

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/17/01855	Your Ref:	APP/17/00906
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	04 October 2017
DC Case Officer:	Mrs Emma Chisnall		
DC Case Officer Extn:	6523		
Application Number:	APP/17/00906		
Site Address:	24 Cavendish Drive, Waterloooville, PO7 7PJ		
Proposed Development:	2 storey side and single storey rear extension with flue to existing dwelling.		

Observations / Comments:

I have looked over the submitted application. The existing property is noted to have been constructed on greenfield land between 1953 & 1961.

There are no contamination concerns associated with the prior use of the land, though it should be noted that there is a risk given the construction date of asbestos being present within a wide range of building materials within the property, and there is a potential for asbestos containing materials to be present in association with hardstanding at the property where construction & demolition wastes have been used as a construction hardcore.

There are no air quality concerns with respect to the exposure of occupants at the existing property, and no change to the exposure risks to external sources will occur as a result of the proposed development.

The proposed flue is noted to be at low elevation, at a position approximately 12m separated from the closest property (which is also positioned down-prevailing-wind of the flue). There would appear to be few opportunities to reposition within the proposed development footprint for reduced risk of interference with neighbours, though the flue is noted not to be proposed in the position likely to be most likely to cause problems with emissions.

There is considered to be a reasonable potential for nuisance complaint with the proposed burner unless care is exercised to ensure that it is appropriately fueled, and properly managed. Management of the fire is particularly important, and poor management can lead to unnecessary nuisance smoke, soot & odour.

The applicant should be aware of the sensitivity of the location, and should account for this when making use of the solid fuel burner. I would recommend that a DEFRA approved burner be specified, that an approved low-smoke fuel be used, and that careful attention is paid to minimising the moisture content of any fuels used.

Were the flue positioned differently, I would have pushed for mitigation of the nuisance

risk (i.e. by repositioning or by omission). In the position currently proposed, nuisance is foreseeable, but likely avoidable through proper management - and therefore probably not a material consideration. In this way, it is likely to be more appropriate for Environmental Health to deal with any issues that may arise through it's duties under the EPA 1990.

Please feel free to formalise the above recommendation as an informative, as you see fit. Otherwise, I have no objections to the development on pollution grounds.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer