

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/15/00806	Your Ref:	APP/15/00586
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	15 July 2015
DC Case Officer:	Sally Smith		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6522		
Application Number:	APP/15/00586		
Site Address:	Premier Inn, 2B Langstone Technology Park and, 39A-45 Brookside Road, Havant, PO9 1JP		
Proposed Development:	Discharge of Condition No/s 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18 of Planning Permission APP/14/01300.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the documentation submitted with this application as it relates to condition No.s 16 & 18, and additional information submitted that is not directly relevant to conditions within the scope of this application (Enzygo Geo-Environmental Report, Simpsons Associates Implementation Plan).

c.16 & 18 (ventilation provision)

The ventilation unit specifications for rooms (Vectaire WHHR Mini DC), and the Jenks Associates mechanical ventilation specification appear to be comprehensive in respect of provision for maintaining appropriate levels of ventilation, preventing cross contamination of air supplies, minimising internal transmission of fan noise & and avoiding duct locations adjacent to local sources of pollution.

The specification leaves several elements of final design to the design & installation contractor, but provides a clear set of parameters for mitigation of internal noise generation and specifies installation locations that will facilitate maintenance of air filtration.

Hotel bedroom noise levels specified (closed windows) are in line with residential standards, and a range of mitigation measures are specified to achieve the specified levels (with respect to transmittance via ducting). A clear requirement is placed upon the mechanical contractor to identify & appropriately rectify local noise generation / transmittance issues through the specification & installation of additional attenuation in accordance with recommendations of an acoustic consultant. Mark Moss may provide further technical comment on noise levels if he considers necessary, but with specific reference to the noise emissions from the specified units (at specified rates) & that provisions for mitigating internal transmittance, the specifications provided are considered to be adequate.

The specified ventilation systems, flow rates & installation provisions are considered acceptable, and the discharge of c.16 is therefore supported.

c.5, c.6 & c.10 (drainage & hardstanding)

I note that Environment Agency support for discharge of c.5, permitting parking area runoff discharge to surface water via attenuation structures & hydrobrake. Car parking areas pose a pollution risk from cumulative small scale chronic leakage (from parked vehicles). However bulk release (e.g. through traffic collision) is considered to be a low risk due to low vehicle speeds on drained area.

It is also acknowledged that rapid & direct transmittance to surface water should be mitigated through attenuation within permeable paving & the underlying substrate matrix, and the use of catchpits & permavoid attenuation. These features provide opportunity for pollution prevention measures to be adopted in the event of significant spillage, preventing discharge to the surface water.

I have reviewed the Simpsons Associates implementation plan and note that full consideration has been given to the prevention of pollution of surface waters (hard-standing construction, drainage installation & maintenance, and during general site operations)

I have no adverse comments to make with respect to the discharge of these conditions.

Additional - Enzygo geo-environmental Assessment

I have reviewed the submitted Geo-Environmental Assessment, and note that the chemical samples taken from upper soils (topsoil & shallow made ground) have been shown to be free from significant contamination. For all determinands sampled, results indicated soils suitable for residential use with private garden areas, and in this way the site is considered unlikely to pose a risk to either human health or local controlled waters receptors.

The only credible source of contamination identified from desk based sources is expected to be deliberate surface disposal of material originating from the local (previously adjacent) sewage treatment works. The intrusive investigation appears to indicate that this did not occur, but there does appear to have been a degree of site disposal of construction inerts & ash (from other sources). WS4 was also noted to have encountered an obstruction, which may indicate the presence of a former (unmapped) structure, tank, or other buried material (e.g concrete).

The physical investigation undertaken was entirely appropriate to the degree of risk identified within the desk study, but there remains a degree of uncertainty. Given the presence of a spring & main river channel on site, the site is considered to be sensitive to contamination - and reference to ubiquitous shallow made ground & unexpected (and unidentified) obstructions leave open the possibility that localised contamination could exist on site. The report proposes maintenance of a watching brief for contamination which recommends that the local planning authority is notified in the event that suspected contamination is identified. In consideration of the sensitivity of the site (in terms of controlled waters), observance of a voluntary watching brief is welcomed.

I also note that piled foundations are recommended. As the investigation identified only 'clean' (chemically uncontaminated) soils on site - there is no specific concern with regards the creation of preferential migration pathways to the underlying principal aquifer. The site is also located to the south of the groundwater source protection zones SPZ1 & SPZ1c, therefore theoretically being located 'down-hydraulic-gradient' of the protected abstraction. However, a spring is located on site (albeit that this is the southern-most spring of which I am aware), and as such the

site is considered to lie within the spatial extents of the Havant & Bedhampton Springs, and penetrative activities that affect the chalk strata may impact upon the public abstraction.

I do not have a full list of springs abstracted by Portsmouth Water, and have insufficient information/expertise to make an authoritative assessment as to whether piling at this site (to between 10-15m depth) is likely to increase turbidity within groundwater & at local springs during works.

I would recommend that the applicant contact Portsmouth Water to discuss the perceived degree of risk from piling activities and any precautionary measures that it may be appropriate to take in order to avoid any adverse short-term impact upon the public supply.

Provision for basic Radon protection measures is considered to be appropriate for the site.



Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer