

Asbestos

Asbestos within the fabric of the building is not typically addressed as a contamination issue – it's a construction/demolition matter governed by Health & Safety & Control of Asbestos Legislation, in addition to Building Control. With reference to NPPF'24 para 201, this shouldn't really be a material planning matter.

That said – the ACM removal work does pose a risk of depositing fibres on site soils and creating a contamination-relevant issue. The Council is reliant upon the non-planning regimes, and upon the general duty of the developer under NPPF'24 para 197. The risk is fairly routine, and I don't think there's any need to seek to control it via condition.

Contamination

The properties were constructed some time between 1909 & 1932 on greenfield land. There are no known sources of potential contamination in the history of the site. I note the proposal to remove a macadam surface and to replace it with a landscaped children's play area. It is understood that the hardstand was probably constructed under a 1972 consent, and so is unlikely to be a tar macadam (it's likely an straight bitumen-) macadam. This type of surface is lower risk (for PAH leaching), and given the temporary tenure, on balance I don't think that contamination controls are necessary.

Air Quality

Were this site of a greater scale, I would raise some points of disagreement with the transport assessment. However, I note that the local Highways Authority does not share (or at least hasn't raised) those concerns, and has instead raised no objection. The issues are not of sufficient magnitude as warrant my contracting the primary consultee.

I similarly note that parking standards were subject to pre-application discussion, and as such I offer no comment. I also note that the climate consultee has raised the lack of detail in the application on sustainability and carbon – the same could be said to be true for air quality emissions offsetting (as emerging policy), though I'd acknowledge that the policy basis for seeking an enhancement to the scheme is not so strong at this stage. Consequently, I'd offer no adverse comments.

Other matters

I note that the location plan redline is incorrect, and is not aligned with the development plans/design & access statement. The location plan includes a ~12 x 32m plot adjacent to 1a Hillside Ave., which is excluded from the detailed plans.

Summary/Conclusions

No objections raised. No conditions proposed.

Best Regards,

Jon

Jonathan Driver

Environmental Control Officer

Havant Borough Council Environmental Health
Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant, Hants, PO9 2AX