [FRA] with respect to the requirements / restrictions on the use of infiltration drainage & contamination / contaminated runoff.

The possibility of existing contamination on site has rightly been highlighted, and this could be significant with respect to SUDS design. I would agree further consideration of contamination mobilisation & through-flow pathways is appropriate if infiltration drainage is found to be viable & contamination is found to be present.

SUDS should also consider the possibility of contaminated runoff - this refers to sources of pollution (inputs) associated with the operational phase of the development. Consideration of pollutant inputs is equally valid whether discharge is to soil, direct to water-course [scoped out by FRA], or to water-course via public system. Attenuation of contaminated run-off within an aerobic 'treatment zone' should be considered in any integrated SUDS design.

As parking areas are predominantly domestic, and the majority of proposed site hard-cover comprises roofed area; I would agree that the runoff quality is likely to be largely good.

Parking areas & access roads are always potential pollutant sources, but this can typically be adequately mitigated for domestic schemes (where low level chronic inputs are likely) vehicle access / manoeuvring & parking areas are drained by means of permeable surfacing or suitable trapped gullies.

I note that HCC has not provided any clear comment on the FRA, which I would interpret to mean that the FRA is considered (by HCC) to be inadequate. Whilst no objection was lodged, or condition wording proposed; I would consider that either;

- i) further information is required to be submitted in support of this application (e.g. SUDS viability &/or design, discharge rate calcs etc.), or;
- ii) a suitable condition should be applied to any consent granted that requires drainage details, inclusive of SUDS provision, to be approved prior to installation. (unless this can be interpreted to be 'in scope' of the condition requested by Southern Water)

The FRA report does present some interim conclusions & makes recommendations; namely that connection to public system is likely to be the most appropriate solution, with approx. 10.7 cu.m attenuation required to fully attenuate a 5mm rainfall event. No calculations are presented with respect to discharge rates benchmarking (undeveloped site), or discharge rate / velocity from attenuation storage (or any comparison made). I also note that the area to the East of the site is treated as an impermeable area, whereas site photographs indicate a granular, permeable surface. This may affect runoff assessments from the existing site, and influence sizing of required attenuation & retention features - surfacing should be confirmed prior to approving calculations.

The assessment also concludes the receiving groundwater to be low sensitivity. I would highlight that groundwater at the site is classified as a Secondary A aquifer, with the majority of the site being H1 soils (high leaching potential). Secondary aquifers are not automatically low risk, and without further justification I would consider the receiving water to be of medium sensitivity. Any future assessment or design of SUDS treatment train should accounting for this, alongside an appropriate assessment of the potential for contaminated runoff, and the through-flow mobilisation pathway for any extant soil contamination.

Given the current uncertainty (Re: SUDS feasibility), and with respect to i) & ii) above; it would appear more expedient to impose a condition requiring approval of SUDS design - a fully formed SUDS design is not likely to be forthcoming within the decision period, and it does not seem reasonable to recommend refusal on this basis - it is not a matter if it is possible to make a development acceptable at all, rather how drainage provision can be made (and demonstrated) to be acceptable.

Energy

Application documents refer to installation of ground source heat pump, but no system requirements are presented, nor is any indication presented of system type given, or plant room provision made on the proposed floorplans.

The site is expected to have shallow groundwater (within 1.5m BEGL), and it's occupation density to site area ratio is probably not favourable for ground source system laid at optimal spacing, even if the building footprint is utilised. Laying pipes at sub-optimal (greater) density can lead to problems with ground freezing, and where shallow groundwater is present, volume change & structural issues.

Similarly, the design should account for the presence of contamination - for example, pipe material resistance to contaminants (especially if laid within building footprint), pipe bedding

material possibility of creating preferential migration pathways.

The alternative installation method would be vertical, which is likely the more viable option for a site like this. This would involve very deep boring (typically 80-100m), and should fully account for the contamination assessment, and should ideally be accompanied by a risk assessment & boring method options appraisal. It is possible that such a borehole could penetrate the London Clay Aquitard - I've not had sight of the BGS records referred to, these may be sufficiently deep as to indicate likely unit depth.

Whilst sustainable energy solutions are desirable, I am cautious of deep boring activities over chalk, and/or in locations where there is a possibility of contamination within the immediate vicinity. Given the lack of detail included within the application, I would suggest *a suitably worded condition be applied with respect to approval of details for the proposed ground source energy system.*

The generic CRL information suggests that ground *or* air-source heat pumps are used where feasible. Given the site size constraints, the cost of installation of vertical ground-source-loop, and lack of plant room on the plans; I suspect that air-source is likely to be the more viable (and possibly the envisaged) solution.

If air-source were to be explored in preference to ground, I would point out that a 44 + 1 residential, + 1 commercial unit development would require significantly sized units (more likely several); these represent tonal noise sources that will at times operate for long periods at any time of day. Given the scale of the development, it is considered that a noise impact & mitigation assessment following the principles of BS4142-2014 should accompany any firm proposals for such equipment. Again, I have found no specific detail on these proposals other than text references in the design & access statements & other general scheme documents.

It is possible that a noise assessment could materially affect viability of an air-source scheme, or influence building design (e.g. plant housing location) - so ideally, proposals should be fleshed out prior to decision, to form part of the approved details. If this is not possible, then *I would suggest that a suitable condition be applied to any consent granted requiring that a BS4142 assessment be undertaken & recommendations implemented (similar to extract ventilation & A/C equipment) prior to commissioning.*

Demolition

The approved plan no. 17211/4 (Sept '72) relating to a 2 storey storage building includes the annotation "Beam to openings to be 12" x 6 1/2" x 27" U.B encased in 1/2" Asbestolux* to give 1/2 hour fire resistance" [ground floor openings]

*Asbestolux contained crocidolite (blue asbestos) used until around 1965, amosite (brown asbestos) from late 1960's, and chrysotile from late 1970's.

Photographs contained within the Archeology site walkover report confirm that the '72 scheme was implemented (currently carpeting & flooring showrooms). I would recommend that the following informative is placed on any consent granted:

"Plans indicate that buildings to be demolished are likely to include asbestos containing materials. A pre-demolition asbestos survey should be undertaken to confirm the presence and location of asbestos containing materials, and any asbestos found should be safely removed prior to demolition by competent and where necessary, appropriately licensed persons. Any intrusive post demolition ground quality assessment (e.g. intrusive site investigation) should include an asbestos fibre screen that uses PLM

(polarised light microscopy) methods, to confirm absence from soils from either historic sources, or as a result of demolition of the existing structures"

Transport (Air Quality)

I have reviewed the transport statement & parking assessment calculations. Whilst the TRICS selection is likely to over-state the current landuse trip rate estimate, the development trip rate & parking demand (retirement flats) are based upon the best available data. Estimates do not account for the two-bed accommodation above the proposed commercial unit, nor the retail floorspace itself.

These issues are not likely to affect the overall conclusion however, and I accept that the proposed development is likely to be neutral in terms of traffic generation in the worst case - with a net reduction in PCU vehicle trips being likely.

The parking quantum, along with its basis, is accepted in so far as the retirement flats. The unallocated retail customer spaces will provide flexibility, but I would question whether the site is sufficiently accessible as to justify the omission of an allocated space for the 2 bedroom flat above the retail unit - some customer / resident parking conflict is foreseeable, and whilst short-term spaces are available in the street, there is no alternative long-term parking nearby that would be suitable for a resident.

With regards servicing - current provision utilises off-street areas, whereas future HGV / servicing is to use Elm Lane (Tesco will continue to use their car park). Whilst the development will reduce the number of HGV trips to the site, refuse vehicles (and potentially deliveries to the proposed retail unit) have the potential to obstruct the highway.

Air quality in this locality is known to be generally good, and this development is unlikely to represent an adverse impact. I expect others to make authoritative comment on the suitability of service & delivery arrangements - in the event that these do represent periodic highway obstructions, the impact is considered likely to be disproportionate, but at a frequency unlikely to be materially significant with respect to its effect on local air quality.

Contamination

An Environmental / Contamination Desk Study report is mentioned within the application cover letter, and the FRA refers to specific sections of the document. The report is not linked to the case however, so I have been unable to review its findings & conclusions.

There are informative site photographs & other contextual information within the archaeology report, and I would consider that a 'builders yard' / open storage use (including plant storage) over an apparently permeable surface could represent a contaminating landuse. The proposed development is sensitive in terms of exposure, and the scheme proposals may include deep boreholes, or infiltration drainage. As such, ground conditions should be confirmed, and any unacceptable contamination found remediated to a standard appropriate to the approved scheme.

I would therefore request that the following conditions be applied to any consent granted in respect of this scheme:

Condition 1 (Contamination)

Prior to the commencement of any specific phase of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in

writing with the Local Planning Authority and notwithstanding any assessment provided with the planning application), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site, whether originating from within or outside the curtilage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons, and the findings presented as a written report.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

- 1) A site walk-over survey &/or sufficient desk-based research to identify;
 - All relevant previous uses of the site
 - Potentially significant contaminants associated with those uses
 - Uncertainties relating to previous use or associated potential contaminants
 - A conceptual site model identifying all relevant sources, exposure pathways and receptors, and;
 - A summary of potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
- 2) Site investigation based on (1), to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise any physical contamination on or affecting the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
- 3) The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1) & (2), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes;
 - appropriately considered remedial objectives,
 - an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to sustainability, and;
 - clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.
- 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the Remediation Strategy (3) are complete, identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

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], Contamination may be present at the site as a result of both previous & current land uses that could pose a risk to future occupants of the site, the occupants or users of neighbouring properties, or controlled waters.

Condition 2 (Verification)

Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, any verification report required in accordance with **condition [X]** shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan, and must demonstrate that site remediation criteria have been

met. Where longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages is identified as being necessary, the report shall clearly set out plans for monitoring, provision for maintenance, relevant triggers and contingency actions (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan").
The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

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], Contamination may be present at the site as a result of both previous & current land uses that could pose a risk to future occupants of the site, the occupants or users of neighbouring properties, or controlled waters

I would also request that the following informative be included, with respect to the encountering of unexpected contamination during groundworks;

"It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure development, upon completion, is safe & suitable for its consented future use. Notwithstanding any site investigation or assessment report submitted with the planning application hereby approved, or submitted in accordance with any condition of this decision notice; contamination may be present at the site within un-investigated areas of the site associated with sources that were either unanticipated, not previously identified, or anticipated but not located. Such contamination may be identified during the course of development. In the event that any discoloured soils or groundwater, oily sheens, foul or solvent odours, or deposits / inclusions comprising obvious waste materials be encountered during groundwork, or if groundwork staff report acute symptoms (skin, eye or respiratory); works in that area of the site should cease until an appropriate assessment of the nature and extent of the suspected contamination has been undertaken. The local planning authority should be notified of the nature of the contamination, and how that contamination is to be dealt with"

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan Driver', with a horizontal line underneath.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer