

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/24/00567	Your Ref:	APP/23/01062
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	Date:	22 February 2024
DC Case Officer:			
DC Case Officer Extn:			
Application Number:	APP/23/01062		
Site Address:	Unit 502, Dunsbury Park, Brooklime Way, Havant, PO9 4FF		
Proposed Development:	Re-fit existing unit as a vehicle service workshop; new external vehicle wash bay and container within existing compound; provision of air intake and extract grills and exhaust extracts on west, east and south elevations.		

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the application documents and have few material comments to make, given the majority of issues will have been addressed at the phase 'shell and core' development phase.

Nuisance & Amenity

It is noted that the proposed activity may give rise to noise & other nuisance issues. The site is notably distant from the nearest residential receptors (being 220m to the West), so issues of noise and dust soiling will be limited to the nearby commercial neighbours, generally considered to be of low sensitivity.

I do however note the vehicle quarantine facilities, and would assume that this carries a risk- (i.e. is required to manage the risk-) of vehicle fires arising from damaged batteries. It is assumed that occurrences would be non-routine, and to occur rarely, if ever.

No management plans or statements are provided in support of the application, and so it is assumed that the management strategy would be reliant upon the emergency services to address any serious vehicle fires occurring.

I note from APP/21/1267 that the yard to unit 502 is served by a Class 1 bypass interceptor, with Alarm, sized according to EA PPG3 to serv. 1100m² and bypassing to the foul system. This should provide adequate protection for fire-fighting runoff, whether provided in-house or municipally.

It is assumed that the risk of fire (occurrence of smoke, fume, and soot deposition) is no greater at this site than would be expected to occur on the A3(M). However, if the frequency of such events is greater than expected, the planned unit 400 may be affected (deposition in parking areas, intake of smoke/soot/fume via intakes – H&S problems or stock fouling via HVAC systems, etc.)

The planning service might wish to seek clarification on the expected frequency of occurrence and/or the management plans/procedures/strategies – however I think that I am content, given both the scale of the unit and its purpose (i.e. as a routine service centre, not a crash recovery & repair facility-), to regard such possibilities as extraordinary events that would not warrant an objection (or any additional management measures, beyond those evident from the plans).

No material objections arise.

Pollution Risk

Bypass interceptor system mentioned above is sufficient to manage typical risks from spillage/leakage. The yard hard-surfacing should prevent any routine surface spillages significantly affecting land quality. Additionally, a high level of housekeeping is expected given the applicant and the facility example photographs.

I do however note the proposed elevated oil storage tanks, positioned over a goods-in delivery bay entrance. The oil tank platform supports are to be used as an enclosure. Whilst I would assume that consideration will have been given to the appropriate protection of the vertical supports, I note that no specific protection is shown (as exists at the bay door provided at shell & core stage).

Given the internal manoeuvring of large & heavy vehicles, and in particular electric vehicles which are capable of delivering high torque at very low speeds – there is a non-negligible risk of collision with the corner support, the subsequent collapse of the platform, and bulk release of oil from all three storage tanks. Whilst the bypass separator would pass any excess volume to foul (meaning that the risk of environmental pollution would be very limited), this seems an easily mitigated risk. The planning service may wish to confirm with the applicant that an appropriate collision protection will be provided for this internal structure.

Extract emissions

No emissions abatement (filtration) is described on plans for the HVAC & ATEX systems, and no system description has been provided in support of the application.

It is assumed that under normal circumstances, the emissions will be negligible in the context of the distance to sensitive receptors and the deep vegetated buffers to the site. No objections arise.

Conclusion

No objections arise, and no conditions are proposed.

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer