

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/15/00326	Your Ref:	APP/15/00215
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	07 April 2015
DC Case Officer:	Tina Pickup		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6461		
Application Number:	APP/15/00215		
Site Address:	Newtown House Hotel, Manor Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0QR		
Proposed Development:	Single storey front extension (and orangery) to restaurant. (Revised Application).		

Observations / Comments:

These comments refer only to a consideration of potential ground contamination, and should be read without prejudice to the previous response from Mark Moss in respect of this application (restricting the use of flood lighting, and recommending the use of informatives to control of hours of working, noise & dust).

Summary

No adverse comments in respect of these proposals - no conditions requested that require investigation of potential contamination, installation of precautionary risk mitigation measures, or that development works proceed under a watching brief.

Rationale is outlined in the sections below. Potential (low risk) sources exist within the curtilage of the application address, but do not intersect the application area (i.e. orangery position on Western facade).

Site history

<1867: Unknown - page 5 of the heritage design & access statement indicates that the original use was a 'farmhouse' and 'latterly a private residence'. mapping indicates that the farmhouse may have already been in use as a private dwelling in 1867.

1867: Site is occupied by at least 9 separate structures, of which it is probable that 2 represent the core elements of extant structures on site. The area of land on the Manor Road frontage is shown to be divided into 5 regular plots, which map symbols indicate are likely to represent formal gardens (negligible risk). A well & pump are marked. The pump is likely to be for water / groundwater - and may have been manual or mechanised (given the number & range of sizes of outbuildings, and the former agricultural use of the site, a pump-house for substantial mechanised pump equipment cannot be ruled out, albeit that it is not necessarily likely given 1898 map annotation)

1898: Site configuration as in 1867. Well to West of the main building is marked "P" (pump), likely that a manual water pump is present to both East & West of the building at this time. 10 distinct structures are clearly marked - at least five of which have been demolished in subsequent years, the remaining five either form the hotel core elements mentioned above, or have been subsequently joined to the core elements with subsequent extensions. Fruit orchards are shown to the North & East of the property.

1909: Map indicates a partial demolition of a substantial structure in the Eastern end of the plot, and a new small outbuilding to the West of the main house (1932 mapping indicates this smaller structure to be a glasshouse)

1932: The structure in the Western end of the plot is shown to be completely demolished by this date. An indistinct feature to the immediate West of the Southern building is shown with increased footprint (now totalling approx. 200 sq.m) - later mapping identifies this to be a pond. Previous maps show boundaries at this location - it is probable that a surface water feature was present in this area of the site throughout the period covered by the mapping, albeit with a smaller surface area. Original boundaries are likely to represent areas with greatest depth (e.g. of waste fill / made ground). An additional glasshouse of modest proportion (i.e. not likely to be associated with a significant boiler house / combustion plant) is shown to the West of the main house, and an infill extension has joined an existing structure to the main house (but does not appear to have replaced it).

1969: Mapping shows the building to be in use as a Hotel by this date. Two structures are shown to have been demolished by this date, and the main house has been extended on both the Northern & Eastern facades. The Pond is marked, and the Tennis courts are also present on this map issue. The northern end of the main building appears to have been divided from the main plot, having separate curtilage fronting manor Road, and being noted as "Newtown house".

1990: A new building (as existing) is shown to have been constructed by this date between the tennis courts and the main house. Further small-footprint extensions to the main house have been constructed. The Southern building is shown to have been linked to the main building by means of a small extension. The boundary of the pond is not shown - possibly indicating that it has been in-filled by this date.

1990-2004: a new building is shown to have been constructed adjacent to the tennis courts, on the site of the former pond. linked to the original build

Potential sources of contamination

The site history indicates a complex succession of buildings & features on this site, over a substantial period of recent history.

Several unmarked / unlabelled buildings are present on the 1867 mapping, arranged around a substantial courtyard area (25x25m approx) to the rear of the farmhouse. It is likely that the outbuildings shown have previously been used for agricultural purpose - but it is unknown what type of farming was in operation in the wider area (no features are specifically marked to indicate arable or livestock).

Contamination is often associated with farm complexes - relating to pesticides (e.g. historically DDT), metals (e.g. associated with animal treatments [sheep dip etc.] or equipment), fuels or combustion residues, nutrients (though historically these would likely have been of natural origin), or indeed local disposal of waste materials.

With the number of demolished former structures on site, it would be expected that there would be some made ground on site. The infilled drainage pond feature is indicative that a relatively substantial quantity of construction/demolition waste could have been disposed of on site (i.e. there is evidence of the waste arising on site, and the opportunity to locally dispose of the waste & level land). Given the dates, made ground could contain asbestos, ash/clinker and other combustion residues.

It is considered that the infilled pond is unlikely to contain significant quantities of putrescible material; if this is the case, I would expect localised ground instability ('slumping') to be evident.

However, it remains possible for organic rich soils / sediments to be present within the area of the former pond that could generate high concentrations (but not large volumes) of Methane / Carbon Dioxide. This could be significant for Health & Safety (working within excavations or service ducts), or for buildings directly overlying the feature - albeit that the acute risk of combustion / asphyxiation is likely to be very low given atmospheric dilution.

Conclusions & recommendations

The current proposals concern alterations to an extension constructed between 1968 & 1990. The previously developed (extension) overlies former gardens, and the increase in building footprint will similarly be accommodated on land previously used as gardens / formal gardens (i.e. no previous potentially contaminative landuses). The extension being altered may however contain asbestos-containing materials, given the range of probable dates for its construction and the presence of ductwork & gas services at this location. Being part of the fabric of the existing structure, the possible presence of asbestos is considered to be a health & safety issue of which I expect the applicant or their principal contractor to take reasonable account. I therefore make no specific recommendations in this regard.

Considering the above, and in the context of these proposals; I see no justification for requiring investigative work, and no practical benefit in requiring that groundworks proceed under a watching brief. There are no foreseeable contamination sources in this area of the site, and the proposed commercial use represents a relatively low exposure risk.

If a comprehensive redevelopment were to be proposed within the wider site area - for example the demolition & replacement of one of the more modern structures - my recommendation would be to include a condition requiring an intrusive investigation & assessment of contamination at the site (proportional to the scale of the development) in order to confirm that no unacceptable risks to human health exist as a result of previous agricultural activity or the presence of made ground.



Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer