

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/15/00432	Your Ref:	APP/15/00268
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	28 April 2015
DC Case Officer:	Heather Lealan		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6523		
Application Number:	APP/15/00268		
Site Address:	44A New Lane, Havant, PO9 2NF		
Proposed Development:	Change of use to sui generis (Plant Hire Company) and to install a wash down area for cleaning plant and machinery		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the submitted documentation alongside responses from both Southern Water and the Environment Agency, with a view to assessing the pollution potential of the proposed use and the appropriateness of proposed mitigation.

It is understood that Mark Moss has already provided comment on other Environmental Health issues such as noise, over-spray & operation hours.

Previous & proposed site use - environmental risks

I am unclear on the previous formal planning status of the site, but note that the previous occupier utilised the site as a fleet depot for small number of crane-equipped beavertail type Rigid HGV/MDV. From a pollution perspective, these fall into a similar risk category as small plant & equipment, in that there are various associated automotive fluids, hydraulic systems & greased linkages/sections on crane booms, and the vehicles are heavily used - requiring relatively frequent maintenance (i.e. risk of leakage from use associated wear & damage).

These factors are considered to broadly apply to small plant, though in addition there is considered to be a greater probability of on-site fuelling being undertaken (and associated need for fuel storage), and an increased risk of release of hydrocarbons as a result of cleaning of plant (in comparison to crane-equipped road vehicles, due to level of soiling). It is understood that both light maintenance' and cleaning of small plant is proposed at the site, but that larger plant will be based at an alternative location.

Wash-down proposals

The submission from the applicant does not provide a great deal of specific information. For example, in relation to the 'interceptor tank', it is unclear whether the proposed tank is for the settlement of silt, separation of free-phase oils, or both (for later removal), whether it is to be fed from the proposed sump under gravity or pump - installed above- or below- ground, or connect to foul sewer under gravity or via pumped system.

Similarly, the volume / capacity is not specified, and phrase "further treatment" is non-specific as to the function of the equipment, or what component is for disposal via foul (or the effluent discharge quality standards to be achieved), and what component is for removal to off site disposal. I am also unclear on how the washdown area (i.e. trade effluent connection to the foul system) is to be separated from the yard area surface water drainage, if indeed it is to be.

There are cost implications for the applicant if rainfall runoff is disposed of as trade effluent, and from an environmental point of view, it is desirable to divert surface water from foul systems where possible to help ease overloading of local treatment facilities (and ultimately the discharge of untreated effluent to an internationally designated marine habitat).

I also note however that the existing yard drainage provision is unspecified, and may currently direct surface water direct to nearby surface water streams without passing through appropriate silt trap &/or oil trap gullies, or an oil interceptor chambers. In this way, collection of yard surface water & discharge to foul drainage after 1st stage treatment (e.g. settlement / separation) could represent an environmental *benefit*.

I have few concerns over cleaning fluids used if discharges are kept separate from surface water systems - the washdown area cleaning process does not require any specific solvent or chemical (acid-, or bleach- based) cleaners, and is connected for a foul system for multi-stage treatment. Cleaning associated with light maintenance (which may involve specialist cleaners) is likely to be undertaken within the unit, utilising either closed systems, or the existing foul provision.

Solely on the basis of the applicant's submissions in support of this application, I would be inclined to require further details on the drainage provision for agreement by the LPA.

Southern Water & Environment Agency consultation responses

I note that the Environment Agency (EA) offered not objection to the proposals, and requested no conditions. It is typical for the EA to request service yard discharges to pass through an oil interceptor unit, but no requirements are proposed in relation to this application, nor is any confirmation of existing provisions requested. It is assumed that the status of the application (i.e. change of use from similar activity) and clear proposals to discharge to the foul system (falling within the regulatory remit of the wastewater undertaker, not the EA) is the reason for not requiring the detail be provided.

It is clear that the EA are content to accept the proposals at face value - i.e. that the applicant will install appropriate attenuation gullies / tanks, and to connect these appropriately to the correct system, and/or that building control / wastewater undertaker will ensure that proposed provisions are satisfactorily implemented.

It would appear that Southern Water Services (SWS) regards the washdown area as a new connection to the public system, however it is possible that the reference to a new connection is simply a standard paragraph - the letter indicates that the development *may* produce trade effluent, and recommends consultation, and the use of appropriate oil trap gullies or interceptors.

It is unclear whether the site constitutes a 'new' connection (as it is already served), or whether SWS could-, or is likely to-, require that drainage serving general hardstanding that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages is retrofitted with suitable attenuation infrastructure, if currently absent.

Whether an existing, or new source - it is likely that the washdown area will constitute trade effluent, requiring consent & subsequent monitoring. A review of the SWS website indicates that standards for both suspended solids & oils appear on the list of mandatory standards (sliding scale for billing, and definition of prohibited effluent). From this perspective, it is apparent that there are adequate controls under the Water Industries Act '91, and that the statutory undertaker is aware of the proposals.

Conclusions & Recommendations

The proposed use of the site carries an elevated pollution risk when compared with the previous use as a fleet base for a specialist transport operator.

It is unclear whether the existing drainage provision meets modern standards for the current consented, or proposed sui-generis use class. It is similarly unclear if & how surface water and trade effluent from the washdown area are to be kept separate, and to what standards the proposed trade effluent interceptor tank is intended to achieve.

Despite the lack of specific information submitted with the application, it is apparent that the appropriate authority with respect to controlled waters (EA) and the wastewater undertaker (SWS) are content to address these issues via other regulatory provisions. Environmental Health considers it appropriate to take these responses as a substantial steer, and does not therefore propose a condition requiring the specific agreement of a drainage scheme.

The EA has however included a caveat referring to acceptance of "the method of disposal for the wash water as stated in the application" [via] ..."sealed drainage"..."disposed of via mains foul drainage or taken off site for disposal..."

In this regard, it is considered appropriate to simply require that the development is undertaken *in substantial accordance with the washdown proposal* (no ref - stamped received 13/03/2015).

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

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer