

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL
Town & Country Planning Act 1990
Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/22/00632	Your Ref:	APP/22/00172
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	13 July 2022
DC Case Officer:	Robert Riley		
DC Case Officer Extn:	-not listed-		
Application Number:	APP/25/00588		
Site Address:	Langstone Technology Park, 2B Langstone Road, Havant, PO9 1SA		
Proposed Development:	Discharge of Conditions 5, 20, 21, 22, 40, 41 and 43 of Planning Permission APP/22/00172		

Observations / Comments:

I have now had opportunity to review the application and it's supporting documents, alongside prior comments made by Environmental Health in connection with prior applications & requests for pre-application advice.

The following conditions are relevant to comments previously provided; Conditions 21, 22, 43 (Air Quality), and 40 & 41 (Pollution via SuDS).

Air Quality; Development as Source – Impacts from Transport & Emissions Offsetting

Arrangements for signage & operation of the Traffic Barriers at the West Access, restricting HGV & public peak AM hour access are in line with expectations. No objections arise to the discharge of c.21 or c.22 (to the extent sought)

At the time of writing, the application to discharge c.43 has been determined. However, for completeness, I can confirm that proposals / provisions are in line with expectations, and that no objections would have arisen.

Pollution; Drainage Strategy

I have looked over the drainage plan, and note that that the separation of catchments served and not served by interceptors is appropriate. Similarly, the full-retention interceptor models specified on the drainage plan are appropriate to the catchment areas being served – being of a capacity which slightly exceeds the area served. No objections arise to the discharge of c.41 (to the extent sought).

In respect of c.40 – the manufacturer's recommended installation & maintenance guide has been submitted in support of this application (only). The Cover letter does not appear to make a commitment to adhering to the minimum service intervals given in the guidance, and no specific comment is made about the use of- or reliance upon- oil level alarms, nor is a responsible party

identified. Similarly, the submission only covers the Interceptors, and doesn't inform arrangements for other key aspects of the system, e.g. the Hydrobrakes.

Looking at the wording for c.40, it may not be sufficient for planning purposes to accept the implicit proposal to adhere to manufacturer's recommendations. Notwithstanding the LLFA's position of 'no objections', I would have expected that more detail would be required for surety that neglect of maintenance will not nullify the value of the interceptor units. Whilst I have confidence that amounts to a paper exercise, I would nevertheless flag that the submission is weak in respect of c. 40, and arguably does not fully meet the requirements specified at a)-f). An objection on this basis could be sustained.

Development Management may wish to seek a more detailed understanding of how (e.g.) operational continuity will be achieved for drainage system maintenance, but rather than lodge for formal objection, in light of the LLFA's comments, I will defer to your service to determine the planning balance (i.e. the value-) of seeking the omitted details.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer